

Problems concerning the Study of History of Colonies in Japan

Toshiro Matsumoto

1. Up to where problems are and how a viewpoint should be analyzed—Diversification of the modern age and historical analyses—

In this paper, problems encountered in the study of history of colonies in Japan are sorted out, and the author's idea regarding the direction of future studies is presented.

The author believes that invasion vs. development, the opposite viewpoints for the study of the colonies, are acquiring equally an important meaning. There are two reasons for this. One reason for the dualistic viewpoints is that the rapid growth of Japanese capitalism has compelled the economies of Asian countries to retain strong dependence on Japan. Furthermore, it is pointed out that new political and economical frictions have been created between Asian countries and Japan due to the political posture of Japanese leaders after World War II, who have never made self-criticism upon Japan's colonial rule over other nations in the past. With regard to the problems of the colonial rule, the situation has been somewhat improved in these years, i. e., the very recent apologies made by senior members of the Liberal Democratic

Party to North and South Korea. It remains to be seen, however, whether the invasion in the past should be recognized as a 'crime' or not.

The other reason for the two opposing viewpoints is that Japan's stride in the international society has been regarded as a model for modernization of the third world, due to the spectacular growth of the Japanese economy and the rapid economic development of Taiwan and South Korea both of which were once Japan's colonies. And the complex of irritation and expectation is reflected upon rekindling of the indemnity problems. Under these circumstances, the study of the history of colonies in Japan is now exposed to the criticism related to the problems of the modernization.

In this case it might be necessary for us to exhibit beforehand the process of the modernization which the author has had in mind, because the author uses the term, *modernization* (hereafter *modernization* when italicized like this, it stands for the author's ideal concept), in a different way from the generally accepted definition.

Regarding *modernization*, the author simply cherishes the concept in relation to the three points: (1) avoidance of invasion to other countries, (2) elimination of poverty, and (3) equalization of political rights of nation. For the Asian peoples who have experienced colonial ages and have not necessarily been successful in building up their states even after they completed their independence, their imminent and earnest assignments are believed to be the realization of the international peace guaranteeing self-independence of their nations and states and the democratization of the political systems. Furthermore, the attainment of wealthier life together with industrialization must also be one of their aims. Such a definition is an ideal for the author himself. It reveals his expectation

toward the concept of modernization.

Thus concerning the author's proposals, there might arise a criticism as follows. When modernization is interpreted as defined above, Japan before World War II might be out of the scope of the Modern History. In addition to the above, the prewar stages of European and American countries that had promoted capitalist policies in political and economic fields at a high level will slip out of the frame of the modern age because of the reason that these western nations possessed colonies.

Although much variety is realized among individual researchers in connection with the definitions of modern age and the dimensions of logic dealt with, the author describes the generally version of modernization in the meaning of the capitalism development. And the author wishes to express his concept regarding a relationship between modernization as a general meaning and *modernization* as an ideal for the modern people, at least, as far as the author is concerned. The illustration in Table 1 reflects the author's concept with respect to the above. Evaluation for plus '+' or minus '-' is made referring to the modernization as an ideal. That is, the symbol '+' is given when the country satisfies the relevant requirement explained above, while the sign '-' is used in the negative way. The symbol '++' stands for a stronger degree. Table 1-(2) is only a reference here.

As to the prewar stage when problems were complicated, we discuss the capitalist countries indicated in Table 1-(1) in more detail; That is to say, the plus elements, for example, comprises '+' of the democratization of Western Europe/U. S. A., '++' of the independence of Western Europe/U. S. A., '++' of the industrialization of Western Europe/U. S. A., '+' of the industrialization of Japan, and Korea/Taiwan. On the

Table 1. Relationships between the ideal and the reality of the modern age
(a) Capitalist Countries

	West Europe /U. S. A		Japan		S. Korea/Taiwan	
	Prewar	Postwar	Prewar	Postwar	Prewar	Postwar
(1)Independence	++	++	+	+	-	+
(1')Non-invasion	-	+	--	++	++	+
(2)Industrialization	++	++	+	++	+	-->++
(3)Democratization	+	++	-	+	-	-->△

(b) Socialist Countries (reference)

	China		N. Korea	
	Prewar	Postwar	Prewar	Postwar
(1)Independence	-	++	-	+
(1')Non-invasion	+	+	++	+
(2)Industrialization	△	-	+	-
(3)Democratization	-	-	-	-

Notes: 1. The symbol '++' indicates strong plus, whereas '+' denotes plus. The symbol '△' indicates intermediate. The symbol '-' indicates minus, whereas '-' denotes strong minus.

2. Division of "prewar" and "postwar" is determined with World War II as a dividing epoch.

3. As far as Non-invasion is concerned, conflicts of China vs. Taiwan, North Korea vs. South Korea and struggle between Western Powers at the World War I, II are not under consideration.

other hand, the minus elements comprises '-' of the non-invasion of Western Europe/ U. S. A. and Japan ('-' of the independence of Korea/Taiwan), and '-' of the democratization of Japan and Korea/Taiwan.

The point to be noted at this stage is as follows: The most important problem is that either plus or minus, i. e. all the elements exhibited above have been intensified in the course of capitalism development and have

been expanded. Discouraged by the miserable decline of socialism in recent years, people are liable to believe that expansion of capitalism is an only contributor to mankind. This is, however, too simplistic an error.

If we consider the minus elements, one of the causes which complicate the matters resides with the following fact. When one observes the elements of minus more closely, two points should be noted. The first is that there are certainly things which are quite newly brought about by the capitalism. The second. There exist some elements which were inherited from the premodern age and have been used aggressively for the capitalism system. Irrespective of whether the elements are new or old, the minus elements are desired to be overcome in a process. And the very minus elements have often played a decisive role in destroying the various kinds of elements observed in the premodern age, up to some stages. It might remain to be seen how the fact that '—' for democratization in the colonies has been a supportive factor of such destruction should be evaluated. Regarding the problems such as the systems of private land-ownership or the formation of relations between capital and wage-earning labor, it seems likely that the dialectical viewpoints explained previously can be adopted.

Another complicated relation of the minus elements can be exemplified. The symbol '—' of the non-invasion ('—' of the independence) was, without doubt, the minus element brought about by the modern age, but it can also be said that the element had also been brought forth by the premodern international sense (the seclusionism) of the invadees. Needless to say, the western major powers had never asked the Asian countries to trade with them upon equal terms and conditions based on considerable politeness. The outer pressure, however, brought into Asia by the West European/American powers to compel the Asians to open their countries

was not necessarily intended to take a style of colonization as the supreme assignment. In the studies of history ever carried out, emphasis has often been placed upon the significance of the loss of the influence of the Japanese policy concerning the expulsion of foreigners conducted by the vigorous royalistic activists who contrived to topple Tokugawa Shogunate in the early age of modern Japan.

With regard to the outer pressure to Asia created by Japan, Japan was much more invasive than the West European/American powers of the same age. Even in this case, however, it might again remain to be seen how the global system of capitalism which criticized Japan's invasion from a viewpoint of morality, and finally oppressed Japan and oriented her toward the invasion to Asia should be dealt with.

When a problem to seek for the starting point of the modern age in the general meaning is taken up, the author is also of the view that it began in the prewar stage not only with the West Europe/U. S. A. but also with Japan as well as Korea/Taiwan. When the problem is re-composed, however, with the author's own concept that the *modernization* satisfies the three elements, no invasion, industrialization, and democratization, at the same time, the modern age began in the postwar not merely with Korea/Taiwan and Japan but with Western Europe/U. S. A. as well.

The author's interest never resides with the denial of the significance of epoch-making modern age which has been brought about by the capitalist countries in the prewar stage, especially by the West Europe and the U. S. A. He does not intend to deny the diversity which the modern age possesses. The interest of the author dwells upon the fact

that it was only after World War II that developed capitalist countries started to seek for their own development based upon the admitted independence of developing countries. In other words, how the new age thus put forth is, for many of the Asian nations, the first epochal one enabling those nations to attain political democratization and wealthier life of people which the western capitalist nations already had acquired should be thought much of ⁽¹⁾. One more point to be noted is how the fact that the arrival of such a new era had already been prepared with the intensification of the various elements for modernization in the prewar stage, including the minus elements, should be evaluated.

If the supposition of both the modern age that exists and modernization that is desirable should be an obstruction in grasping the actual modern age as a whole, such an attempt should be neglected as a methodological error. The author has, however, an impression that it might be a very important academic task to apply this frame work of 'two' modern ages, actual and ideal, in historical analysis.

A problem originates from the fact that no technical term, except *modernization*, can be found, which allows a distinction between the prewar and postwar stages, and can at the same time contain both of

(1) The causes bringing forth the new age are as follows: (a) Asian nations have been strong enough to vie with the advanced countries, to ask them to make concessions and rectify direction in policies by acquiring resisting ideologies such as socialism or liberation from the colonial restraint. (b) Advancement of the modernization has cultured, in developed countries, a high-level political sense to think highly of the self-establishment of the developing countries. (c) Under such circumstances, bringing up self-established states has been highly recommended even from the side of advanced capitalist countries with an aim of avoiding the expansion of socialism and the instability of their own administration. With regard to this matter, refer to Matsumoto [1987] and the Note 5 below in this paper.

them in a shooting range. In this situation, it is important to avoid unnecessary confusion in historical studies by permitting individual researchers to make their own definitions of the term, modernization, on which they stand.

2 . Three problems in Studies of colonial history

Even though the usage of the term, “modernization”, is allowed in the manner mentioned above, it is still not so easy to consider modernization of the colonies. As has already been shown in Table 1, the actual state of colonial rule in the prewar Japan resulted in a complicated situation. On the one hand, Japanese colonial policy which brought a considerable degree of expansion in relation to the industrialization, was destructive on the minus elements of the premodern age. On the other hand, her policy was essentially invasion to other countries, opposite of independence and democratization. Furthermore, the problem of discussing *modernization* in colonies has been divided into the following three topics oppressive enough to make the Japanese historians discouraged⁽²⁾.

[1] The first problem mentally oppressive to the Japanese historians is how Japan’s colonial invasion should be dealt with when the prewar history of Japan is studied. The possibility that the wake of the capitalism promotion of the prewar Japan can be a model for the future of the

(2) *Modernization* in the colonies means, as has already been explained in the text, that the process of capitalism development equally expanded the elements of minus and plus for the ideal modernization, and prepared the other aspects of modernization also in the postwar age. Refer to Table 1 (p.90).

third world countries should be restricted only to some aspects of the industrial policy of the prewar Japan. This is due to the establishment of Japan in the Meiji Era as a state where the development of the nation was thenceforth accomplished based upon the invasion to the Asian countries.

With regard to the problems of modernization of Japan and Asia, it might be necessary to consider the well-known facts which have repeatedly taken up by the researchers of the history. They are: (1) The periods and the ways of outer pressure applied from the West Europe/U. S. A. were strikingly different. (2) The responsive methods to such pressure from the westerners were different on the point of national unity and self-dependence. (3) The ways of political powers in transfer from feudalism to the capitalist system were different. (4) The characters of the authorities as the mainstay of productivity enhancement and industrial policy were considerably different. (5) The cultures which the individual nations possessed were different in the way of looking at West Europe/U. S. A.

In addition to these points, the fact that the mutual and direct relationships between the modernization of Japan and Asian countries exist should not be neglected.

The history of the prewar Japan characterized by the invasion to other countries should be rejected based upon a valuational criterion judged from a moral viewpoint. Besides, the history has a limited value as a model due to a greater probability that repetition of such a tragedy will be prevented from occurring owing to the international opposition. Also, the fact that the Japanese postwar economy has successfully been

developed without Japan's possession of colonies, teaches us that the status of prewar economy of the nation has to be reinvestigated from a viewpoint of criticism.

It was certain that there were few conditions for the Japanese capitalism in the prewar time to develop without invading into the Asian countries. First of all, political forces and national consciousness to resist the invasion were very fragile not only in Japan but also in the Asian area where military invasion was made by the Japanese force. Why was the fragility on the both sides of the invader and the invadees produced? How should the differences in such fragility be distinguished when a problem of morality is taken into consideration? These problems will not be discussed in this paper.

Secondly the European and American developed capitalist countries, i. e. the international system of capitalism had immaturity in their strategy and imperfection in their system, and moreover they had to seek for their own economic advancement, and thus could not afford to allow Japan, the resourceless state, to develop. Supposing that the invasion had been avoided, there would arise a doubt in what a style Japan's prewar capitalism was able to be in development. This question should be taken up as a problem of the global system, certainly in a dimension different from the criticism to the militarism of the prewar Japan. Such a study has a very important meaning when one considers the causes of rise of the 'Asianism' by which ideology Japan's invasion to Asia was justified.

Again supposing that Japan's invasion to Asian countries was inevitable due to such causes, it is very dangerous for every historian to construct an affirmative model by holding the relation between his/her research region and such inevitability of invasion in an ambiguous state, even if

the problems of colonies are not dealt with directly. Self-restriction in various studies not to justify the past history of Japan, however, has seldom been carried out thoroughly. On the contrary, this type of attitude is sometimes ignored intentionally. Accordingly, most historians of colonies cannot but continue incessantly to think of the opposing relation between such 'optimistic' research tides and their studies.

[2] The second problem where tension is tightening is related with economic development and racial concept of the one-time colonial countries. Japan's colonial rule was not promoted with the intention of development of the governees by any means. *Modernization* that was advanced for Japan's sake in colonies was not intended to help the governees to achieve independence and modernization, but contrarily compelled the races concerned to be placed in a subordinate position. The drastic rise of the nationalism among the native peoples after the liberation from the colonial restraint was supported with the repulsion to this humiliating past.

Some arrangement of the problem is, however, required for making clear the meaning which Japan's colonial rule had for modernization of the postwar Asia. This is because "modernization" with various minus elements promoted in colonies is believed to be, beyond the imagination of the rulers of the colonies, one of the accelerating conditions for the modernization of the countries concerned after they realized their independence.

The differences in the social and economic conditions through the lapse of years between the time when the colonization by Japan was started and the day of August 15, 1945 when the colonial rule was dissolved has

a significant meaning relating to the primary condition for the modernization of the area. In addition, admitting not only the promotive condition for modernization but also the obstructive condition against modernization, i. e. differences in the social and economic conditions between the two time points of starting and closing of the colonial era and the distortion of modernization from *modernization* that should exist, is intrinsically not equal to affirming the colonial rule.

Clive Hamilton points out, "All in all, colonial domination in the two countries (Korea and Taiwan—Matsumoto) had a fundamental impact on domestic class structures the full significance of which would only emerge after decolonization" ⁽³⁾.

On the other hand, Mark Peattie presents a problem by saying, "How does one balance the creation of a modern educational system in Korea with the attempt to eradicate the Korean language and culture? What is the trade-off between the establishment of modern administrative structures against the difficulty of a Taiwanese gaining responsible within them? It is more useful perhaps to take note of the transforming effects—for good or ill—of Japanese rule among its colonies" ⁽⁴⁾. The remarks of these scholars poignantly refer to one important aspect of the problem.

In analyzing the present status of Korea and Taiwan, the former colonial countries, the peculiar problem of the postwar age should be first of all considered taking account of the fact that the individual states were divided into two regimes and the two power blocs have changed

(3) Hamilton [1983], p. 40.

(4) Myers & Peattie [1984], p. 45.

the world strategy with World War II, the Civil War in Greece, the Chinese Revolution, the Cuban Revolution, the showdown between China and U. S. S. R., the Vietnam War, etc. as the momenta⁽⁵⁾. Especially problems such as the destruction of labor force and means of production by the Korean War and the inflow of the Nationalist Party forces from Mainland China into Taiwan have played a great role in the process through which the society and the economy of Korea and Taiwan have become quite different from the ones before the war. Despite of this, grasping the objective status of the reality of the society and the economy in the era of colonies has a valuable meaning in investigating the problems of the modernization after their liberation from the colonial restraint.

The studies of colonies based upon such a viewpoint have often been detested and expelled by many Japanese historians of colonies on the pretext that the Japanese imperialism will be embellished by these studies. Thus there are available little numbers of researches employing the viewpoint. In this country, it is difficult for the scholars to admit, in whatever context the analysis has been done, the progress of modernization in the colonies without severe criticism from many of researchers (mainly historians) of colonial problems in Japan and Asian countries

(5) With regard to the modernization of Korea and Taiwan, the five social conditions shown below should be considered. (a) Systems and infrastructures which the Japanese imperialism brought in. (b) Liberation from the Japanese Imperialism after World War II. (c) Initial conditions structured by the Cold War effect. (d) The Far Eastern policy of the U. S. A. which supported by the Japanese economy since the mid 1960s. (e) The successful development strategy of both governments. For the author's view in detail in connection with this problem, refer to Matsumoto [1989b, 1988].

from the viewpoint of personality and morality.

[3] The third oppressive problem is the one concerning the future modernization and the meaning of socialism. Looking in retrospect at the study of colonies up until present time, it can safely be said that the colonial invasion and rule of Japan have been evaluated in general in a negative manner. In the attitudes assumed by the Japanese government, above all the ministries of education, foreign affairs, and finance, in the textbook controversy, the recovery of diplomatic relations, and the indemnity problems, or in the many retrospective documents edited and published by former rulers of colonies, either remorse or self-criticism has hardly been mentioned with respect to the Japanese management of colonies. Sometimes even affirmative descriptions for the colonial policies have appeared in some documents, which have naturally angered, at least embarrassed neighboring nations. The critical attitude in studying the colonial rule which has long been retained firmly in the traditional studies of colonies has a great value in gaining a foothold in the analysis, on the present situation where right-winged policies of Japan and the swelling of Japanese economy all over the Asian have been started.

In these studies of colonies, however, a prejudice that the overseas invasion of the prewar Japan is described as a fate of capitalism is found. Moreover, a problem that the criticism directed to the past will be implicitly connected to the expectation for the socialism can also be pointed out.

After witnessing the brutal and ghastly invasion to Asian countries and the life of Japanese people thoroughly destroyed as a result of the war,

most Japanese historical researchers, particularly those of colonies, had thought highly of the degree of anti-Japanese behavior and the anti-war attitude as the only absolute criterion in evaluating the progressiveness of the historical changes. Whether in Japan or in the colonies, it was socialists that resisted against the colonial invasion of Japan at the greatest sacrifice. They also explicitly prophesied in the prewar time that the Japanese invasion to Asia would soon come to rupture. These facts drove an overwhelming number of the postwar historians to carry out their studies with the expectation for socialism as premise. A twin of the separated socialist nations, China and North Korea, had just appeared as if it completed its construction as a state with grand splendor, which has an exerted great influence upon the selection of the researchers's viewpoints. The expectation towards socialism has, however, been liable to reduce historical studies of colonies to a mere criticism of the rightism and imperialism. Besides, especially in recent years, a tendency is yielded in which the studies of history are confined within 'abstinent positivism', which might be caused by the elusiveness of the modern world and, above all, the disillusion brought about by the recent changes in the socialist regime⁽⁶⁾.

(6) Behind this view of the author lies the following idea. If one thinks persistently of today's affairs of Asian countries in a concrete manner and wishes to position there a starting point to construct his/her own viewpoint, the state regime and the international political style of the capitalism have built up the most modernized social system up to the present, so long as there exist resistive forces against the powers of the regime within and without the country. Furthermore, in consideration of the present situation in which a more excellent social system can not be conceived, the process itself to find room for improvement in a given system may have a great meaning. Regarding this point, some more account is given below.

It is acknowledged that when things are judged from two criteria of democracy

and material affluence in the life of people, the socialist nations in Asia are far behind NIEs.

Finding faults with socialism in its efficiency has been quite fashionable. Nonetheless, when today's negative situation in the socialist countries should be considered, the following two problems will have to be taken up for investigation.

The first problem to be tackled is how the negative situation of socialist countries will be related with a variety of pressure from the capitalist bloc.

For example, the Socialist China has been placed, in achieving economic development, under disadvantageous circumstances compared with Taiwan. No help from the U. S. A. could evidently be expected before 1970s, and the Soviet Union had also discontinued its economic cooperation due to the China-Soviet rivalry. The factors which negatively reacted upon the construction of the state for the Socialist China can be found in various directions as below (refer to Furusawa [1987] for other factors). (a) Soviet sought for autarkic industrialization in order to overcome the Interference War against to the whole world. (b) As an extension of the one-state socialism revolution, a leading-nation concept was intensified in the Soviet Union. (c) With the incompatibility of such a leading-nation concept with the prestigious thought of China (the sinocenterism), China was also obliged to place an excessive emphasis upon the development of heavy industry to realize autarky as the Soviet Union did. (d) Under the circumstances where no introduction of foreign capital could be expected, excessive capital accumulation (exploitation) from the agricultural sector was demanded as an inevitable consequence. (e) Such development of heavy industry was utilized for confronting the strain of the international politics and was forcibly conducted in the inland area by ignoring efficiency. (f) No ways for absorption of the excessive population could be opened due to the backwardness of light industry sector. This method of the state construction of the Soviet Union and China have become a concrete concept of living socialism, which has undoubtedly influenced North Korea. In the case of Vietnam facing economic rupture, the after-effects of antiforeign-force wars, i.e. wars against Japan, France, and U.S.A. remain as too heavy a burden for Vietnam's national economy.

The second problem is how to deal with the fact that emergence of socialism and development in the state construction of the socialist countries have afforded a positive presentation of the problems for the recompilation of the history of human beings and/or the capitalist regime. For example, with regard to the construction of welfare states and welfare economics, the growth of Japanese capitalism in the postwar time, and to sprouting of NIEs.

The capitalism has not completed the existing international regime spontaneously from the inner side. It certainly does not mean that various sorts of political

So long as the studies of history with respect to the Japanese invasion to Asia in the prewar time remain in a stage where the Japanese imperialism is convicted, they cannot propose a new dimension in historical analysis. This is because the conviction of the invasion is not a terminal of the problem, but the final problem should be considered, i. e. the problem how to realize modernization inclusive of international peace together with the avoidance of invasion.

New trials concerning methods and viewpoints different from those in the traditional studies of history are certainly being made. Nonetheless even when such trials are taken into consideration, it seems to the author that the study which deals straightforwardly with the mentioned three morally heavy problems without losing well-balanced standpoint has not been grown up within Japan. In statistics-oriented studies of colonial history which have evolved as a field of econometrics, abstinent tendencies have conspicuously appeared, where the arrangement of the fundamental statistical data itself is a main subject, or only a correlation

movements in capitalist countries have no effect to modify their systems. What should be noticed is that the leaders of the capitalist countries have improved their systems by considering the influence of the socialism. Taking up the postwar time, the U. S. A. was able to take these new strategies of the Marshal Plan, the Policy of Reconstruction of Japan, the Alliance for Progress, the NIEs policy, etc. with audacity as the first attempt by becoming aware of the feeling for crisis or expensive compensation that has never been expected in confronting the new international order such as, for example, the postwar situation, the Civil Wars in Greece, the Chinese Revolution, the Cuban Revolution, and the defeat in the Vietnam War.

It is a great problem left before us to investigate the entangled relationships between the socialist countries in the present less favorable situation and the capitalist regime that has become wise rapidly. See Matsumoto [1987] for more details.

analysis is presented.

In comparison with the fact that European and U. S. researchers such as Hamilton and Peattie propose the problems in an audacious way regardless of the differences of their standpoints or methods, the Japanese researchers have been less challenging. The historical studies of colonies in Japan up to the present have often criticized the invasive characters and barbarism of the prewar Japanese capitalism. Also, such tendencies have very often been noticed in their restricting problems to caricaturing the fragility of the prewar Japan as her colonialism empire, and to intrinsical evasion of proposing realistic and constructive interpretation of history toward the future modernization of Asia. Not only owing to the restriction peculiar to the analytical objectives but also due to the historical pressure imposed upon the 'criminal' nation, and furthermore, due to the standstill of the modern world including socialism states, a sort of excessive self-restriction has been applied to the contents of studies⁽⁷⁾.

(7) One thing to be added is that complicated problems have been brought about with the relation to the scars of the colonial rule and the division of the state in the postwar age in the one-time colonial countries. Generally speaking, a mere reference to some aspects of the modernization in the colonial era has been regarded as a taboo. In China, the facts of the national resistance and economic development conducted by the Nationalist Party have not been dealt with as objects in evaluation of history. In Taiwan or South Korea still exists a problem which forms a good contrast to the problems in evaluating Nationalist Party in China, i.e. the problems that the resistance by socialists against the Japanese invasion is not duly evaluated. These points in the studies in the former colonial countries are not considered as the problems of the attitude of individual researchers, but are the results of political tension within and without the nation. Thus it can be said that the problem hereby dealt with is a little different in character from the problem in the studies of colonial history in Japan.

3 . Conclusions

The significance of modernization in studying colonial problems has been enhanced for years both in Japan and in the one-time colonial countries. Problems are until now, however, still very complicated and relationships with the reality are very delicate. To use a straightforward phrase, well-balanced researches observing the past and the present or the future in an omni-temperate way have hardly been brought about and actually cannot easily be brought up.

The fundamental problems are related with whether the antagonistic forces against the powers of the regimes which promoted the colonial invasion were able to exist in the history of Asian nations including Japan, or whether such forces will be able to develop themselves in the future. The controversy will be extended to the points whether the existence of such antagonistic forces can be allowed, and also whether the international regime, to help the growth of such forces was capable of existing in the past and is capable of existing at the present and in the future. It is necessary to explain, standing upon a contact point of both Japan and Asia, how the Japan's colonial invasion had been expanded and how the history and the economy of the colonies had been transformed in their outlook. The author has an impression that it is an indispensable premise in promoting such works to re-grasp the diversified and complicated ways in which the real modernization in the past was carried out with awakened eyes based upon a concept of *modernization* as an ideal.

The author is of the opinion that to tackle the problems described in this paper is important not only in criticizing the studies of history, but

also in realizing the new international sense which is open for the Asian nations and required for the Japanese people of the modern age.

Literature

- (1) Hamilton, Clive [1983]. "Capitalist Industrialization in East Asia's Four Little Tigers", *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, No. 13, Vol. 1.
- (2) Furusawa, Kenji [1987]. "Chugoku-keizai no Gendaika to Taigai-kaiho-seisaku (Modernization of Chinese Economy and the Open-door Policy)", *Kikan Keizai-Kenkyu (The Quarterly Journal of Economic Studies)*, Vol. 10, No. 1. (in Japanese).
- (3) Matsumoto, Toshiro [1987]. "Ajia niokeru Kindaika no Tembo to Kotaisuru Marukusushugi (Contemporary Asia and the Retrocession of Marxism)", *Okayama-Daigaku Keizai-Gakkai Zasshi (Okayama Economic Review)*, Vol. 19, No. 2. (in Japanese).
- (4) [1988]. *Shinryaku to Kaihatsu (Colonial Occupation and the Economic Development in China)*, Ochanomizu-Shobo, Tokyo. (in Japanese).
- (5) [1989a]. "Chugoku-rekishigakkai no Genjo to Shokuminchi-kenkyu no Kadai (Discussions between Japanese and Chinese Historians in China)", *Rekishigaku Kenkyu (Journal of Historical Studies)*, No. 592. (in Japanese).
- (6) [1989b]. "Taiwan/Kankoku Keizai no Chokiteki-doko-bunseki, 1903-83 (Economic Development in Taiwan and South Korea, 1903-83)", *Shakaikeizaishigaku (Socio-Economic History)*, Vol. 56, No. 1. (in Japanese).
- (7) Myers, Ramon H. & Peattie, Mark R. [1984]. *The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895-1945*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.