

History Education and Historical Reconciliation in East Asia: Focusing on the History Textbook Dialogues between South Korea and Japan

Unsuik Han
Universität Tübingen

The Journal of Northeast Asian History
Volume 12 Number 1 (Summer 2015), 95-133

Copyright © 2015 by the Northeast Asian History Foundation. All Rights Reserved.
No portion of the contents may be reproduced in any form without
written permission of the Northeast Asian History Foundation.

History Education and Historical Reconciliation in East Asia: Focusing on the History Textbook Dialogues between South Korea and Japan

East Asia, with its rapid economic development, is expected to play a constructive role for world peace. Peaceful regional cooperation presupposes a historical reconciliation, for which dialogues on textbooks will be important. To bring about reconciliation, and not to repeat the past misery, we must not turn away from the uncomfortable history, but face it with sincerity. East Asian peace and prosperity will be accomplished through the establishment of the East Asian Community as successfully as the European Union, and through the East Asian identity to function as its basis. The efforts to develop the main concepts of East Asian regional history will take great effort and a long time. In this regard, lessons learned from the cases of Europe and other regions in making joint history textbooks will be a good guideline and offer encouragement. Above all, we can learn much from the new concepts and methods of history education in Europe and the efforts to promote a European consciousness which will help us to overcome the too strong national perspectives in the East Asian region.

Keywords: history education, South Korea, Japan, reconciliation, textbook dialogue, national history, regional history, East Asian community, history conflicts, common textbook, European integration, European Union, UNESCO

History Education and Historical Reconciliation in East Asia: Focusing on the History Textbook Dialogues between South Korea and Japan

Unsuik Han
Universität Tübingen

Opening

Many discussions regarding an East Asian Community are ongoing, but few people are optimistic about the realization of such a community in the near future. To begin with, even the scope of East Asia is defined differently among those engaged in such discussions. For many Koreans, East Asia refers to the region consisting of China, Japan and the Republic of Korea, as well as Taiwan and North Korea. Some would add Vietnam, which belongs culturally to the Sinosphere, while some may add Mongolia for its historical involvement with China and Korea. However, considering that China and Japan have not been particularly responsive to the discussions in South Korea, an East Asian community based on a narrower definition of East Asia seems impractical. It would then be advisable to include ASEAN member states, even at the expense of cultural cohesiveness within the community. In addition, the European conceptions of East Asia also embody ASEAN and Northeast Asia, including China, Japan, and South Korea. Hence, this paper shall accordingly take the wider definition of East Asia that embraces Northeast

Asia and Southeast Asia.¹

A consensus seems to be forming that coming to terms with the past and achieving historical reconciliation is a prerequisite for establishing an East Asian Community. Japan's "third textbook attack" in the mid-1990s aggravated historical conflicts and tension in East Asia. This crisis, on the other hand, prompted East Asian civil societies to engage in dialogues about history textbooks, which produced meaningful results in the 2000s. This paper therefore examines how European dialogues surrounding history textbooks have influenced dialogues in China, Japan, and South Korea. This paper also points out what East Asian dialogues have accomplished as well as the limitations they face, focusing on the cases of Japan and South Korea. The efforts made by the Council of Europe and other bodies to strengthen the European identity shall also be covered in search of implications they may have for an East Asian Community.

1. UNESCO Activities in Promoting International Understanding and European Cooperation on Textbooks

Some of UNESCO's major programs have attempted to promote international understanding through textbook revision, inheriting invaluable achievements of the interwar period. In the aftermath of World War I waged as imperialist conflicts between European countries and by their radical nationalisms, there emerged discussions to use textbooks for international understanding necessary to achieve peace. Established in 1922, the International Committee on Intellectual Cooperation of the League of Nations showed a willingness to contribute to a peaceful

This paper has been developed from a contribution published in *Korea Forum Spezial* no. 1 (2013) under the title "East Asian Historical Reconciliation Can Learn from European Cooperation on History Textbooks: Focusing on the Role of UNESCO."

¹ Cf. for other scholars who present a wider definition of East Asia, see Shin Ju-back, *Yeoksa hwahae wa Dong Asia hyeong mirae mandeulgi* [History Reconciliation and Building an East Asian Form of Future] (Seoul: Sunin, 2014), 323-352.

Europe through textbook revision when it adopted the Casares Resolution in 1926. This Committee developed into UNESCO, the international organization founded on November 16, 1945. UNESCO's mission was to promote educational, scientific, and cultural cooperation among people and to contribute to peace and security with a view toward building an international society where justice, law, human rights, and fundamental freedom are universally respected. Mindful of its mission, UNESCO carried forward textbook revision for international understanding as one of its main activities. The Preamble to the Constitution of UNESCO explains why the organization stressed textbook revision: "That since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed; that ignorance of each other's ways and lives has been a common cause, throughout the history of mankind, of that suspicion and mistrust between the peoples of the world through which their differences have all too often broken into war."²

UNESCO's textbook revision activities were carried out in two ways. One was to function as the international network and clearinghouse by gathering relevant actors from around the world, for instance, by holding teachers' seminars. The other was to provide international practical guidelines for textbook analysis. At its first session in Paris in 1946, the General Conference of UNESCO adopted a nine-point program, which requested the organization to establish a center to collect textbooks from all its member states, and have each National Commission for UNESCO review their own as well as other countries' textbooks in collaboration with relevant institutions and submit their opinions on the issue.³

² Kim Seung-ryeol and Lee Yong-jae, *Hamkke sseuneun yeoksa: Dogil gwa Peurangsseu ui hwahae wa yeoksa gyogwaseo gaeseon hwaldong* [Writing History Together: The French-German Reconciliation and Joint Activities to Improve History Textbooks] (Seoul: Dongbuga yeoksa jaedan [Northeast Asian History Foundation], 2008), 87.

³ Otto-Ernst Schüddekopf, *Mirae reul geonseul haneun yeoksa gyoyuk: 1945-1965 yureop yeoksa gyogwaseo gaeseon hwaldong* [Zwanzig Jahre westeuropäischer Schulgeschichtsbuchrevision

UNESCO published *A Handbook for the Improvement of Textbooks and Teaching Materials as Aids to International Understanding* in 1949, based on the interwar experiences. Kim Seung-ryeol and Lee Yong-jae wrote, “This handbook was the first to provide standards for revising/making textbooks that can promote international understanding, and still remains as a classic to researchers who conduct comparative study of textbooks.”⁴ The handbook presented six principles in its Model Plan for the Analysis and Improvement of Textbook and Teaching Materials: accuracy, fairness, worth, comprehensiveness and balance, world-mindedness, and international cooperation. Accuracy meant that “the information included in textbooks and teaching materials should be accurate and up-to-date” and that “there should be no factual distortion.” This principle extended beyond text to illustrations, charts, graphs, and maps. Fairness meant that “minority groups, other races, and other nations and nationalities should be treated fairly and due representation should be given to their contributions” and that “unpleasant facts and undesirable conducts should not be ignored, but they should be placed in perspective, and controversial issues should be presented objectively. If the scholars of two or more countries cannot agree on the facts or interpretation of important events in their relationships with each other, fair statements of the different points of view should be presented.”⁵ These principles were taken into consideration for post-World War I textbook cooperation, as did the French-German dialogues about history textbooks.

Although the French-German agreement on history textbooks was reached in 1935 at the initiative of the French Association of History and Geography Teachers, European cooperation on textbooks was halted altogether upon the outbreak of World War II in 1939. After this war, a

1945-1965. Tatsachen und Probleme], trans. Kim Seung-ryeol (Seoul: Yeoksa bipyongsa, 2003), 51.

⁴ Kim and Lee, *Hamkke sseuneun yeoksa*, 88.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 91.

cooperative mood was formed among French and German historians and history educators in the French occupation zone in Germany, owing to amicable cultural policies. This helped resume in 1950 the French-German Textbook Conference, which finally led to the 1951 French-German agreement on history textbooks consisting of 40 provisions. Leading this cooperation was the French Association of History and Geography Teachers, and the International Institute for Textbook Improvement in Germany, founded by Georg Eckert. The 1951 Accord clarified the items previously agreed upon in 1935 and resolved unsettled issues, expanding the scope of their mutual consensus.⁶

The cultural agreement between France and West Germany in October 1954 reasserted the necessity of a mutual revision of their history textbooks: “Article 13. The High Contracting Parties shall ensure, in accordance with the means at their disposal and with their domestic legislation, that in all branches of education questions concerning the other Party shall be presented with the greatest objectivity, and that textbooks, particularly history textbooks, are free from all comments of an emotional nature which might be detrimental to goodwill between the two peoples.”⁷ Their bilateral relationship further improved with the Élysée Treaty of 1963, based on which the French-West German Youth Office was founded to promote mutual understanding between young people of the two countries.

The French-West German Textbook Conference was held seventeen times from 1951, when the two countries reached the 1951 Accord, until 1967. The next meeting was held in 1981, where the Conference supplemented the 1951 Accord with the 1987 Accord. While the former Accord focused on abolishing one party’s negative ideas about the other, the 1987 Accord highlighted integration of important historical aspects of

⁶ Ibid., 103-112.

⁷ Ibid., 110-112.

one's country into the other's history textbooks—especially, the history of the Weimar Republic into French history textbooks and the history of the French Third Republic into German history textbooks.⁸ This series of dialogues reached a climax with the publication of their joint history textbook. In 2003, the French-German Youth Office gathered in Berlin to celebrate the fortieth anniversary of the Élysée Treaty. There, the office called on West German Chancellor Gerhard Schröder and French President Jacques Chirac to publish a joint history textbook of the two countries and its request was granted. The joint history textbook project thereby attempted to provide a foundation on which French and German students could cultivate their mutual historical awareness about the process of the European integration. The publication guidelines made in 2004 reflected the previous Accords. For instance, in compliance with the 1987 Accord, the histories of the Weimar Republic and the French Third Republic were given sufficient emphasis. Based on the guidelines, a group made of five teachers from each country published in 2006 the joint history textbook's third volume about the post-1945 period, the second volume in 2008 covering from the 1815 Congress of Vienna to 1945, and the first volume in 2011 concerning Europe and the World from ancient times to 1815.

The dialogues between France and West Germany, the leaders of the postwar European integration, became a bilateral model of history textbooks for other European countries. First, historians, history education experts, history teachers, and textbook authors from the two countries would organize a bilateral committee for textbook consultations. Then, the committee would carry out a cross analysis and evaluation of textbooks to draw up joint recommendations to be used as a basis to improve

⁸ Ibid., 115-118; “Togil-Peurangseu yeoksa gyogwaseo hyeobnyeok e daehayeo” [Regarding the French-German Cooperation on History Textbooks], *Dongbuga yeoksa jaedan* [Northeast Asian History Foundation], n.d., accessed February 15, 2015, <http://www.historyfoundation.or.kr/?sidx=122&styp=1>.

textbooks. In follow-up meetings, controversial issues between the countries would be identified and discussed for resolution, and the outcomes would be recorded as publications. This has been considered a classic model of bilateral dialogue for joint textbooks.

Stages of Textbook Consultations²

<p>Working agreement Preliminary meetings with researchers/textbook authors/teachers to define aims/methods/duration of the project</p>
<p>Textbook exchange Pretest</p>
<p>Textbook consultations Analysis/Reviews Basic lectures</p>
<p>Publication of Recommendations Research and documentation on effects of recommendations</p>
<p>Follow-up conferences on specific topics teacher/textbook author training seminars; production of teaching aids</p>

Following the model of the French-West German Textbook Conference, the West German-Polish Textbook Commission successfully drew up joint recommendations on history and geography courses. Granted that the work of Enno Meyer in the 1950s was pioneering, it was the Warsaw Pact in 1970 that made possible full-scale dialogues on textbooks between West Germany and Poland. Georg Eckert, the Chairperson of the (West) German National Commission for UNESCO, and Władysław Markiewicz, the Chairperson of the Polish National Commission for UNESCO met at the sixteenth session of the UNESCO General Conference in Paris in 1970 to exchange opinions on possible improvements that

² Falk Pingel, *UNESCO Guidebook on Textbook Research and Textbook Revision*, 2nd ed. (Paris: UNESCO, 2010), 21.

could be made to their history and geography textbooks. It took two years of arrangement before the national commissions began consultation meetings in February 1972 to produce joint recommendations on history and geography courses. Since the first edition was published in German and Polish in early 1977, over 300,000 copies of the recommendations were distributed until the early 1990s. The commissions have subsequently been publishing every year the outcomes of their joint research on major historical themes and periods related to their bilateral relationship, and the outcomes of their textbook analysis. In the late 1980s, they went as far as to develop a medium to present the results of their dialogues as an education tool. The democratization of Poland in 1989 and the unification of Germany in 1990 brought a turning point for the two countries' bilateral relationship. In 1991, Germany and Poland concluded a good neighbor and friendship treaty to establish a political basis for vitalizing their cultural exchanges. In 2001, their cooperation on textbooks that had been growing increasingly active since the 1990s led to the publication of a teacher's handbook on twentieth century modern history.

Recently, Poland and Germany have reached an agreement on publishing a joint history textbook. Frank-Walter Steinmeier, the German Federal Minister of Foreign Affairs, proposed the collaboration to Radosław Sikorski of Poland and obtained his consent when they met in January 2008. The agreement of 2003 to publish a German-French joint history textbook seems to have acted as a stimulus for a Germany-Poland joint history book, just as the textbook talk in the 1970s had. The Germany-Poland Textbook Commission set its aim to publish an authorized textbook that meets curriculums in both countries for it to be adopted by as many schools as possible. The textbook is expected to facilitate a better understanding of the history of Eastern Europe through a broader depiction of European history as well as global history, and will also include an increased coverage of Germany-Poland relations

compared to other textbooks.¹⁰ The first book of the project for middle schools is expected to be published this year.

However, much higher barriers stand in the way of the Germany-Poland Textbook Commission. Among them are the large-scale massacres by the Nazi regime, forced labor, anti-Semitism and the holocaust, drastic territorial changes, the deportation of Germans and so forth. Relations between Germany and Poland are described much less in history textbooks in Germany than in Poland. Nevertheless, the experts council composed of historians and history educators, under the lead of both chairmen of the Germany-Poland Textbook Commission, made a great contribution in overcoming these obstacles by compiling recommendations for a common history textbook.¹¹

2. Influences of European Cooperation on History Textbooks on the Northeast Asian Dialogues on History

“The Past That Will Not Pass,” the short piece written by Ernst Nolte, triggered the “historians’ dispute” (*G. Historikerstreit*) in West Germany in the mid-1980s. This term perhaps better fits to describe East Asian cultures of memory. The long-standing issue concerning the unsettled past has been furthered by “integral nationalism” and “policy of remembrance” of conservative politicians and cultural elites of Japan. In China and South Korea, ethnic sentiments have been stirred against this, escalating ethnic conflicts in the Northeast Asian region. This crisis,

¹⁰ See “Deutsch-polnisches Geschichtsbuch,” accessed February 15, 2015, <http://www.gei.de/forschung/europa/europa-und-der-nationale-faktor/deutsch-polnisches-geschichtsbuch.html>. See also recommendations for the common textbook: Steuerungsrat und Expertenrat des Projektes “Deutsch-Polnisches Geschichtsbuch,” *Schulbuch Geschichte. Ein deutsch-polnisches Projekt – Empfehlungen* (Berlin, Warsaw, 2010), accessed February 15, 2015, http://www.gei.de/fileadmin/gei.de/pdf/abteilungen/europa/Schulbuch_Geschichte_Ein_deutsch-polnisches_Projekt-Empfehlungen.pdf.

¹¹ *Schulbuch Geschichte. Ein deutsch-polnisches Projekt – Empfehlungen*.

however, encouraged civil societies to act for future-oriented transnational solidarity.

In 1982, the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science and Culture attempted to replace the word *shinryaku* (K. *chimnyak* 侵略 invasion) in a high school history textbook, which referred to Japan's invasion into the Asian continent, with a morally neutral concept called *shinshutsu* (K. *jinchul* 進出 advance). This gave rise to fierce resistance from China and South Korea. This instance was called Japan's second textbook attack, following the first attack when Ienaga Saburō had to suffer from lawsuits criticizing descriptions of Japanese imperialism in the history textbook he had authored. The Japanese government eventually withdrew the attempt out of concern that it may disgrace itself internationally and inserted a "neighboring countries clause" into government guidelines for textbook screening. Japanese history textbooks first began including the dark side of Japanese history—the 1937 Nanjing Massacre, Comfort Women, and Unit 731 where atrocious biological experiments were conducted upon prisoners of war in Manchuria.¹² This change in the Japanese memory politics reached its climax in the mid-1990s with the Murayama Declaration, an apology made by then-Prime Minister of Japan Murayama Tomiichi.

Progressive Japanese historians such as Nishikawa Masao and Bandō Hiroshi took note of the West German-Polish textbook consultations in reflecting upon the second textbook attack in 1982. Their focus was, however, on highlighting what was problematic about the Japanese textbook monitoring system in contrast to Germany's permit system, rather than on collaborating with neighboring countries to revise history textbooks.¹³ Japanese conservative scholars argued against

¹² Sven Saaler, "Implikationen der jüngsten Debatte um japanische Geschichtslehrbuecher für die japanisch-koreanischen Beziehungen," in *Japan und Korea auf dem Weg in eine gemeinsame Zukunft. Aufgaben und Perspektiven*. (Munich: Iudicium verlag, 2003), 126.

¹³ Shin Ju-back, "Hanil gan yeoksa daewha mosaek gwa hyeobnyeok model chatgi (1982-1993)

learning from the West German-Polish model of textbook dialogues. Watanabe Shōichi rejected the West German model, asserting that it would be inequitable to compare prewar Japan with Nazi Germany. Nishi Yoshiyuki distortedly interpreted the West German-Polish joint recommendations and discussions that occurred in West Germany. He commented that leaving the Katyn Forest Massacre out of the recommendations was because resistance from the Soviet Union had been expected. Thus, what Bekki Atsuhiko considered as a strategy to maintain peace was deemed a submission to politics by Nishi. Some South Korean historians also viewed the West German-Polish textbook consultation process as a role model that Japan should adopt.¹⁴ Yet, this series of discussions was insufficient in dealing with the historical background of European textbook dialogues, or the direction to improve history textbooks in Japan and South Korea. In 2002, in-depth discussions on dialogues concerning the West German-Polish and French- West German textbooks and their implications for textbook dialogues in East Asia resulted in several major research outcomes that responded to Japan's third textbook attack.¹⁵

[Pursuing the Japanese-Korean History Dialogue and Finding a Cooperation Model (1982-1993)],” in *Dong Asia eseo yeoksa insik eui gukgyeong neomgi* [Going Beyond the Borderline of Historical Awareness in East Asia] (Seoul: Sunin, 2008), 19-21.

¹⁴ Moon Ki-sang, “Dogil eui yeoksa gyoyuk: Dogil Poland yeoksa gyogwaseo hyeobeuihoe chucheon munhang eul jungsimeuro” [History Education in Germany: With a Focus on the Recommendations by the German-Polish Textbook Commission], *Yeoksa gyoyuk* 34 (1983): 223-257; Lee Min-ho, “Dogil-Polandeu gyogwaseo hyeobui” [The German-Polish Textbook Consultation], in *Dogil, Dogil minjok, Dogilsa: Bundan Dogil eui yeoksa euisik* [Germany, German people, and German history: Historical Awareness during the Division of Germany] (Seoul: Neutinamu, 1990).

¹⁵ Kim Yu-gyeong, “Gieok eul dulleossan galdeung gwa hwahae: Dogil-Peurangseu mit Dogil-Polandeu eui yeoksa gyogwaseo hyeobeui” [Conflicts and Reconciliation Surrounding Memories—The French-German and German-Polish History Textbook Consultations], *Yeoksa bipyeong* 59 (2002): 363-385; Unsuk Han, “Yeoksa gyogwaseo sujeong eul tonghan Dogil-Polandeu ganeui hwahae noryeok” [Efforts for Reconciliation through the Textbook: Revision between Germany and Poland], *Seoyangsarou* 75 (2002): 203-236; Kim Seung-ryeol, “Sukjeok gwangae eseo hyeobnyeok gwangae ro: Dogil-Peurangseu yeoksa gyogwaseo hyeobeui” [From

In the 1990s, conservative Japanese politicians, especially those of the Liberal Democratic Party, fiercely resisted the so-called masochistic view of history in Japanese textbooks. The Association for the Advancement of the Liberal View of History led by Fujioka Nobukatsu tried to radically revise the self-critical perspective of postwar historical studies. The Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform (*Atarashii rekishi o tsukurukai*) was founded in 1996 as an assemblage of historians, journalists, cartoonists, politicians, and economic personalities who purported to research history education so as to nurture in students “healthy nationalism” and “pride in being Japanese.” What this society actually intended to achieve was to forbid atrocious historical facts of Comfort Women or Unit 731 from appearing in textbooks. The Tsukurukai’s *New History Textbook* for middle schools published by Fusōsha in 2001 provides its readers with a glorified version of Japan’s history that would surely boost their pride as Japanese nationals.

The memory politics of Japanese conservative elites naturally came to face vehement disputes with neighboring countries. Their endeavor to establish neo-nationalist identity essentially entailed a violation of the 1982 neighboring countries clause. This third textbook attack provoked NGOs in Japan and Korea to take firm actions in solidarity. They carried out joint movements against permission and distribution of the Tsukurukai’s *New History Textbook*, and a years-long project to jointly create an auxiliary history textbook. These joint actions generated several publications including the following: *Korean Mission to Japan, History that Opens the Future*, *The Modern History of Korea and Japan: From the Perspective of Women*, *History of Korea and Japan Face-to-Face I*

Hereditary Enemy to Cordial Partner: The Franco-German History Textbook Work], *Yeoksa wa gyeonggye* 49 (2003): 139-170; Han Unsuk et al., *Gahae wa pihae eui gubun eul neomeo: Dogil-Polandeu yeoksa hwahae eui gil* [Beyond the Distinction Between Aggressor and Victim: Towards the French-German Historical Reconciliation] (Seoul: Dongbuga yeoksa jaedan [Northeast Asian History Foundation], 2008); Kim and Lee, *Hamkke sseuneun yeoksa*.

and II, and *A History of Mutual Exchanges*.¹⁶

Among these publications, *History that Opens the Future*, the result of collaboration among China, Japan, and South Korea, has attracted the greatest attention and controversy. The Asia Peace and History Education Network in Korea, the Children and Textbook Network 21 in Japan, and, from China, the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Shanghai Normal University, and the Nanjing Massacre Memorial Hall have worked together as the main agents of this trilateral cooperation. Starting with the Nanjing Conference held in March 2002, eleven sessions of international academic conferences have been convened to publish in May 2005 a joint auxiliary textbook for the modern and contemporary histories of China, Japan, and South Korea.

This publication project began as a reaction to the distortion and glorification of Japanese colonialism and the Asia-Pacific War in Japanese right-wing history textbooks. The central themes were Japanese imperialism and resistance against it, victimized people, persons who acted beyond their national interests, requests for Japan's apology and repentance, and the process of reconciliation. The following is a list of this joint textbook's limitations and remaining challenges identified by

¹⁶ Hanil gongtong yeoksa gyojae jejaktim [Korea-Japan Common History Textbook Production Team], *Joseon tongshinsa* [Korean Mission to Japan] (Seoul: Hangilsa, 2005); Hanjungil sanguk gongdong yeoksa pyeonchan wiwonhoe [China-Japan-Korea Common History Compilation Committee], *Mirae reul yeoneun yeoksa* [History that Opens the Future] (Seoul: Hankyoreh shinmunsa, 2006); Hanil yeoseong gongdong yeoksa gyojae pyeonchan wiwonhoe [The Korea-Japan Women Joint Publication Committee on History Textbooks], *Yeoseong eui nun ero bon Hanil geunhyeondaesa* [The Modern History of Korea and Japan: From the Perspective of Women] (Paju, South Korea: Hanul, 2005); Jeonguk yeoksa gyosa moim [Association of Korean History Teachers] and Rekishi kyōikusha kyōgikai [Council of History Educators in Japan], *Majubonun Hanilsa I, II* [History of Korea and Japan Face-to-Face I and II] (Paju, South Korea: Sakyejul, 2006); Yeoksa gyogwaseo yeonguhoe [Association of History Textbook Researchers] (Korea) and Rekishi kyōiku kenkyūkai [Association of History Education Researchers] (Japan), *Hanil yeoksa gongtong gyojae. Hanil gyoryu eui yeoksa: Seonsa eseo hyeondaekkaji* [History Education Material for Joint Use in Korea and Japan. A History of Mutual Exchanges: From Prehistoric to Modern Times] (Seoul: Hyeon, 2007).

readers as well as by the authors:¹⁷

- Written predominantly from a nation-state perspective
- Overly weighted toward political history
- Considered Japanese imperialism as the agent of history, and the people of China and Japan as mere objects
- Controversial discussion over exactly when Japan emerged as an imperialist nation
- Controversial discussion over whether treaties signed until the Japanese annexation of Korea were internationally legitimate
- Lack of scientific verification of the statistics provided for victims of genocide and compulsory mobilization
- No concept established for East Asian history

The authors seem to have accepted the main points of criticism.¹⁸ Since 2006, the participants of this trilateral project have been working on two books aimed at systematically providing an understanding of the development of East Asian modern history in the context of world history. The authors made great efforts to explain the structural changes of the political system and mutual relations of South Korea, China, and Japan in the context of their international relations, not only within but also beyond

¹⁷ Asia Peace and History Institute, ed., *Dong Asia eseo yeoksa insik eui gukgyeong neomgi* [Going Beyond the Borderline of Historical Awareness in East Asia] (Seoul: Sunin, 2008). The third part includes reviews of *History that Opens the Future*. Iwasaki Minoru and Narita Ryūichi raise fundamental questions about the book's goal "to share historical understanding about Japan's war of aggression." See Ryuichi Narita and Minoru Iwasaki, "Writing History Textbooks in East Asia: The Possibilities and Pitfalls of 'History That Opens the Future,'" in *Contested Views of a Common Past: Revision of History in Contemporary East Asia*, ed. Steffi Richter (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2008), 271-283.

¹⁸ Hanjungil samguk gongdong yeoksa pyeonchan wiwonhoe, *Hanjungil i hamgge sseun Dong Asia geunhyeondaesa 1: Gukje gwangye eui byeondong euro ikneun Dong Asia eui yeoksa* [Modern and Contemporary East Asian History Written by South Korean, Chinese, and Japanese Historians: The History of East Asia in the Context of Changes in International Relations] (Seoul: Humanist, 2012), 5.

East Asia and especially in the context of their relations to the West. The two books were published in 2012.¹⁹ The first of the two books treats chronologically the structural changes in the modern histories of the three nations, while the second thematically covers people's lives and exchanges among them. The authors strived to overcome earlier criticisms and to deepen the understanding of East Asian modern history by "bearing in mind the common goal of building a peace community in East Asia."²⁰

3. Accomplishments and Limitations of Northeast Asian Dialogues on History Textbooks

3.1. Prerequisites for Dialogue: The Role of a National Government in Resolving Historical Conflicts

State support may be very helpful to long-term projects. The Northeast Asian History Foundation in South Korea is contributing to the East Asian historical reconciliation process by supporting numerous bilateral and multilateral projects such as encouraging transnational cooperation, promoting in-depth understanding of neighboring countries' histories, eliminating national prejudices, supporting programs for developing a regional (East Asian) identity, sponsoring bilateral and trilateral projects to publish auxiliary history textbooks, and supporting various events including the China-Japan-South Korea Youth History Summer Camp, teacher training programs, and the International NGO Conference on History and Peace. These activities of the Foundation, financially supported by the South Korean government, prove that a national

¹⁹ See footnote no. 16 in *ibid.* and Hanjungil samguk gongdong yeoksa pyeonchan wiwonhoe, *Hanjungil i hamgesseun Dong Asia geunhyeondaesa 2: Tema ro ikneun saram gwa gyoryu eui yeoksa* [Modern and Contemporary East Asian History Written by Korean, Chinese, and Japanese Historians: Thematic History of People and Their Exchanges] (Seoul: Humanist, 2012).

²⁰ *Hanjungil i hamgge sseun Dong Asia geunhyeondaesa*, 7, 360-361.

government can contribute to East Asian dialogues. One should, however, take note that the Foundation is inherently subject to national politics due to that national-level support. This places the Foundation at risk of being more mindful of public or political responses toward the more conspicuous issues, such as territorial disputes, and less attentive and critical when it comes to issues concerning South Korean history textbooks and education.

In contrast, the South Korean-Japanese Joint Committee for History Research made only limited achievements in spite of national support. When the Japanese Ministry of Education, Science and Culture monitored and licensed the Tsukurukai's *New History Textbook*, historical conflict escalated between Japan and South Korea. Thus, the two governments agreed upon establishing a committee to resolve the situation and launched the "South Korea-Japan Joint History Research Committee" in March 2002. Made up of 22 committee members and chairmen, the committee faced conflicting opinions between South Korea and Japan surrounding the choice of a research methodology. While South Korea proposed to focus on controversial issues between South Korea and Japan and reflect the research outcomes in the history textbook to be compiled, Japan suggested that research themes be selected from the academic viewpoint instead of mainly covering history textbook-related issues. After more than three years of joint research and debate, the committee released a final report and halted its activities as of June 2005.

A second committee was subsequently formed with a total of 34 scholars assigned to four different research groups, one more group than the initial committee, which had been divided into ancient history, medieval and modern history, and modern and contemporary history. The second committee published a final report in February 2010 after two and one-half years of joint research.

The Japanese government has since appeared to be unwilling to commit a concerted effort to overcoming the uncomfortable past. It has appointed as committee members Japanese historians who are negative or

passive toward historical reconciliation, making it difficult to reach a consensus on controversial issues. Despite its limitations, the South Korea-Japan Joint History Research Committee and its academic activities are still significant for being the first joint research attempt by historians of both countries with governmental support, and for identifying the great gap between the two countries in their awareness of history. In total, 49 South Korean and Japanese historians took part in five and one-half years of joint research throughout the two committees. This was a considerable achievement that expanded the exchange of research between South Korean and Japanese scholars. Their research achievements will help people of both countries gain a better understanding of current historical issues between South Korea and Japan. Depending upon cases, such achievements can also be used in compiling textbooks. Difficulties raised in the process of collaborating for research shall also be helpful for scholars of history in both countries for challenging them to more thoroughly study the history of Korean-Japanese relations.²¹

3.2. Accomplishments: Changes in Perspectives and Attitudes of the Participants, Overcoming Nation-state/Nationalist Viewpoints, Improved Understanding of the Histories of Neighboring Countries, and Lessons Learned from Exchanges over History Education

Joint discussions on textbooks have been an enlightening learning process. Those who participated in such discussions were not able to entirely shake off their nation-state perspective of history, but they were able to considerably revise it. This has been especially true for historians and history educators from China and South Korea rather than their

²¹ On the accomplishments and limits of the South Korean-Japanese Joint Committee for History Research, see Shin, *Yeoksa hwahae wa Dong Asia hyeong mirae mandeulgi*, 193-204.

Japanese counterparts. Even so, progressive and conscientious Japanese historians and school administrators were able to realize through these trilateral dialogues that their postwar historical perspective has been unacceptable for China and South Korea. Their knowledge of neighboring countries' history, along with their understanding of different interpretations of history, has therefore been further enriched. Moreover, all participants were able to learn from European textbook experts, including those from the Georg Eckert Institute in Germany.

One oversight many South Korean participants particularly make as they recount the discussions they had on East Asian textbooks is that they have unconsciously learned and gradually internalized many things from Japanese participants in terms of historical studies and history pedagogy, including their cosmopolitan values. As the influx of Europeans and Americans from the mid-nineteenth century caused turmoil, Japanese elites began adopting as their motto "Leaving Asia and Entering Europe" (脱亞入歐). Japanese historians and history educators accepted and internalized developments in European historical studies and history pedagogy earlier than China and South Korea. Social history and comparative history became integrated into historical studies, and in history pedagogy, historical consciousness came to be more highlighted than knowledge transfer. This trend encouraged textbooks to be developed into self-teaching materials. While South Korean scholars have long believed that "the historical truth" exists, Japanese scholars have valued the possession of multiple perspectives. Emulating this Japanese style of gradual learning might be able to facilitate having constructive bilateral discussions on textbooks. That is not to say Japanese historians and history educators are without shortcomings, one of which is that they are often trapped in relativism and have not been consistent or bold enough to continuously reflect their scholarly developments into textbooks.

3.3. Obstacles

The nation-state perspective still exerts a strong influence on bilateral or trilateral dialogues on textbooks, which is most prominent in Chinese committee members, followed by South Korean members. Japanese committee members, who had been involved in history textbook dialogues since the 1980s, thought on the other hand that history textbooks must not be swayed by joint historical interpretation because historical studies and narratives are bound to be infused with national culture and socio-educational goals. To them, understanding and respecting differences between their own historical interpretations and those of neighboring countries was what they sought to achieve from textbook dialogues. On the other hand, South Korean historians considered it improper to abandon the nation-state perspective, advocating progressive roles played by nationalism in cases such as Korean national liberation movements under the Japanese colonial rule and reunification movements after Korea's national division. We need not overestimate the nation-state perspective as an impassable obstacle to textbook dialogues, which may progress even as such a perspective is maintained.

Rather than its distortion of history in textbooks, Japanese provocation surrounding the sovereignty of the South Korean island Dokdo was what mainly provoked nationalist sentiments among South Koreans. This is where the most fundamental type of Korean thoughts and arguments can be encountered when it comes to historical disputes: few South Koreans listen to arguments from the Japanese side or look at their evidential documents. Wada Haruki, a Japanese expert on Korea, once remarked that Japan should have accepted Dokdo as South Korean territory, which then would have presented an opportunity for bilateral reconciliation. Japan should learn from the case of Germany that accepted the Oder-Neisse line as the border between Germany and Poland for historical reconciliation at the expense of an area larger than South Korea. There are several areas in East Asia that are suffering from territorial

disputes. Each of the concerned parties in such disputes should learn to relativize their own arguments and to understand each other's stances if they are not able to accept them. That is the point where a dialogue for a reasonable solution could be launched.

Voices from outside criticizing Japan's moral aspects have evoked defiance among many Japanese people, for their emotions of self-defense have been replaced by anti-Korean sentiments. These days, some Japanese intellectuals even say that it is better to let go of the past. Most South Korean intellectuals, however, adhere to their belief that a genuine apology from Japan for its atrocities, or Japan's coming to terms with the past, is a precondition for achieving historical reconciliation between the two countries and establishing an East Asian Community. This wide disparity between Japan and South Korea in their respective memories about the uncomfortable history they share remains the biggest obstacle to their reconciliation.

With South Korea's democratization in 1987, the South Korean memory culture also underwent a drastic democratization. Under the dictatorship of former presidents Park Chung-hee and Chun Doo-hwan, South Korean people felt that their memory about Japanese colonialism had been strongly suppressed. Once they were freed from suppression, however, they came to focus more firmly on their sufferings and censure wrongdoings committed by Japanese perpetrators. The situation has been further aggravated by the conservative memory politics of Japanese elites. Nevertheless, Japanese attitudes toward the settlement of the past should not be devalued by comparison with European cases, which will only frustrate attempts to resolve the conflict and to bring about reconciliation. What is needed is the willingness to slowly and steadily proceed together, beginning with learning to respect even the slightest efforts made by either side.

3.4. Search for Alternatives: Reconsidering Historical Thinking and Improving Teaching Methods and Concepts

The aforementioned recommendation for the German-Polish history textbook (hereafter as German-Polish recommendation) offers many important lessons for the improvement of history education in East Asia. It reflects the accomplishments of the historiography and history education in Europe over the past few decades. It underlines at first that history is always a construction.²² Historical thinking here is far from being the process of searching for the truth. The students should learn that there is no “one history.” However, many South Korean historians still believe that there is a single historical truth. This belief greatly obstructs dialogue between South Korean and Japanese historians. Historical conflicts cannot be solved if the contending parties continue to insist on a single truth. One party would always accuse the other of distorting the historical truth.

For several decades, multiperspectivity has been one of the central principles in historical learning in Europe through which historical issues are described based on perspectives of various persons involved. The diversity of perspectives seems to have developed from different themes including gender, interests, religious beliefs, or other convictions. Klaus Bergmann points out three dimensions of multiple perspectives in historical education. A perspective is consciously or unconsciously revealed in historical resources that were left behind by persons who were involved in certain historical events (multiperspectivity, G. *multiperspektivität*). Interpretations of historical issues based on various perspectives lead to controversies in the historical sciences (controversiality, G. *kontroversität*).²³ German history textbooks refer to many

²² *Schulbuch Geschichte. Ein deutsch-polnisches Projekt – Empfehlungen*, 13.

²³ Klaus Bergmann, “Multiperspektivität,” in *Handbuch Methoden im Geschichtsunterricht* (Schwalbach am Taunus: Wochenschau Verlag, 2004), 55-56.

historical sources and various interpretations by historians. They promote the plurality of views and judgments among students as they let the students grapple with resources that project multiple perspectives and controversial interpretations.

The German-Polish recommendation admits itself to new principles of international history education. It takes into consideration, above all, the concepts of multiperspectivity and controversiality. Historical resources in the textbook have to reflect historical events from various points of view, for example, juxtaposing central with peripheral, poor with rich, women with men, and the colonized with the colonial ruler. The recommendation, on the other hand, advises deployment of the interpretations of historians and the texts of textbook authors in such a way that they stimulate reflection and facilitate alternative interpretations, according to the concept of controversiality. “The students should be thus encouraged and enabled to recognize the given narratives, to evaluate, to assess critically and, if necessary, to discard (evaluating competence). They should be capable of dealing with this plurality of opinions and evaluations on historical events and in doing so, they should bear in mind their current situation or actual circumstances (action competence, G. *handlungskompetenz*).”²⁴

This paper proposes the following strategies of interpretation:

- The authors’ texts should not dominate, but be paired with visual historical resources with enough room for controversial evaluations or comments.
- The resources should not only confirm the statements of the authors’ texts, but also complement or object to them, leaving students with chances to critically consider them on their own.

²⁴ *Schulbuch Geschichte. Ein deutsch-polnisches Projekt – Empfehlungen*, 15.

- The change of perspectives should be emphasized in order to reinforce the ability to critically analyze and interpret historical data as well as their evaluation.
- The students should be able to apply methods of deconstruction and reconstruction to all available materials. For this, textbook authors should make their own perspectives known and encourage students to discuss them.
- Various encouragements should be offered to take up projects or other initiatives (action and product orientation, *G. handlungs- und produktorientierung*) for approaching history.²⁵

Historical materials that reflect perspectives of other countries regarding mutual controversies should be provided to students in tandem with formal history textbooks, so as to eliminate unnecessary adherence to a single nation-state interpretation of history. Competence in democratic citizenship can be nurtured upon becoming freed from traditional history education that views history textbooks as the scripture of an official nation-state history and standardizes historical knowledge. Textbooks should be developed into self-teaching materials with different historical interpretations and supplementary data to become a better tool for peace education, with which students may make their own historical judgments. Far more pages and classes are needed for that to happen.²⁶ In the early 2000s when Japan's third textbook attack enraged South Koreans, some of them took it as an opportunity to self-reflect on their own history education. At the Third Symposium on South Korean History Textbooks organized by the Civilian Movement for Correcting Japan-Distorted Textbooks, Ji Su-geol criticized the national/nation-state perspective in South Korean textbooks, arguing that a textbook raising many good

²⁵ Ibid., 15-16.

²⁶ The proportion of narrative texts by authors in Germany's history textbook is as low as 25-30% of all pages.

questions is desirable rather than a textbook that forces a single answer upon students.²⁷

From National to Regional History

One of the challenges in bilateral or trilateral textbook dialogues is to identify an alternative for the nation-state perspective on history. Efforts are being made to discover a new East Asian perspective: how should we define East Asia in terms of physical space? Are the use of chopsticks and the presence of the monsoon essential factors, as Reinhard Zöllner of the University of Bonn has argued? What about Chinese characters or Confucianism? Some have raised criticisms against the book *History that Opens the Future* for failing to cover Vietnam, Mongolia, North Korea, and Taiwan. How to establish criteria to define East Asia has remained an ongoing question. Interests in East Asian discourses vary in size and type among China, Japan, and South Korea. Influenced by their traditional Sino-centrism, Chinese historians do not seem much interested in such discourses. Japanese intellectuals are skeptical because the concept of such discourses invokes “the Great East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere” propaganda of the Japanese military regime during the Asia-Pacific War, a half-hearted stance that may also be ascribed to their motto of “Leaving Asia and Entering Europe.” East Asian discourses have become most active in South Korea since the 1990s. The South Korean Ministry of Education, Science and Technology has adopted an optional East Asian history course for high school curricula from 2012. In South Korea, however, perspectives on regional history have not been sufficiently

²⁷ Ji Su-geol, “Guksa kyogwaseo gukjeong cheje eui munjejeom gwa daean mosaek” [Problems of and Alternatives to the National Management of Korean History Textbooks], in *Hanguksa kyogwaseo eui huimang eul chajaseo: 21-segi Hanguksa kyogwaseo wa yeoksa kyoyuk eui banghyang* [Finding Hope for Korean History Textbooks: Direction of Korean History Textbooks and History Education in the 21st Century] (Seoul: Yeoksa bipyeongasa, 2003).

developed. To achieve further progress, it may be worth attempting to draw implications from the efforts made earlier by the European Union and the Council of Europe to foster a European identity through history education.

Although the founding of the European Coal and Steel Community in 1951 triggered European integration and the Council of Europe endeavored early on to reinforce European awareness among students, a clear improvement in Germany's history education only appeared as late as the 1990s. Reinforcement of the European identity among young Germans and their awareness of the European integration came to be considered as an urgent challenge in the turmoil of events such as the fall of the Berlin Wall, the German unification, and the European Union's expansion. The revision of German history textbooks entailed an increase in pages to include Europe's common developments and to highlight a comparison between the history of Germany and that of other European countries.

West Germany, as one of the leaders in the European integration, worked together with the European Union and the Council of Europe in strengthening a European dimension in education at each country. The European integration took steps to gradually expand its scope, so that most of the eastern European countries have joined the European Union since the 1990s. However, it should be noted that there had long been discussions and research on common European cultural heritage, which made a crucial contribution to the later social and economic integration of Europe. On the contrary, in East Asia, where political integration is far out of reach, countries need to first seek a common cultural identity upon which they can build a common political community. This rings true, especially considering that conflicts surrounding history are the biggest obstacle for an East Asian community.

The concept of a European tradition originated from western and central European cultures, but has been extended as the European integration proceeded and expanded its scope. Until the 1980s, defining a

European tradition referred to highlighting the Western European civilization that has subsisted amid the flow of ancient Greece, the Roman Empire, medieval Christian society, the Renaissance in Italy, the Reformation in Germany, the Age of Discovery and European colonialism led by Spain and Portugal, the French Enlightenment, the Industrial Revolution that started from Great Britain, and European imperialism. Then in the 1990s when the European integration spread into Eastern Europe, other historical entities and events—the Byzantine Empire, the Greek Orthodox church, and confrontation against and interaction with Muslims—were given significance as part of the European tradition. Defining “European” has now become a far more complicated and difficult challenge. Thus, it is necessary to recognize diversity in European culture along with efforts to find its common roots. In addition, emphasis is being put on the need to teach about the European integration’s political and economic aspects, and of relevant ideas and organizations that have developed since 1945.

The European integration tells us that defining a common Asian cultural tradition should start with a narrower scope, such as Northeast Asia or Southeast Asia, which would then be expanded into East Asia based upon ample research. Comparative historical studies could identify commonalities and differences among countries and sub-regions in terms of various cultural factors such as Chinese characters, Confucianism, Buddhism, Islam, and Christianity. Pursuing an understanding of commonalities as well as differences may help in examining how each of the East Asian countries confronted threats from imperialism and how each case of confrontation led to differences in their later historical development. This also holds true for the formation and progress of the Cold War structure in East Asia. Once an East Asian historical tradition has been uncovered by identifying the region’s common cultural foundation and its different modes of confrontation against external challenges, preparations shall have been made for cultural and economic interactions to be promoted across the whole of Asia. While the European

integration is trying to establish a “Europe of (diverse) regions” upon common cultural grounds of a single Christian civilization, Asia may aim for a loose community where different civilizations interact with one another. Therefore, defining an Asian identity, which will be harder than the European case, should be carried out in a different way. More attention should be given to researching the exchange of cultures and goods between Asian civilizations. For instance, apart from the Silk Road, cultural and economic exchanges made through the maritime trade route that connected Bohai Bay, Japan, the South China Sea, the Indochina Peninsula, the Indian Ocean, and the Arab region would count as an important topic.

History education should be geared toward conveying the outcomes of such academic research on forming an Asian tradition. An international organization may be established at the Asian level, beyond the East Asian level, to improve history education. Education policies of the European Union, the Council of Europe, the Georg Eckert Institute, and each government for raising European awareness in school curricula should all be good references to consult. Transnational/regional interaction and understanding among teachers and students through exchange programs, youth camps, cooperation projects, and contests would be able to function as vehicles for developing an East Asian, or Asian identity.

Global History

At the turn of the century, some South Korean historians, especially those studying Western history, began to take interest in global history. Remarkable publications from Europe, the United States, China, and Japan were introduced into South Korea, kindling local discussions on global history.²⁸ The main topics of such publications translated into the

²⁸ Han Unsuk, “Globalisierung aus asiatischer Sicht: Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Diskurse

Korean language are as follows:

- 1) Theoretical studies on global history²⁹
- 2) Criticism of Eurocentric interpretations of world history³⁰
- 3) Asian, Islamic, Latin American, and African histories, which have so far been insufficiently dealt with in world history³¹
- 4) Interaction between different regions of the world, and issues that can be properly understood only in a global context³²

um Global History in Südkorea,” *Berliner Debatte Initial* 23, no. 4 (2012): 92-98.

²⁹ Pamela Kyle Crossley, *What is Global History?* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2008). In the preface to the following co-edited book on global history, Sebastian Conrad and Andreas Eckert present relevant studies in a very organized manner: Sebastian Conrad and Andreas Eckert, “Globalgeschichte, Globalisierung, multiple Modernen: Zur Geschichtsschreibung der modernen Welt,” in *Globalgeschichte: Theorien, Ansätze, Themen* (Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2007), 7-52.

³⁰ Giovanni Arrighi, *Janggi isipsegi: Hwape gwollyeok geurigo eurisidae eui giwon* [The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power and the Origins of Our Times], trans. Baek Seung-Wook (Seoul: Greenbee, 2008); Giovanni Arrighi, *Beijing eui Adam Smith: Isipsegi eui gyebo* [Adam Smith in Beijing: Lineages of the Twenty-First Century], trans. Kang Jin-a (Seoul: Gil, 2009); Andre Gunder Frank, *Riorienteu* [ReOrient], trans. Lee Hee-jae (Seoul: Yeesan, 2003); Janet L. Abu-Lughod, *Eureob paeggwon ijeon: Sipsamsegi segye cheje* [Before European Hegemony: The 13th Century World System], trans. Park Heung-sik (Seoul: Kachi Publishing, 2006); Steven Topik and Kenneth Pomeranz, *Seoltang, keopi geurigo pognyeok: Gyoyeok euro ikneun segyesa sanchaek* [Sugar, Coffee, and Violence: A Walk Through Trade in World History], trans. Park Kwang-sik (Seoul: Simsan, 2003); James M. Blaut, *Eureob jungsimjueui reul bipanhanda: Yeoksahak eui hamjeong* [Criticizing Eurocentrism: The Trap of History], trans. Park Gwang-sik (Seoul: Pureunsup, 2008); John M. Hobson, *Seogu munmyeong eun dongyang eseo sijak doeotda* [Western Civilisation Originated from the East], trans. Jung Gyeong-ok (Seoul: Ecolivres, 2005); Paul A. Cohen, *Hakmun eui jegukjueui: Orientallizeum gwa jungguksa* [Imperialism of Study: Orientalism and Chinese History], trans. Lee Nam-hee (Seoul: Sanhae, 2003); Sandra Halperin, *Eureob eui jabonjueui: Jasaengjeok baljeon inga, jongsokjeok baljeon inga* [Capitalism of Europe: Autonomous or Dependent Development?], trans. Choi Jae-in (Seoul: Yongeui sup, 2009). In addition to these, some Chinese and Japanese papers have been translated into Korean.

³¹ Marshall G. S. Hodgson, *Marshall Hodgson eui segyesaron* [Marshall Hodgson’s Thoughts on World History], ed. Edmund Burke, trans. Yi Eun Jeong (Seoul: Sakyjeul Publishing, 2006); Walter D. Mignolo, *Latin America, madeureojin daeryuk: Sikminjeok sangcheo wa talsikminjeok jeonhwan* [Latin America, a Made Continent: Colonial Scars and Postcolonial Switch], trans. Kim Eun-joong (Seoul: Greenbee, 2010).

³² William H. McNeill, *Jeonyeombyeong eui segyesa* [Plagues and Peoples], trans. Kim Woo-young (Seoul: Yeesan, 2005); John R. McNeill and William H. McNeill, *Hyumeon web: Segyehwa eui*

- 5) The big history that studies the relationship between humans and nature from the perspective of cosmic, geographical, and environmental history³³

Studies on the fourth topic involving global history mentioned above could present a new direction that may help to overcome nation-state historical perspectives in textbooks. Current phenomena—industrialization, dominance of industrial capitalism, environmental problems, rise and fall of races in the process of globalization process, colonialism and imperialism, deportation and the diaspora, homogenization/differentiation among cultures, change in perception of time and space, changes in transportation and communication, and the emergence of the information society—can no longer be explained within the nation-state framework. Rather, the formation of the nation-state framework itself—nationalism, nation-states, and national markets—could be better understood in a wider context of colonial interventions and global capitalism. As researchers have begun to take note of such interactions at a global level, increasing attention is being given to the history of macro-spaces such as ancient empires, the Mediterranean Sea, the Atlantic Ocean, and the Indian Ocean.³⁴

segyses [The Human Web: Globalization of World History], trans. Kim Woo-young and Yoo Jung-hee (Seoul: Yeesan, 2007); William H. McNeill, *Jeonjaeng eui segyses* [World History of War], trans. Shin Mi-won (Seoul: Yeesan, 2005); William H. McNeill, *Segye eui yeoksa* [A World History], trans. Kim Woo-young (Seoul: Yeesan, 2007).

³³ David Christian, *Geodaesa: Bikbaeng eseo isipilsegi kkaji geullobeol neteuwokeu eui yeoksa, segyses eui saeroun daean* [Big History: A Global Network's History between the Big Bang and the 21st Century, a New Alternative to Global History], trans. Kim Seo-hyung and Kim Yong-woo (Seoul: Seohaemunjip, 2009); Cynthia Stokes Brown, *Big Hiseutori: Uju, jigu, saengmyeong, ingan eui yeoksa reul tonghap hada* [Big History: Merging the Histories of the Cosmos, Earth, Life and Man], trans. Lee Geun-young (Seoul: Pressian Books, 2009).

³⁴ For studies on the Indian Ocean as a topic of the trans-regional historical narrative, see Ulrike Freitag and William Gervase Clarence-Smith, *Hadhrami Traders, Scholars and Statesmen in the Indian Ocean, 1750s-1960s* (Leiden: Brill, 1997); Michael Naylor Pearson, *The Indian Ocean* (London: Routledge, 2003); Markus P. M. Vink, "Indian Ocean Studies and the 'New

East Asian Style Textbook Dialogues versus European Style Textbook Dialogues?

Are the French-German, or German-Polish dialogues on history textbooks unrealizable and unsuitable for the East Asian region? Shin Ju-baek underlines the point that East Asian textbook dialogues take a different direction than European textbook dialogues due to disparities in regional situations. He emphasizes that it would be difficult to expect dialogues on textbooks to take place at a national level in East Asia where they would need to be supported by immediate political measures. In this context, progressive intellectuals in civil society should take the lead by swiftly publishing joint auxiliary textbooks, sensitizing the public, initiating discussions, encouraging the continuation of textbook dialogues, and urging governments to take actions.³⁵

It should, however, be kept in mind that the outcomes of textbook dialogues cannot be reflected in formal textbooks without official support from concerned governments. The Japanese-Korean auxiliary textbook project, carried out by a small group of progressive or Korea-friendly Japanese scholars and teachers, was not accepted by the Japanese public or academia. To make a greater impact on Japanese civil society, it is necessary to expand the scope of such dialogues to reach even centrist and conservative Japanese historians. When a consensus and trust between Japan and South Korea develops further, it should be worth trying European style textbook dialogues. If it proves difficult to gain governmental support, it will then be necessary to convince more Japanese historians and history educators to support such dialogues, which would in turn help obtain support from the Japanese civil society—a process likely to require much patience and time.

Thalassology,” *Journal of Global History* 2, no. 1 (2007): 41-62.

³⁵ See Shin, *Yeoksa hwahae wa Dong Asia hyeong mirae mandeulgi*, 204-215.

Closing

East Asia, with its rapid economic development, is expected to play a constructive role for world peace. Peaceful regional cooperation presupposes historical reconciliation, for which dialogues on textbooks will be important. To bring about reconciliation, and not repeat misery from the past, we must not turn away from uncomfortable history, but face it with sincerity. East Asian peace and prosperity can be accomplished through the establishment of an East Asian Community as successful as the European Union, with an East Asian identity as its basis. Developing main concepts of East Asian regional history shall take great efforts over an extended period of time. In this regard, lessons learned from the cases of Europe and other regions in composing their joint history textbooks should offer a good guideline and encouragement. Attention should above all be paid to the fact that new principles and concepts of history education contributed much to the revision of history textbooks and to historical reconciliation. Only when freed from the belief that historical truths alone should be represented can real dialogues be initiated between neighboring countries. History textbooks should no longer be used as an instrument to indoctrinate students with national or nationalist spirit. They should have much more space to introduce historical resources from various perspectives (multiperspectivity) and different interpretations among historians about historical events (controversiality). History should be taught as a thought provoking subject that promotes the plurality of views and judgments. Textbooks should no longer be treated as cannons that drill in historical truths. They should be downscaled to leave much more room for other materials that can stimulate students to think critically. History teaching should overcome the narrow perspective that solely focuses on national history and should incorporate more regional and global perspectives. Small innovations in the classrooms will slowly but steadily contribute to historical reconciliation in East Asia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abu-Lughod, Janet L. *Eureob paeggwon ijeon: Sipsamsegi segye cheje* [Before European Hegemony: The 13th Century World System]. Translated by Park Heung-sik. Seoul: Kachi Publishing, 2006. Originally published as *Before European Hegemony: The World System A. D. 1250-1350*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Arrighi, Giovanni. *Beijing eui Adam Smith: Isipilsegi eui gyebo* [Adam Smith in Beijing: Lineages of the Twenty-First Century]. Translated by Kang Jin-a. Seoul: Gil, 2009. Originally published as *Adam Smith in Beijing: Lineages of the Twenty-First Century*. London: Verso, 2007.
- . *Janggi isipsegi: Hwape gwollyeok geurigo eurisidae eui giwon* [The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power and the Origins of Our Times]. Translated by Baek Seung-Wook. Seoul: Greenbee, 2008. Originally published as *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power and the Origins of Our Times*. London: Verso, 1994.
- Asia Peace and History Institute, ed. *Dong Asia eseo yeoksa insik eui gukgyeong neomgi* [Moving Beyond the Borderline of Historical Awareness in East Asia]. Seoul: Sunin, 2008.
- Berger, Stefan, Mark Donovan, and Kevin Passmore, eds. *Writing National Histories: Western Europe since 1800*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Blaut, James M. *Eureob jungsimjueui reul bipanhanda: Yeoksahak eui hamjeong* [Criticizing Eurocentrism: The Trap of History]. Translated by Park Gwang-sik. Seoul: Pureunsup, 2008. Originally published as *Eight Eurocentric Historians*. New York: Guilford Press, 2000.
- Brown, Cynthia Stokes. *Big Hiseutori: Wuju, jigu, saengmyeong, ingan eui yeoksa reul tonghap hada* [Big History: Merging the Histories of the Cosmos, Earth, Life and Man]. Translated by Lee Geun-young. Seoul: Pressian Books, 2009. Originally published as *Big History: From the Big Bang to the Present*. New York: The New Press, 2007.
- Christian, David. *Geodaesa: Bikbaeng eseo isipilsegi kkaji geullobeol neteuwokeu eui yeoksa, segyesa eui saeroun daean* [Big History: A Global Network's History between the Big Bang and the 21st Century, a New Alternative to Global History]. Translated by Kim Seo-hyung and Kim Yong-woo. Seoul: SeoHaemunjip, 2009. Originally published as *This Fleeting World: A Short*

History of Humanity. Great Barrington, MA: Berkshire Publishing Group, 2008.

Cohen, Paul A. *Hakmun eui jegukjueui: Orientallizeum gwa jungguksa* [Imperialism of Study: Orientalism and Chinese History]. Translated by Lee Nam-hee. Seoul: Sanhae, 2003. Originally published as *Discovering History in China: American Historical Writing on the Recent Chinese Past*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.

Conrad, Sebastian, and Andreas Eckert. "Globalgeschichte, Globalisierung, multiple Modernen: Zur Geschichtsschreibung der modernen Welt." In *Globalgeschichte: Theorien, Ansätze, Themen*, 7-52. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2007.

Crossley, Pamela Kyle. *What Is Global History?* Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2008.

Frank, Andre Gunder. *Riorienteu* [ReOrient]. Translated by Lee Hee-jae. Seoul: Yeesan, 2003. Originally published as *ReOrient: Global Economy in the Asian Age*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1998.

Freitag, Ulrike, and William Gervase Clarence-Smith. *Hadhrami Traders, Scholars and Statesmen in the Indian Ocean, 1750s-1960s*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Halperin, Sandra. *Eureob eui jabonjueui: Jasaengjeok baljeon inga, jongsokjeok baljeon inga* [Capitalism of Europe: Autonomous or Dependent Development?]. Translated by Choi Jae-in. Seoul: Yongeui sup, 2009. Originally published as *In the Mirror of the Third World: Capitalist Development in Modern Europe*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1997.

Hanil gongtong yeoksagyojae jejaktim [Korea-Japan Common History Textbook Production Team]. *Joseon tongshinsa* [Korean Mission to Japan]. Seoul: Hangilsa, 2005.

Hanil yeoseong gongdong yeoksagyojae pyeonchanwiwonhoe [The Korea-Japan Women Joint Publication Committee on History Textbooks]. *Yeoseong eui nun ero bon hanil geunhyeondaesa* [The Modern History of Korea and Japan: From the Perspective of Women]. Paju, South Korea: Hanul, 2005.

Hanjungil samguk gongdongyeoksa pyeonchanwiwonhoe [Korea-China-Japan Common History Committee]. *Hanjungil i hamggesseun Dong Asia geunhyeondaesa 1: Gukjegwangye eui byeondong euro ikneun Dong Asia eui yeoksa* [Modern and Contemporary East Asian History Written by

- Korean, Chinese and Japanese Historians: The History of East Asia in the Context of Changes in International Relations]. Seoul: Humanist, 2012.
- . *Hanjungil i hamggesseun Dong Asia geunhyeondaesa 2: Tema ro ikneun saram gwa gyoryu eui yeoksa* [Modern and Contemporary East Asian History Written by Korean, Chinese and Japanese Historians: Thematic History of People and Their Exchanges]. Seoul: Humanist, 2012.
- . *Mirae reul yeoneun yeoksa* [History that Opens the Future]. Seoul: Hankyoreh shinmunsa, 2006.
- Han, Unsuik. “Globalisierung aus asiatischer Sicht: Mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Diskurse um Global History in Südkorea.” *Berliner Debatte Initial* 23, no. 4 (2012): 92-98.
- . “Yeoksa gyogwaseo sujeong eul tonghan Dogil-Polandeu ganeui hwahae noryeok” [Efforts for Reconciliation through the Textbook: Revision between Germany and Poland]. *Seoyangsaron* 75 (2002): 203-236.
- Han, Unsuik, Kim Yong-deog, Cha Yong-ku, and Kim Seung-ryeol. *Gahae wa pihae eui gubun eul neomeo: Dogil-Polandeu yeoksa hwahae eui gil* [Beyond the Distinction Between Aggressor and Victim: Towards the French-German Historical Reconciliation]. Seoul: Dongbuga yeoksa jaedan [Northeast Asian History Foundation], 2008.
- Hobson, John M. *Seogu munmyeong eun dongyang eseo sijakdoeeotda* [Western Civilisation Originated from the East]. Translated by Jung Gyeong-ok. Seoul: Ecolivres, 2005. Originally published as *The Eastern Origins of Western Civilisation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Hodgson, Marshall G. S. *Marshall Hodgson eui segyesaron* [Marshall Hodgson’s Thoughts on World History]. Translated by Yi Eun Jeong. Seoul: Sakyejul Publishing, 2006. Originally published as *Rethinking World History: Essays on Europe, Islam and World History*. Edited by Edmund Burke. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- Jeonguk yeoksa gyosa moim [Association of Korean History Teachers], and Rekishi kyōikusha kyōgikai [Council of History Educators in Japan]. *Majubonun hanilsa I, II* [History of Korea and Japan Face-to-Face I and II]. Paju, South Korea: Sakyejul, 2006.
- Ji, Su-geol. “Guksa kyogwaseo gukjeong cheje eui munjejeom gwa daean mosaek” [Problems of and Alternatives for the National Management of Korean

- History Textbooks]. In *Hanguksa gyogwaseo eui huimang eul chajaseo: 21-segi hanguksa kyogwaseo wa yeoksa kyoyuk eui banghyang* [Finding Hope for Korean History Textbooks: Direction of Korean History Textbooks and History Education in the 21st Century]. Seoul: Yeoksa bipyeongsa, 2003.
- Kim, Seung-ryeol. “Sukjeok gwangae eseo hyeobnyeok gwangae ro: Dogil-Peurangseu yeoksa gyogwaseo hyeobeui” [From Hereditary Enemies to Cordial Partners: The Franco-German History Textbook Consultation]. *Yeoksawa gyeonggye* 49 (2003): 139-170.
- Kim, Seung-ryeol, and Lee Yong-jae. *Hamkke sseuneun yeoksa: Dogil gwa Peurangsseu ui hwahae wa yeoksa gyogwaseo gaeseon hwaldong* [Writing History Together: The French-German Reconciliation and Cooperation to Improve History Textbooks]. Seoul: Dongbuga yeoksa jaedan [Northeast Asian History Foundation], 2008.
- Kim, Yu-gyeong. “Gieok eul dulleossan galdeung gwa hwahae: Dogil-Peurangseu mit Dogil-Polandeu eui yeoksa gyogwaseo hyeobeui” [Conflicts and Reconciliation Surrounding Memories—The French-German and German-Polish History Textbook Consultations]. *Yeoksa bipyeong* 59 (2002): 363-385.
- Körber, Andreas, Waltraud Schreiber, and Alexander Schöner, eds. *Kompetenzen Historischen Denkens: Ein Strukturmodell Als Beitrag Zur Kompetenzorientierung in Der Geschichtsdidaktik*. Neuried, Germany: Ars Una, 2007.
- Lee, Min-ho. “Dogil-Polandeu gyogwaseo hyeobui” [The German-Polish Textbook Consultation]. In *Dogil, Dogil minjok, Dogilsa: Bundan Dogil eui yeoksa euisik* [Germany, German people, and German history: Historical Awareness during the Division of Germany]. Seoul: Neutinamu, 1990.
- Mayer, Ulrich, Hans-Jürgen Pandel, and Gerhard Schneider. *Handbuch Methoden im Geschichtsunterricht*. Schwalbach am Taunus: Wochenschau Verlag, 2004.
- McNeill, John R., and William H. McNeill. *Humeon web: Segyehwa eui segyesa* [The Human Web: Globalization of World History]. Translated by Kim Wooyoung and Yoo Jung-hee. Seoul: Yeesan, 2007. Originally published as *The Human Web: A Bird's Eye View of World History*. New York: W. W. Norton, 2003.
- McNeill, William H. *Segye eui yeoksa* [A World History]. Translated by Kim Woo-

- young. Seoul: Yeesan, 2007. Originally published as *A World History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- . *Jeonyeombyeong eui segyesa* [World History of Plagues]. Translated by Kim Woo-young. Seoul: Yeesan, 2005. Originally published as *Plagues and Peoples*. New York: Anchor Books, 1998.
- . *Jeonjaeng eui segyesa* [World History of War]. Translated by Shin Mi-won. Seoul: Yeesan, 2005. Originally published as *The Pursuit of Power: Technology, Armed Force, and Society since A.D. 1000*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.
- Mignolo, Walter D. *Latin America, madeureojin daeryuk: Sikminjeok sangcheo wa talsikminjeok jeonhwan* [Latin America, a Made Continent: Colonial Scars and Postcolonial Switch]. Translated by Kim Eun-joong. Seoul: Greenbee, 2010. Originally published as *The Idea of Latin America*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005.
- Moon, Ki-sang. “Dogil eui yeoksa gyoyuk: Dogil Poland yeoksa gyogwaseo hyeobeuihoe chucheon munhang eul jungsimeuro” [History Education in Germany: With a Focus on the Recommendations by the German-Polish Textbook Commission]. *Yeoksa gyoyuk* 34 (1983): 223-257.
- Pearson, Michael Naylor. *The Indian Ocean*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Pingel, Falk. *Macht Europa Schule?: Die Darstellung Europas in Schulbüchern der Europäischen Gemeinschaft*. Frankfurt: Diesterweg, 1995.
- . *UNESCO Guidebook on Textbook Research and Textbook Revision*. 2nd ed. Paris: UNESCO, 2010.
- Narita, Ryuichi, and Minoru Iwasaki. “Writing History Textbooks in East Asia: The Possibilities and Pitfalls of ‘History that Opens the Future.’” In *Contested Views of a Common Past: Revision of History in Contemporary East Asia*, edited by Steffi Richter, 271-283. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 2008.
- Saaler, Sven. “Implikationen der jüngsten Debatte um japanische Geschichtslehrbücher für die japanisch-koreanischen Beziehungen.” In *Japan und Korea auf dem Weg in eine gemeinsame Zukunft. Aufgaben und Perspektiven.*, 123-149. Munich: iudicium verlag, 2003.
- Schüddekopf, Otto-Ernst. *Miraereul geonseulhaneun yeoksa gyoyuk: 1945-1965 yureop yeoksa gyogwaseo gaeseon hwaldong* [Future Building History

- Education: European Textbook Improvement Operations, 1954-1965]. Translated by Kim Seung-ryeol. Seoul: Yeoksa bipyeongsa, 2003. Originally published as *Zwanzig Jahre Westeuropäischer Schulgeschichtsbuchrevision 1945-1965. Tatsachen Und Probleme*. Braunschweig: Albert Limbach Verlag, 1966.
- Shin, Ju-back. "Hanil gan yeoksa daewha mosaekgwa hyeopnyeok model chatgi (1982-1993)" [Pursuing the Japanese-Korean History Dialogue and Finding a Cooperation Model (1982-1993)]. In *Dong Asia eseo yeoksa insik eui gukgyeong neomgi* [Moving Beyond the Borderline of Historical Awareness in East Asia]. Seoul: Sunin, 2008.
- . *Yeoksa hwahae wa Dong Asia hyeong mirae mandeulgi* [History Reconciliation and Building an East Asian Form of Future]. Seoul: Sunin, 2014.
- Steuerungsrat und Expertenrat des Projektes "Deutsch-Polnisches Geschichtsbuch." *Schulbuch Geschichte. Ein deutsch-polnisches Projekt – Empfehlungen*. Berlin, Warsaw, 2010. http://www.gei.de/fileadmin/gei.de/pdf/abteilungen/europa/Schulbuch_Geschichte._Ein_deutsch-polnisches_Projekt-Empfehlungen.pdf.
- Topik, Steven, and Kenneth Pomeranz. *Seoltang, keopi geurigo pognyeok: Gyoyeok euro ikneun segyesa sanchaek* [Sugar, Coffee, and Violence: A Walk Through Trade in World History]. Translated by Park Kwang-sik. Seoul: Simsan, 2003. Originally published as *The World That Trade Created: Society, Culture and the World Economy, 1400 to the Present*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe, 1999.
- Vink, Markus P. M. "Indian Ocean Studies and the 'New Thalassology.'" *Journal of Global History* 2, no. 1 (2007): 41-62.
- Yeoksa gyogwaseo yeonguhoe [Association of History Textbook Researchers] (Korea), and Rekishi kyōiku kenkyūkai [Association of History Education Researchers] (Japan). *Hanil yeoksa gongtong gyojae. Hanil gyoryu eui yeoksa: Seonsa eseo hyeondaekkaji* [History Education Material for Joint Use in Korea and Japan. A History of Mutual Exchanges: From Prehistoric to Modern Times]. Seoul: Hyeon, 2007.