

WORLD CIVILIZATION AND WESTERN CIVILIZATION:  
A SYMPOSIUM FOCUSED ON PAPERS BY  
GORDON MORK, BULLITT LOWRY, AND SHANNON DOYLE

Edited by

Bullitt Lowry

During the Missouri Valley History Conference in March, 1985, in Omaha, Nebraska, Teaching History: A Journal of Methods sponsored a session on World Civilization and Western Civilization. Chaired by Sam Dicks of Emporia State University, the session provoked much comment. The editors of Teaching History are pleased to present here the three papers that formed the framework for the discussion and a portion of the tape recorded discussion itself. For reasons of space, the papers presented at the session are printed here in abbreviated form, with illustrative examples, anecdotes, and footnotes excised.

"INTRODUCTION TO THE MODERN WORLD": WHAT IN THE WORLD ARE WE DOING?

Gordon R. Mork  
Purdue University

At Purdue University, I inherited a traditional "Western Civilization Since 1500" course; this survey is now required for education students, and it is one of several options for a great many others to fulfill core requirements. There are few history majors at Purdue, and fewer still of our students will ever become professional historians. For about half of my students, this course will be the only history they take in college. My major goal for the course is to provide to a diverse group of students a basis for understanding a shrinking world. Today's students ought to be prepared (and, I hope, inspired) for further lifelong learning and for responsible action; historians of the modern world have special qualifications and special obligations, I believe, relevant to that goal.

I was trained as a historian in the fifties and sixties. Europe was then still the primary area of overseas interest for most Americans, but the world-wide involvement of the United States over the past twenty-five years has demanded a new approach. Formal pressure has also arisen, responding, I think, to the same perceived needs. Our State Department of Education in Indiana has begun to require that all future schoolteachers have a course in World History, rather than Western Civilization.

The responses to this challenge by historians, both locally and nationally, have been hesitant and partial. Some argue, not without merit, that the pressures to globalize the course ought to be rejected forthrightly, because introducing students to our own western civilization is a difficult enough job. Others respond to the challenge with a patchwork approach, inserting colorful cuttings of non-western materials into the syllabus, often with the aid of colleagues who specialize in those areas. Textbooks also favor the "additive" method, inserting new chapters into current frameworks to increase coverage. Books that are already heavy with the newest historical insights become weightier still, and students' time (both in and out of class) becomes increasingly crowded with names, dates, and comparative chronologies. There is less and less time to read historic classics--whether Machiavelli, Marx, or Mao--let alone to reflect upon them.

On the other end of the spectrum, some devotees of globalism condescendingly denounce traditionalists as ethnocentrically Europeanist,

and reject any approach that mentions the roles of Great White Men. But I am still looking for a colleague who can present a convincing case for one particular set of priorities in this complex world. Specialists in Asia want more Asian coverage, Africanists more on Africa, and so on.

In my own course, I have addressed the challenge by maintaining a Western framework and providing reading and writing options for my students, with books on the African slave trade or Gandhi as well as ones on the Protestant Reformation or Lenin. There are advantages to this approach, which forces students to make decisions about their own education.

\* \* \* \* \*

So, where in the world are we on this question: World Civilization or Western Civilization? Let me suggest three proposals to get your reactions.

1) We historians should get together and agree on the general scope and content of a course on the modern world that will encompass both western and global history. This may be a hopeless task, given the fragmented nature of our profession and of our world. But I am optimistic enough to believe that we might have a greater degree of commonality than we give ourselves credit for. There was always divergence in detail in the many Western Civilization textbooks and courses, and yet the same peaks and valleys always seemed to emerge on the historical landscape. I would suggest that the common theme that can bind us together is the concept of modernization and its interaction with traditional societies, whether Judeo-Christian (as among Europeans), Muslim, Asian, African, Native American, or Oceanic.

2) We need books and materials that are reoriented in approach and manageable in size, allowing students and instructors flexibility to introduce various teaching options, while confronting them with world-wide scope. Books that are increasingly encyclopedic, in order to maximize coverage, frustrate both the professional historian and the introductory student.

3) Finally, we need professional opportunities and incentives to encourage scholar-teachers to come out of their niches, to gain new perspectives, and to bring these perspectives to students through their teaching and writings. Both faculty and graduate students need globalizing experiences to allow them to go beyond a Euro-centered world history. Current support for research, travel, and study is skewed to send scholars back to the same geographical areas again and again. No doubt each of us could recount cases in which our colleagues found professional preferment for repeated specialized studies, but found only condescension given to proposals that attempted to address broader problems in ways undergraduates can understand. Yet there are occasional opportunities for globalizing experiences. Two years ago I attended a fascinating conference held in cooperation with the East-West Center in Hawaii, entitled "Europe and Asia, 600-1600: Institutions and Ideas." We should make vigorous efforts to seek support for such activities.

## WORLD CIVILIZATION: INSTRUCTORS AND ORGANIZATION

Bullitt Lowry  
North Texas State University

We at North Texas State University are in a position that I suspect practically all of you share: either you have recently converted a Western Civilization course to World Civilization or there is pressure to do so. I suspect that there is no ideal situation. What I have done is to examine the various possibilities for, first, who would teach the World Civilization course, and what the course content might be as a consequence. Then I have noted advantages and disadvantages of various combinations of instructors and content.

If you haven't yet made a decision on whether or how to convert to a World Civilization course, perhaps this analysis will be of some help to you. If you have already made the conversion, perhaps this approach might suggest things to look out for. I don't mean to imply that any of the disadvantages listed is disabling, nor is listing them meant as an indictment of the basic course in World Civilization.

The course content of World Civilization is such that many departments have thought about team teaching, the notion being that one could avoid the problems of ignorance on the faculty's part by getting specialists in Asian history, specialists in African history, and so on, to give lectures on their particular areas of training. This approach does have the great advantage that the professors speak from a basis of knowledge. The trouble is that when two or three or four people teach a course, it is very hard to develop any sort of coherent narrative and hard for the students to hold any sort of logical sequence in hand. Generally, no single pattern holds a team-taught courses together, and the student is left with a lot of disassociated information. In a small department those same problems exist, and a small department probably does not have specialists in all the areas the course might cover.

In one school that recently began to offer World Civilization, the course is taught by a European and an Oriental historian. Each teaches a separate section until mid-semester, and then they switch; basically, what they have is two short courses, one on Western Civilization and one on Oriental Civilization. That approach is not intellectually reprehensible, but it certainly does not generate a unified course.

Then there is the offering presented by a single professor. Most often, a department takes a historian trained in European history, the most common of non-American specialties, and assigns him or her to teach World Civilization. Three things can happen. First, and probably the likeliest, is that he will teach Western Civilization, using his tried and true notes, with something cut out so that he can insert two or three lectures on Asia and Africa. He will talk to his friends in the profession, read some of the increasingly available material on the non-Western world, and add some non-Western works to his reading lists. They will tend to be works that catch his imagination, not ones that flow systematically from formal training. The result is basically a Western Civilization course with non-Western supplementary reading.

Table 1

## WORLD CIVILIZATION INSTRUCTION

BASIC SYSTEM	PROF'S SPECIALTY	TEXTS AND COLLATERAL READINGS	ADVANTAGES	DISADVANTAGES
Team taught, large department	Various. Usually chosen to cover Europe, Asia, & 3rd World	Variety. Usually one on Europe & one on 3rd World. Often one on Orient or on imperialism	Professors speak on specialties	Disorganized. Lack of coherence. Hard to show causal chains
Team taught, small department	Various. Usually lacks some major spec.	As above.	Students are exposed to various viewpoints. Professors frequently are enthusiastic	As above. Professors may not cover all areas expertly
European with World collateral reading	European	Standard Western Civilization text or possibly a reworked European survey text. Readings from anthro. or dark, brooding diaries	Professor focuses on lecture material familiar to him	Fails to provide true world outlook.
European with World collateral reading	European	World text, e.g. McNeill. Readings from European "Great Books"	Lets professor stay on familiar ground in discussion	Readings give no reinforcement on world. Often confusing to student because priorities reverse
World with World collateral reading	European	World text. Readings often connected with imperialism, not internal matters	Follows course title	Professor unfamiliar with much material. Quantity of strange items overwhelms students
Ditto	Non-European	World text. Readings often exotic	Lets professor teach his specialty in larger context	Frequently ethnocentric in specialty area less important to world than Europe

The second possible arrangement for which this hypothetical Europeanist might opt is a World approach with European collateral reading. In this arrangement the professor will try to do a real World History, using one of the few textbooks written for World History, and then focus the collateral reading lists on European Great Books, on the ideas and culture of the Western World, because he feels uncomfortable leading discussions on non-Western materials about which he has little background. Thus, students get a text and lectures focused with a World outlook, and then their required readings stress Western materials. The trouble with this approach is that when the students get to examinations, they find themselves wondering exactly what is being taught. There is a World framework, and yet there is a stress on outside readings, none of which go beyond the boundaries of traditional Europe.

The third approach, a World framework and World collateral readings, has many advantages, but the students face a lot of unfamiliar material. From their high school history, students have at least heard of the Renaissance or the French Revolution. They have heard some of the names. As little background as there is to work with in Western Civilization, students are far more at sea when they meet the rest of the world for the first time, and, of course, the professor is frequently sailing through murky waters himself.

These are the three Europeanist single-professor patterns then: the Western Civilization with World supplements, the World Civilization with Western readings, and a World Civilization with World readings. The final possibility is the single-professor class taught by a professor who is trained in non-European studies. A professor in Near-Eastern or Asian history is assigned World Civilization. All too often, the professor sees that assignment as a glorious chance to emphasize his or her specialty, perhaps at the expense of balance in the course. On the other hand, an American historian, facing the same assignment, is all too prone to see it as an exile from the promised land.

\* \* \* \* \*

There are three basic patterns for arranging the material. The traditional one notes everything "important" that has happened, usually organized dynastically within broad periods. The students, even in a European survey, tend to become lost in a profusion of isolated facts. As unmanageable as this approach is in a European survey, it is entirely useless in a world context in which the very concepts used to organize European events--the Middle Ages, for example--are without meaning for the rest of the world.

If, on the other hand, the professor takes a single theme--modernization, the history of women, the history of warfare--he can reduce the welter of facts to a manageable structure. Moreover, the students can see logical sequences emerge. Yet in the process the professor necessarily excludes so much material that he feels he is not giving a balanced interpretation. Therefore, he starts pulling things in. He inserts Bismarck's unification of Germany, for example, because it is unthinkable to pass a freshman who has never heard of Bismarck. It is hard to develop a balanced introductory course around a single theme, or once the theme is being developed, to avoid the temptation of inserting non-thematic material here and there.

The third approach is the multi-topical one. It courts the danger of expanding the number of topics to an unreasonable level, thus returning unwittingly to a course very like a traditional one.

None of the approaches presented here is a perfect one. Probably there isn't one. Each of our departments, if it should offer World Civilization, will find one compromise or another necessary, and my hope is that these comments will prepare you for the compromises you will have to make.

#### WESTERN CIVILIZATION

Shannon Doyle  
University of Houston-Downtown

I teach at the University of Houston-Downtown, an urban institution with an ethnically mixed student body. Most of our students are low-income students, the first members of a particular family attending college, and all of our students are majoring in some area of business. Practically none of the students comes to acquire an education; they come to acquire a piece of paper, a certificate to get a job or get a better job.

It has always seemed to me that if a person is going to go out and get a job in the world, there is a certain amount of information that he or she needs. I'm not sure where you get this information. Those who grow up in nice, upper middle-class families acquire it by osmosis, but most of my students come to me with no background in the liberal arts whatsoever. I have decided that I have an obligation to the people that I deal with: it is to provide them with some kind of information, so that when they go out and get jobs as accountants, they don't make fools of themselves when somebody refers to Sparta or mentions Machiavelli.

So I have come to the conclusion that we need to do two things. We need to teach our students something about Western Civilization and something about World History. Nevertheless, looking at my students, I suggest that they don't need the traditional course. What I have finally decided I am going to do is to develop a one-semester Western Civilization course. I think it can be done if you look at Western Civilization as a topic in which each society is making some kind of contribution to the development of modern institutions which we all think we need to know. You look at degrees, not absolutes. For example, students can learn from the Greeks something about democracy. They can see the Athenian model of the state, that the state existed to meet the needs of the citizens, and the Spartan model, that the citizens existed to meet the needs of the state.

I am convinced that in a brief time you can tell people what they really need to know about the Greeks, and you can mention some of the names that they have never heard. I would suggest that most of the traditional Western Civilization and World History courses that we teach are not really teaching our students what the students need to know in order to survive in the world. We are not teaching them how to read the front page of the newspaper or how to hold a sensible conversation with someone about the really big issues of the day. If people did those kinds of things, then neither Western Civilization nor World Civilization would be unmanageable.

I think you need to start with Western Civilization because you need some kind of context. You need something to hang World History on. People

can't understand the rest of the world if they don't have a clue about their own culture. You need to start with Western Civilization and then branch out.

#### THE DISCUSSION

Because most speakers did not identify themselves, it seemed unfair to name those who have distinctive voices and clothe the others with anonymity. Therefore, comments by panelists or the session chairman are identified as "Panelist" and those by others as "Audience." I dislike the term "Audience" because it detracts from the sense of collegiality that was present at the session, but I have found no better term.

In addition, I have taken the liberty of collecting comments on a given subject under one rubric, justifying that reorganization with the realization that speakers, waiting their turns to participate in the discussion, frequently added significant insights to subjects that other persons had raised earlier.

The discussion concentrated on the problems of organizing and presenting a World History course, and people said comparatively less in defense of teaching Western Civilization as the required course. That may be less a reflection of the feelings of historians as a group than it was the result of concerns over what is for many a new course in the curriculum. In the discussion, however, several general points were made:

Audience -- As historians, should we not be concerned primarily with history as a discipline and exposing our students to that discipline? By that, I don't mean that we should ignore content, but if we're going to help our students use history beyond the classroom, beyond their undergraduate education, we have to be concerned with what history is about. It is not the bare, dry facts, not twentieth-century history, not ancient history. It is understanding the past to illuminate the present. The content is somewhat less important than conveying lessons in a context in which questions are asked. I would suggest that in World Civilization, Western Civilization, or my Latin-American history course, we can deal with that problem. But until we decide what we're going to teach as a discipline, this debate seems somewhat beyond the point.

Panelist -- The reason why we have this kind of meeting, and why they draw audiences as large as this one, is that we're all essentially confused on what such a course should cover. What should we do in a semester? What is it possible for us to do in a semester? You are right in the kinds of things we should be focusing on, but we can't get away from content.

Another Panelist -- Any number of course structures have been suggested, among them the Amherst course in how to read a book. Everybody there reads about French history and the French Revolution, thereby gaining insight into how the minds of historians work. I would suggest that an introductory course, whatever that course is, should include local history. You can do some very useful things working with local history. You can have simple research projects and so forth. And it can all be set into a worldwide context. Thus, you're not doing just methodology. The use of local history lets the students see how historians do things. It lets them learn why it is important to think like a historian.

Some persons were concerned with the ongoing debate about the traditional content of the introductory course:

Audience -- To me, there is a real problem, a real conflict, beneath the things we have been saying. The conflict is between teaching Western Civilization in a traditional manner versus teaching it in a critical manner that allows students to claim their own history. The historian defines what history is, and we can choose to be traditional or not.

Panelist -- I think what is wrong with the discipline is that there are no generalists left. If you are going to give an overview, then you are essentially going to teach an elitist history, and I'm just not embarrassed by that. I don't have time to include everyone in my history course. I'm going to give him the big things, and then he can go and explore the valleys on his own. I want my students to have a clear handle on the general information that educated people possess.

The Same Member of the Audience -- I agree that humanists, because we narrow the full structure of research and so on, aren't allowed to be broad teachers. But aren't attempts to teach the broad overview and the critical processes mutually exclusive?

Another Panelist -- When I taught United States history in the 1950s, I had a number of Sioux Indians in my class. I taught white man's history, and I turned the students off. When I got to the nineteenth century and the Great Plains, I talked about what Custer was really like and so on. For the first time I made them enthusiastic about history. Oftentimes, if you can appeal to a particular ethnic group who feel left out by the history of the European white man, then you can turn them on. You need to think about what your audience is.

Some persons defended the Western Civilization course:

Audience -- Doesn't it really make more sense to teach a Western Civilization course and do it right than to teach this World History with its tacked on material, apologizing for a few added lectures? It strikes me as irresponsible, and it doesn't really do the job.

Another Member of the Audience -- The students have trouble dealing with something even as little alien as Europe. How can they possibly deal with the rest of the world effectively?

Panelist -- All we're presenting to these people is the barest of skeletons, which they may read about for the rest of their lives, or they may forget all about it. We're presenting only a bare skeleton. Should it be a skeleton of only a segment of the world or of the entire world?

Another Member of the Audience -- I have 200 to 300 students to whom to relate the events of 1500 to the present. They don't even know the modern world. So let's be realistic.

Another Panelist -- One of the things we've been saying for twenty years is that the students won't do this or that. Students won't read more than three books a semester, or four. Of course they will, if we tell them to do it. We fall into a trap by saying that because these people are singularly uninformed, because they come to us with very weak skills, they won't or can't. And so we don't ask them. I think most of us don't know any more what the average student can or cannot do.



The case for World History was argued most succinctly by a student:

Audience (a Student) -- To be a world citizen any more you have to know what's going on in the world. Why do people think the way they think? Why do they act the way they act? Why do we think they're acting the way they're acting? It's better to know something about everybody.

Panelist -- What I noticed after I started teaching the World Civilization course is that my pupils became more interested in Western Civilization, and they understood more about it after taking World Civilization. I look at Japanese feudalism versus Western feudalism. Or, for example, when I teach the great religions, I can look at the comparisons. The students gain a better idea of the nature of the Western monotheistic religions after they understand the quite different religions of East Asia. To look even briefly at other cultures, whether they see similarities or differences, gives them more insight into Western culture.

One point seemed to find general agreement:

Audience -- What we've been saying here points up the need for historians actually somehow to come to some agreement about what the content of a World History course should be. I'm not sure how you do that. I'm sure that people who produce what we call World Civilization textbooks bring in lots of experts. But each expert feels that he has to put as much of his expertise as possible into the textbook. I don't think that helps. Maybe we need non-experts to work on textbooks.

Audience (a Publisher) -- I work for a publishing company, and I have been thinking about the realities of how World History is now taught. Right now, the majority of those who teach World History do not want to teach it. They have no commitment to it. Professors teach what is required. As a result, at nine out of ten colleges, professors are teaching directly from the textbook. They are teaching a Western Civilization course, and at the end of it, they will throw in a lecture on China, a lecture on India, something like that. For a World History course to actually grab the students, there must be some kind of consensus on the content.

Audience -- One of the reasons that we're here this morning is that increasingly the rest of the world won't let us get away with dictating what the big issues are. Are we in fact justified in saying that Socrates and Pericles are fundamental when lots of people in China wouldn't necessarily agree?

There was comment about using modernization as a theme with which to organize World History:

Audience -- I wanted to make a comment about using the concept of modernization as a theme or organizing principle for a course. The concept has come under greater and greater attack from people of various social sciences and from historians who aren't European. They say that the concept is a Eurocentric or Atlantocentric idea. They say that the concept of modernization is unfair to Third World civilizations and societies. What sort of response would you make to this?

Panelist -- I think that dealing with the objection is one of the ways of dealing with the problem. We could say in our courses that modernization is one of the ways of looking at events. We would then say that there are objections to it and spell out those objections. I don't wish to be

insensitive to traditional societies. What is true for any society, European or Third World, is that you have a real clash between traditional sets of values and the forces of modernization and all of its aspects, be they political, economic, industrial, etc. I certainly wouldn't teach modernization with a Whiggish approach, the approach that we are getting better and better.

Another Member of the Audience -- We have been working on a project-model of Western Civilization and the Third World. In the process of developing Third World dividing points, we have come up with a conceptual idea of presenting the traditional structure into which older Europe fits. You can put the pre-Renaissance history of the Western world into a traditional World framework. Then, you can take your European history with its points of importance and talk about the age of European expansion, and looking at the traditional world reaction to modern European history, you can talk about the imperialism of later centuries.

Problems of emphasis and chronology concerned many speakers:

Panelist -- A lot of us complain about how we over-emphasize Europe. It is equally important to note that we over-emphasize the modern period. That, to me, is just as narrow.

Another Panelist -- You can explain the modern in terms of ancient history, but you can't explain ancient in terms of modern. I think it makes sense, with all due regard to the ancient world, to spend less time on the earlier period and progressively more class time as you get nearer to the year 1985, or 1945, or wherever you stop. However you slice it, you don't give equal time to something we call ancient or classical or Middle Ages. You spend a disproportionate amount of time on recent years.

A Third Panelist -- I break at 1900, which appals everyone I know.

Audience -- We break in 1664. If I were to go to four terms I would make the breaks at 1500, at the French Revolution, and at 1900.

A Panelist -- 1500 makes a lot of sense because there you start getting people sailing back and forth in large numbers. As far as the French Revolution/Industrialization, you can make a good argument for that one.

Another Member of the Audience -- I teach "The West and the World," and I hope it is a little more than material tacked on to a Western Civilization course, but on the other hand, I wouldn't be so presumptuous as to say it is integrated. The content of the non-Western is there, but it is being forced into Western chronological watersheds. Textbooks do that, too, for example, China in the Middle Ages. What do we do about that?

Textbooks for World History and for Western Civilization were discussed:

Audience (a Publisher) -- Publishing companies have let down the history profession. They haven't produced the textbooks. They offer Western Civilization texts with things added here and there. To change that situation there must be pressure from the profession, because I don't think the publishers will change on their own.

Panelist -- I don't blame publishers too much, because historians, who choose books for this course, generally are European historians, and they

pick a European textbook with a few added chapters because that's the way they conceptualize the course.

Audience (the Publisher) -- Publishers, what they give to you, is determined by two things: first, market and marketability; and second, the reviews that come from the profession itself. Basically we've been told for a number of years that this is what is wanted. It is just recently, in the last year or two, that there has been a realization on the publishers' part that, all of a sudden, here is this new course, and now people want something more than just a few chapters tacked onto something European. We deserve some of the blame, but certainly not all of it, because the history profession has a larger say through reviews than we do.

Panelist -- I'm fairly happy with the textbooks I use. But the area of readings is a problem. I want to go to a single book of readings. There are lots of them for Western Civilization, but there don't seem to be any for World History.

Audience (a Publisher) -- We're working on one, but the chronological breaks are difficult to manage. The first volume we're breaking at 300 A.D., which is a natural break for both East and West, and the second volume at 1000 A.D., also a natural break. The third volume we are breaking at 1500 A.D., which is a little less natural. But the Western Civilization market, which we would like to serve too, usually breaks in 1660, so it is a very difficult problem.

Problems faced by the faculty also received attention:

Audience -- I think that probably most of us realize that we've done more learning since we got our degrees than before. We do and can learn what we need to teach the Third World. I think European historians can learn about the nonwest. I think we do. How many of you teach in your area of expertise? I spend 95 percent of my entire time learning to teach something.

Panelist -- But we all spend three or four years in graduate school, in my case learning something about Europe from the time of Napoleon to the present, with an occasional glance elsewhere and backwards. I think to teach effectively on the Near East or Africa, I would have to have roughly that same quantity of information. Otherwise, I'm only a TV talking head, cramming from one textbook and spouting it out the next day to a class that's read a different one.

Another Panelist -- I don't think that's true. The trap in teaching either Western Civilization or World History is thinking that if you don't know everything as well as you do your dissertation topic, you're not serving the needs of your students.

A Third Panelist -- Sometimes there are advantages in not knowing so much. My problem is in dealing with something like the decline and fall of the Roman Empire. I know too much about it. But when I get down to the causes of World War I, I can say, one, two, three, four. A modern historian would be aghast at hearing me do that. So it works both directions.

More specifically, there was discussion about assigning American historians to teach World history:

Audience -- I'm going to be teaching World Civilization, and I'm an American historian.

Panelist -- I don't think that's at all uncommon.

Another Member of the Audience -- I don't think it is necessarily bad either, because as I tell my students, America is part of the world, too. In fact, it is a very interesting part of the world, because it is made up of all sorts of people with different backgrounds. That might be a place to start, with students from a variety of backgrounds and not much knowledge.

A Third Member of the Audience -- We're in the third or fourth year of converting to a World History course. We're turning American historians into World historians. It has been very beneficial to us as a faculty.

Another Panelist -- One of the courses that we're going to offer this fall to fill the state-mandated requirement for American history is "The United States and the World." That's one way to help the students who absolutely aren't going to take anything other than the required course.

The need for informational conferences which would present general material was stressed:

Panelist -- I think the problems of most people in deciding whether to teach Western Civilization or World Civilization lie in what you yourself know. I go to these meetings hoping that I will learn something about, say, African history, so that I won't make a fool of myself when I have to talk about it. Or I go to these meetings hoping for some sort of insight into early Chinese history, something that will make it make sense to me.

Another Panelist -- What we need to do is to get people with a global perspective and have some opportunity for those people to trade ideas. I don't want to castigate the nice people who organized this conference: it is no different from any other. But go to any conference, and the people who organize to provide a Latin-American session, a European session, and we all go off and do our own thing. I'd love to see sometime a conference on what is the problem of industrialization in this or that culture, or the problem of religious reform in this or that kind of culture. We can do it in Omaha or we can do it wherever we can get, if we can get people to start the ball rolling. It would help us with content, and it would help us with enthusiasm.

Audience -- We need to have some sessions by people to get information, historiographical things, etc. We need to get information on major topics. We need major retraining.

A Third Panelist -- We need presentations by people who can put information into a context, not just stun you with their erudition.

The time having expired, session moderator Dicks thanked the audience.