

Un-suk Han/Takahiro Kondo
Biao Yang/Falk Pingel
(eds.)

HISTORY EDUCATION AND RECONCILIATION

Comparative Perspectives on East Asia



PETER LANG
Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften

Ever since the foundation of the Travel Unit of Remembering and Proclaiming Peace in 1992, we have visited war relics of different places in China and recorded the testimonies from the war victims. The activity was held by Japanese Labor and Democratic Group of Young Students every year continually. Till the end of 2007, over 600 Japanese students have participated in the activity, which has become an organization to continuously proclaim peace in Japan.

The Nanjing Massacre has passed over 70 years. To make the history unforgettable and let history be the source of peace, the Japanese youth hereby declare, "Proclaiming Peace Continually and Reflecting on the History of Aggression of China."

Committee of Fete of Peace and Friendship
by Janpanese Young Students
December 23 ,2002

从1992年开始，我们组成了“牢记并不断诉说和平之旅”，考察了中国各地的战争遗址，听取了受害者们的证言。这一活动由日本的劳动组合与民主团体的青年学生们每年不间断地举行，到2007年为止，参加者已达600人以上，是日本国内一个持续诉说和平的团体。

南京大屠杀已经过去70多年，为了不让这段历史被遗忘，为了让历史成为未来和平的源泉，日本的年轻人为此宣誓：“为了和平不断诉说真相，反省侵略历史。”

日本青年学生和平友好实行委员会
2008年12月23日

History Education and Reconciliation

Un-suk Han/Takahiro Kondo
Biao Yang/Falk Pingel
(eds.)

HISTORY EDUCATION AND RECONCILIATION

Comparative Perspectives on East Asia



PETER LANG

Frankfurt am Main · Berlin · Bern · Bruxelles · New York · Oxford · Wien

**Bibliographic Information published by the Deutsche
Nationalbibliothek**

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the
Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is
available in the internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

Cover Design:

© Olaf Gloeckler, Atelier Platen, Friedberg

Cover Illustration:

Participants of the 10th History Camp for Korean,
Chinese and Japanese Youth in Kanghwado/South Korea,
5 August 2011 (Photo: Asia Peace & History Education
Network). Memorial Stone at the Memorial Site for Victims
of the Nanjing Massacre in Nanjing/China
(Photo: Falk Pingel)

ISBN 978-3-631-63284-0 (Print)

ISBN 978-3-653-01807-3 (E-Book)

DOI 10.3726/978-3-653-01807-3

© Peter Lang GmbH

Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften

Frankfurt am Main 2012

All rights reserved.

All parts of this publication are protected by copyright. Any
utilisation outside the strict limits of the copyright law, without
the permission of the publisher, is forbidden and liable to
prosecution. This applies in particular to reproductions,
translations, microfilming, and storage and processing in
electronic retrieval systems.

www.peterlang.de

Contents

Falk Pingel

Introduction.....	7
-------------------	---

Han, Un-suk

Japanese Colonial Domination and the Second World War – Politics of Remembrance in South Korea, 1945-2011.....	21
---	----

Ide, Hiroto

The Development of History Teaching in Korea.....	41
---	----

Chang, Sei-yoon

The Current History Education Curriculum and the System of Textbook Authorization in Korea.....	59
--	----

Atsuko Kawakita

The Culture of Remembrance in Contemporary Japan: International Historical Issues in the Japanese Mass Media.....	81
--	----

Ritsu Ijuin

Japan's World History Education and the Significance of Sadao Nishijima's Theory of the East Asian World.....	95
--	----

Yang, Biao

China in Japan's History Teaching.....	105
--	-----

Li, Yueqin

Teaching Chinese-Japanese Relations in History Classes of Chinese Secondary Schools.....	113
---	-----

Shin, Ju-back

The Second World War in World History Textbooks
of Korea, China and Japan.....121

Bu, Ping

Historical Perceptions: Within the Border or beyond the Border?.....137

Takahiro Kondo

Progress in Dialogues on History in East Asia and Future Perspectives.....155

Chung, Jae-jeong

Experiencing the Writing of a Joint History Textbook
for Korean and Japanese Students.....165

Park, Kyung-seok

Remembering Wars: War Memorial Halls and Historical Disputes
in Northeast Asia.....175

Contributors.....193

Falk Pingel

Introduction

The Past That Will Not Go Away – this phrase, taken from the title of an essay which stirred a historical dispute over the interpretation of the legacy of the Nazi dictatorship in Germany, became a catchword in the debate on Japan's role in the Second World War in East Asia (see Kawakita's essay in this volume). In spite of obvious differences between the Nazi racist policy of extermination and subjugation on the one hand and Japanese expansionist and aggressive authoritarian militarism on the other, the deeds of both regimes generated a call for reconciliation with their former adversaries and compensation for the damages, injustice and losses they had inflicted on them. However, both societies responded to this claim in different ways.

For Germany, the admittance of guilt for crimes against humanity, material restitution, and reconciliatory efforts became a pre-condition for economic co-operation and the establishment of political-military alliances after the war.¹

U.S. occupation policy in Japan followed similar principles to those applied to Germany, such as taking political and military leaders to court, dissolving economic and financial conglomerates, ordering demilitarization and reforming the education system. However, these measures did not help Japan in post-war years to build constructive relations with her neighboring states formerly occupied or annexed by her. Diplomatic as well as notable economic and cultural relations with communist China were only re-established in 1972. As Korea was excluded from the San Francisco Peace Conference, torn by war and divided into two different systems, issues of war crimes, compensation and reconciliation were not dealt with at an official level until 1965 when South Korea and Japan concluded the 'Treaty on Basic Relations'. It is noteworthy in comparison to developments in Europe that Japan's treaties with South Korea and China played down the reconciliation and compensation issues and dealt with them superficially (see Han's article highlighting the U.S role in this regard, and Park's article speaking of China's 'lenient attitude' towards compensation claims as early as the 1950s).² It was felt that negotiating them in any detail

1 Lily Gardner Feldman: *The Role of History in Germany's Foreign Policy of Reconciliation*. In: *Opening Historical Reconciliation through Historical Dialogue*. Seoul: North-east Asian History Foundation, 2009: 44-77 (in English and Korean).

2 For a detailed treatment of the issue see Kimiya, Tadashi: *The Cold War and Relations between Japan and Korea*. In: *The Historical Perceptions of Korea and Japan*. Ed. Hyun, Dae-song. Paju: Nanam, 2008: 279-303. Concerning the Chinese government's

could harm, not foster the renewal of stable economic and political relations. The resurgence of diplomatic relations did not open a debate on how to deal with past injustice. It regulated financial compensation in a very general and favorable way for Japan without detailing the damages that should be compensated in a realistic and comprehensive manner. Rather, it was meant to close the debate about these issues, and to this day it is the official stance of the Japanese government (and of the Chinese who are not pursuing any further material compensation from Japan). In South Korea, public protest against this attitude towards the past could exert influence on the authorities only with the rise of democratization. Verbally, the democratic governments supported this stance but remained officially obliged to stick to the bilateral treaties which did not offer any hope for taking up compensation issues successfully without Japan's consent.

In stark contrast to post-war political culture in Europe (in the 'West' as well as in the 'East', and after the fall of the 'Iron Curtain' also between the 'West' and the 'East'), cooperation between the East Asia states has been built on bilateral agreements and has not yet developed into multi-partite concerted action, not to speak of multilateral agreements with South-east Asian countries or alliances.

The different politico-cultural approaches to a problematic past in Europe and East Asia nevertheless led, superficially speaking, to the same result: A past that will not go away:

Germany made final compensation payments in 2011 but new claims were raised recently; the intellectual debates continue, and the public outrage at crimes committed by the army in the Second World War reigned strong in the 1990s.

In East Asia, the falsification of history in Japanese textbooks, the visits of politicians to national shrines that also commemorate war criminals, and the denial of war crimes and of recognition of victims stirred public protest in China and South Korea, led to a deterioration of mutual relations, and triggered painful history debates from time to time since the 1980s.

A deeper look into the issue reveals the difference:

Germany had to cope with its difficult past because of commitments to her post-war allies. Step by step and over generations, most Germans accepted and internalized these commitments as a moral obligation that helped to come to

use of the history debate for political aims, see He, Yinan: *Remembering and Forgetting the War. Elite Mythmaking, Mass Reaction, and Sino-Japanese Relations, 1950–2006*. In: *History and Memory*, 19 (2007) 2: 43–74.

grips with one's own past as well as to combat hatred and negative images widespread in former enemy countries in post-war years. It helped to ease tensions.

In contrast, in East Asia the history debate still mostly contributes to arousing tensions and fostering negative images of the other. Furthermore, it is often easily linked to territorial issues between the countries and complicates matters instead of offering ways to resolving them as with the conflict over the small island of Dokdo/Takeshima and the debate on historical roots and the national belonging of China's northeastern population.

Last, but not least, one should not forget that the Cold War is not yet over in the Korean peninsula. Ide's analysis of the South Korean history curriculum in this volume distinguishes two levels (or inherent 'structures' as he calls it) characterizing the South Korean narrative: to give legitimacy to South Korea as the only legitimate Korean state and to replace the pro-Japanese colonial narrative which represented the official version until 1945. Both objectives are 'negative' as they create distance between neighbors. The rebuilding of collective identities in East Asia after the war was to a large extent based on objectives of history teaching that kept distance between one's neighbors. Only in recent years, has a more positive and cooperative approach emerged.

The Textbook Debate

Concerning the debate about the legacy of the Second World War and Japan's expansionist policy in the 20th century, the textbook issue played the most important role and was on the agenda almost since the mid-1950s when the Japanese authorities used their newly acquired responsibility for education to fully control and centralize the textbook authorization system and so revert changes that were introduced under the umbrella of democratization and participation during the occupation period.³ With the production of joint teaching material that transgresses national borders since the 1990s, the controversial and often heated debate has turned, at least partly, into a constructive discourse. The authors of this volume strive to go further in this direction. On the one hand, their contributions offer basic information on how the conflict is presented in history education; they analyze current textbook and curriculum contents as well as take into account the political context of history textbook development such as ap-

3 Julian Dierkes: *Guilty Lessons? Postwar History Education in Japan and the Germanys*. New York: Routledge, 2010; Nozaki, Yoshiko/Inokuchi, Hiromitsu: *Japanese Education, Nationalism, and Ienaga Saburo's Textbook Lawsuits*. In: Laura Hein/Mark Selden (eds.): *Censoring History. Citizenship and Memory in Japan, Germany, and the United States*. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe, 2008: 96-126.

proval procedures. On the other hand, they give orientation towards possible approaches to textbook revision and multilateral cooperation in the future.

Since the 1990s, at first glance, the East Asian countries have applied methods and procedures to deal with the textbook issue that are similar to those used by Western European countries in textbook consultations. History textbooks have been exchanged and analyzed. Based on the findings, suggestions for improving each other's representation in textbooks have been formulated and discussed in academic circles as well as in the concerned public. Even joint teaching materials have been developed for use in two or all three countries. These activities were mainly driven by individual scholars, academic institutions and/or civil society organizations (see Chung's article in this volume giving insight into the work of one of these initiatives⁴). However, although state-official bilateral history commissions have been founded, they have not yet dealt with school textbooks as the 'hottest' issue. The topic was on the agenda of the Korean-Japanese commission but it has been deferred several times. UNESCO as the most important international organization for state-commissioned textbook consultations has also conducted a number of multilateral conferences but failed to engage the Japanese National UNESCO Commission. So far, no official bi- or tri-lateral textbook commission could be set up. In contrast, textbook revision in Western Europe started with meetings, seminars and commissions established or financed by ministries of education often in cooperation with academic institutions and teachers associations. Commissions or working groups supported by educational authorities represented the most common model of textbook revision in post-war decades. They paved the way for widespread recognition of international textbook comparison and revision based on scholarly analysis amongst academics as well as politicians. Together with politically induced activities of textbook revision meant to produce practical recommendations for changing textbooks and curricula, textbook research projects were conducted at academic institutions to further develop methods of comparative analysis.⁵

Only with the breakdown of the communist system, the work of NGOs gained importance particularly in countries of transition in Eastern Europe where the governments were often hesitant to deal openly with controversial issues like the presentation of minorities and border conflicts in teaching material. Similar to their colleagues and institutions in East Asia, scholars and teachers developed source books and experimental teaching material aimed at making

4 See also Wang, Zhen: *Old Wounds, New Narratives: Joint History Textbook Writing and Peacebuilding in East Asia*. In: *History and Memory*, 21 (2009) 1: 101-126.

5 See Falk Pingel: *UNESCO Guidebook on Textbook Research and Textbook Revision*. 2nd, rev. ed., Braunschweig/Paris: Georg Eckert Institute/UNESCO, 2010 (Korean ed. Seoul: Northeast Asian History Foundation, 2011).

teachers familiar with new teaching methods and topics that were avoided or presented in a one-sided way in the past. At times these activities evoked similar responses as in East Asia often stirring up controversial debates, provoking negative reactions from the ministries and were not implemented in classroom. Partly, the activities made it into classrooms, were accepted by the ministries and helped to reduce the use of nationalistic or ethnically biased arguments in teaching material. The German-French history textbook, which is often referred to in this regard, has a particular significance. So far it is the only bi-national history teaching material used as a regular textbook fitting into the curricula of both countries. It is based on close cooperation between French and German historians and on mutual textbook consultations since decades. The content and methodologies are not politically provocative. Instead, they show that different interpretations reflect different historical experiences and theoretical approaches that are often no longer related to the authors' national affiliations but to a fundamental variety of trends in historiography. They challenge students with a multi-perspective discourse.

Such a discourse is only now taking shape in East Asia but differing in depth and extent in each of the three countries. The asymmetry of communication within and between the three societies poses a particular problem for the advancement of textbook consultations and the implementation of joint recommendations.

This applies to all the four dimensions textbook consultations have to take into account:

1. The political dimension dealing with the official policy of remembrance.
2. The scientific dimension offering points of view and results of academic research on the topics pertinent to the textbook issues at stake.
3. The civil society dimension dealing with the position of victims and perpetrators in post-conflict societies, the recognition or denial of crimes and suffering, and the engagement of civil society groups in remembrance activities.
4. The pedagogical and school dimension addressing curricula and textbook approval procedures.

These four dimensions do not represent isolated spaces of communication and decision making, in fact they interact.

In all three countries, official remembrance ceremonies exert great influence on people's historical consciousness and the way the past is remembered. In China, an alternative remembrance culture beyond official commemoration ceremonies and memorials does not exist. Although China is diversifying and de-centralizing her textbook and curricula systems, all textbooks are state-commissioned so that dimension (4) is strongly dependent on dimension (1).

South Korea is going further in her recent reforms favoring the production of state-authorized over state-commissioned books. This has already led to a significant and controversial diversification of interpretations as Chang indicates in his article. In addition, as historians and political scientists engage in penetrating self-searching research about South Korea's path to authoritarian rule and state-committed crimes, the reconciliation issue is therefore viewed not only as a claim on Japan but has also an important inner dimension - a critical look into one's own difficult past that has influenced the way Koreans deal with the victims of Japanese occupation, as Han shows in his contribution to this volume. The democratization of the South Korean society made ordinary people as well as politicians aware, that not only the victims of the crimes of the 'other', the Japanese, should be remembered, but that remembrance should also include the victims of one's own violent and dictatorial regimes. This implies that the victims of both foreign and domestic regimes are of equal value - not only were their national rights violated, they suffered from a violation of their rights as human beings (as Han underscores in his article). Such an attitude has strengthened the role civil society organizations have in dealing with reconciliation. The production of alternative bilateral teaching materials has been widely welcomed in South Korea and was not rejected by the authorities (as Chung shows in his article), although this material is not yet widely used in schools, not least due to the strict examination system which offers teachers little time to use additional material.

Openness towards one's own deeds pushes its way through only very slowly in the bi- and trilateral working groups and official history commissions. Still, Japan's actions and the other countries' reactions are in the foreground so that the roles of who is right and who is wrong are, as a rule, clearly defined. However, drawing clear dividing lines in textbook consultations makes it difficult to generate lasting trust between the participants. All partners should be ready to critically examine not only the history of the others but also their own past. Some progress has been made in this regard. For example, the Academy of Korean Studies holds annual meetings with Chinese textbook publishers.

Although Japan is the only East Asian country with an open market textbook system, rigid approval guidelines restrict the freedom of textbook authors, particularly when writing about collective identification patterns and sensitive topics of national pride.⁶ Besides official ceremonies commemorating events related to the Second World War, an alternative sector of historical enquiry and

6 Nishino, Ryota: *The Political Economy of the Textbook in Japan: With Particular Focus on Middle-School History Textbooks, ca. 1945-1995*. In: *Internationale Schulbuchforschung/International Textbook Research*, 30 (2008): 487-513.

remembrance emerged; smaller museums and commemoration places were established often at the initiative of civil society organizations (see, for example, Kawakita about the Okinawa issue in this volume). However, these activities are hardly integrated into official public commemoration. Often, they are labeled ‘left wing’ and research results they produce are not taken up and acknowledged by main stream studies (see Kondo’s article). Kondo, who can be regarded as one of the protagonists of textbook revision in Japan, poses the question: Why have the many activities undertaken by academics and civil society organizations not yet had the desired effect?

The reconciliation debate in East Asia has long attracted the attention of researchers interested in the politics of remembrance since. As the interest often was directed at comparative approaches not only between the East Asian states, but also between East Asia and Europe or other regions, these studies were mainly conducted or edited by researchers working at academic institutions outside the region.⁷ Measured against ‘progress’ in the West, ‘stagnation’ or stale-

7 See among others: Ian Buruma: *The Wages of Guilt: Memories of War in Germany and Japan*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1994; Sven Saaler: *Politics, Memory and Public Opinion: The History Textbook Controversy and Japanese Society*. München: Iudicium, 2005; Nozaki, Yoshiko: *War, Memory, Nationalism and Education in Postwar Japan, 1945-2007: The Japanese History Textbook Controversy and Ienaga Saburo’s Court Challenge*. London: Routledge, 2008; Hasegawa, Tsuyoshi/Togo, Kazuhiko (eds.): *East Asia’s Haunted Present: Historical Memories and the Resurgence of Nationalism*. Westport: Praeger Security International, 2008; Hirona, Mutsumi: *History Education and International Relations: A Case Study of Diplomatic Disputes over Japanese Textbooks*. Folkestone: Global Oriental, 2009; Dierkes: *Guilty Lessons?*; Nishino, Ryota: *Changing Histories: Japanese and South African Textbooks in Comparison (1945-1995)*. Göttingen: V&R unipress, 2011; Gotelind Müller (ed.): *Designing History in East Asian Textbooks. Identity Politics and Transnational Aspirations*. London: Routledge, 2011; Gi-Wook Shin/Daniel C. Sneider (eds.): *History Textbooks and the Wars in Asia*. London: Routledge, 2011. A broader thematic area beyond the textbook issue offer: Daqing Yang/Liu, Jie/Mitani, Hiroshi: *Historical Understanding that Transcend National Boundaries*. Tokyo: Tokyo University Press, 2006 (Chinese ed. Beijing: Social Science Academic Press, 2006); Steffi Richter (ed.): *Contested Views of a Common Past. Revision of History in East Asia*. Frankfurt/M: Campus, 2008; Edward Vickers/Alisa Jones (eds.): *History Education in East Asia*. London: Routledge, 2005.

For early stages of Japanese-Korean textbook talks on academic level see Kimijima, Kazuhiko: *The Continuing Legacy of Japanese Colonialism: The Japan-South Korea Joint Study Group on History Textbooks*. In: Hein/Selden: *Censoring History*: 203-223; the Korean head of the group, Lee, Tae-yong, founder and director of the International Textbook Institute in Seoul, visited the Georg Eckert Institute several times; Sakai, Toshiki: *International Exchange on Textbooks in Japan: An Interim Report*. In: Andrew Horvat/Gebhard Hielscher (eds.): *Sharing the Burden of the Past: Legacies of War in*

mate in the East has been the inevitable conclusion of such studies. Against this background, textbook revision and textbook research as conducted in the West, in particular by German agencies, developed into a model of how to deal with a difficult past in education in East Asia. Since the 1980s, and increasingly since the 1990s, researchers from the East Asian countries have traveled to the Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research in Germany and other institutions involved in textbook consultations to study their work. Several publications on textbook issues have been translated into Korean or Japanese.⁸ This seemed to confirm the impression of a linear knowledge transfer from West to East. Although this is partly true, one should not overlook the many studies on textbooks often including a critical evaluation of what can be learned from textbook consultations in the West that appeared in Japan (see Kawakita) and Korea, and to a lesser extent in China.⁹ However, because of language problems,

Europe, America and Asia. Tokyo: The Asia Foundation/Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, 2003: 100-106.

- 8 The Korean Curriculum Development Institute (KEDI) translated two volumes published by the Georg Eckert Institute on the results and implementation of the German-Polish textbook consultations as well as the commemorative publication on the Institute's 25th anniversary into Korean language in 2002; furthermore, a Korean edition of O.E. Schüddekopf's book on *Twenty Years of Textbook Revision in Western Europe* was published by Yoksabipyongsa in 2003. To support transnational textbook writing in East Asia, the *European History Textbook* and the *German-French History Textbook* are being translated into Korean and Japanese; in 2011, the Northeast Asia History Foundation published a Korean edition of the *UNESCO Guidebook on Textbook Research and Textbook Revision*.
- 9 See amongst others Fujisawa, Hoei: *Doitsujin no rekishi ishiki: Kyokasho ni miru senso sekininron* [The historical consciousness of the Germans: The theory of war responsibility through textbooks]. Tokyo: Akishobo, 1986; Sato, Komei: *Kyokasho kentei no gamba kara: 17-nen kann no insaida repoto* [From the coalface of textbook screening: An insider report of seventeen years of experience]. Tokyo: Waseda Shuppan, 1987; Takasaki, Soji (ed.): *Rekishi kyokasho to kokusai rikai* [History textbooks and international understanding]. Tokyo: Iwanami-Shoten, 1991; Nishikawa, Masao (ed.): *Jikokusi o koeta rekishi kyoiku* [History teaching beyond national history]. Tokyo: Sanseido Shoten, 1992; Tokutake, Toshio: *Kyokasho no sengoshi* [A history of textbooks in the post-war period]. Tokyo: Shin Nihon Shuppansha, 1995; Kimijima, Kazuhiko: *Kyokasho no shiso: Nihon to Kankoku no kingendaishi* [Ideologies in textbooks: Contemporary histories of Japan and Korea]. Tokyo: Suzusawa Shoten, 1996; Kondo, Takahiro: *Rekishi kyoiku to kyokasho: Doitsu, Osutoria soshite Nihon* [History teaching and textbooks: Germany, Austria and Japan]. Tokyo: Iwanami, 2001; Kondo, Takahiro: *Rekishi kyokasho mondai - Mirai eno kaito: Higashi Ajia kyotsu no rekishikan ha kano ka* [Textbook problems – Seeking answers for the future: The feasibility of a common historical understanding in East Asia]. Tokyo: Iwanami, 2001; Nitani, Sadao (ed.): *21-seiki no rekishi ninshiki to kokusai rikai. Kankoku, Chūgoku, Nihon kara no teigen*

these studies were taken into account outside the region only by experts in East Asian studies. Therefore, this volume gives insight into current research done in the region by authors from the region.

Most of the East Asian studies dealt with the content of textbooks or certain incriminatory passages in a narrow sense without reflecting the discourse strate-

[Images of history in the 21st century and international understanding. Suggestions from China, Korea and Japan]. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 2004; Mitani, Hiroshi/Kim, Tae-chang (eds.): *Higashi Ajia rekishi taiwa* [Transnational and transgenerational dialogues on histories in East Asia]. Tokyo: The University of Tokyo Press, 2007; Kondo, Takahiro (ed.): *Higashi Ajia no rekishi seisaku – Nicchukan taiwa to rekishininshiki* [History politics in East Asia – Dialogues on historical understanding among Japan, China and Korea]. Tokyo: Akashi Publishing, 2008; Kenmochi, Hisaki/Kosuge, Nobuko/Babicz, Lionel (eds.): *Rekishi ninshiki kyoyu no chihei* [Horizon of a common historical perception]. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 2009.

In Korea, besides KEDI, the non-governmental International Textbook Institute in Seoul published a series of conference reports with textbook analyses in the 1990s. In the late 1990s and early 2000s smaller studies were published concentrating on the Japanese textbook issue; not least due to the experience gained in multi-national textbook working groups, more research driven studies have been conducted in recent years, see Han, Un-suk: *Dogilui Yeoksa hwahaewa Yeoksa gyoyuk* [Historical reconciliation and teaching history in Germany]. Seoul: Sinseowon, 2008; Han, Un-suk et al.: *Kahaewa Pihaeui Kubuneul Nomo: Tokil-Poland Yoksa Whahaeeui Kil* [Beyond the distinction of offender and victim: Historical reconciliation between Germany and Poland]. Seoul: Northeast Asian History Foundation, 2008; Kim, Seun-ryul/Lee, Yong-jae: *Hamke Ssneun Yoksa: Tokilgwa Franceui Hwahaewa Yoksagyogwaso Gaesonghwaldong* [Writing history together: Reconciliation between Germany and France and activities for textbook revision]. Seoul: Northeast Asian History Foundation, 2008; Asia Pyonghwawa Yoksayonguso: *Asia Pyonghwawa Dongasiaesoeui Yoksainsikeui Kukgyongnomgi* [Asian peace and transnational historical consciousness in East-Asia]. Seoul: Dosoculpansonin, 2008; Asia Pyonghwawa Yoksayonguso: *Yoksainsikeul Dulossan Jawhasang. Oebueui Sison* [Self-image and historical consciousness. Perspective from outside]. Seoul: Dosoculpansonin, 2008; Asia Pyonghwawa Yoksayonguso: *Hanjungil Dongasiasa Kyoyukeui Hyonhwanggw Gwaje* [The situation and the task of history education about East Asian history]. Seoul: Dosoculpansonin, 2008; Chung, Jae-jeong: *Hankukeui Nonri* [The Korean thinking]. Seoul: Hyoneumsa, 1998; Chung, Jae-jeong: *Ilboneui Nonri: Cheonhwangieui Yoksagyoyukgwa Hangug Insik* [Japanese thinking: History education at the turning point and the image of Korea]. Seoul: Hyoneumsa, 1998. In China, textbook studies were mainly produced in the context of German-Chinese consultations organized by the Georg Eckert Institute on the German side; on the Chinese side, foremost the East China and the Shanghai Pedagogical Universities provided the institutional framework. A bi-lingual CD-Rom documenting key lectures of joint seminars is being produced by the Georg Eckert Institute.

I am grateful to my co-editors for their contributions to this footnote.

gies and historiographic trends behind the textbook narrative. Textbook studies were almost exclusively conducted with a view to textbook revision and were seldom devoted to methodological issues such as fine-tuning the tools of analysis and comparison. Textbook research that works independently from current projects of textbook revision could not be established as a recognized academic sub-discipline. I believe this is one of the reasons why textbook revision is still highly politicized in East Asia. The research dimension on which proposals for revision should be grounded is underdeveloped and underestimated.¹⁰

International Understanding, Transitional Justice, and Reconciliation

If a more profound understanding of the impact of the Second World War in East Asia were to be based on appropriate knowledge of each other's recent history, then curricular changes are of paramount importance. Due to the current curricular structures in the three countries, the war is very much seen from a national perspective. National and world history have been taught separately and treated in different textbooks in China and Korea. This approach excludes the domestic war from its international context and focusses the international context on the Western war theater as Shin convincingly shows in his contribution to this volume. Although the Japanese history curriculum integrates world and national history, the international dimension is hardly taught in its own right but serves as a mere context background for what happened in Japan (see Yang's analysis in this volume). The traditional equation of world history with the history of the Western world in all three countries has an impact on the structures of the history curricula to this day as textbook analyses reveal (see Chang's and Shin's articles).¹¹ A regional approach takes shape at best in the treatment of pre-modern history in relation to cultural commonalities like Chinese characters, Buddhism, etc. The dominance of the Western paradigm in world history has led to underestimating the East Asian space as a regional unit with an entangled history (see Ijuin).¹² The articles by Yang and Li underscore, with a touch of mel-

10 See in more detail Falk Pingel: *Old and New Models of Textbook Revision and Their Impact on the East Asian History Debate*. In: *Journal of Northeast Asian History*, 7 (winter 2010) 2: 5-36.

11 For China see Gotelind Müller: *Teaching 'the Others' History' in Chinese Schools. The State, Cultural Asymmetries and Shifting Images of Europe (from 1900 to today)*. In: Müller: *Designing History*: 32-59.

12 See also Wang, Yuanzhon: *A Peripheral Vision of China's Historiography. Ups and Downs*. In: *Journal of Northeast Asian History*, 5 (2008) 1: 45-86.

ancholy, that the decay of the Chinese tributary system and its inherent concept of a China-centered world order diminished the validity of a regional approach to the modern history of the East Asian countries. Wars, occupation and annexation, competing politico-economic systems generated persistent mistrust that has hampered tri-national cooperation to this day (see Bu's contribution to this volume).¹³ In this distrustful atmosphere public apologies and even concessions for modest financial compensation by Japanese Prime Ministers in the 1990s were not acknowledged and did not cause any political effect in China and Korea as long as other Japanese politicians objected to them (as confirmed by Bu's assessment of the 'political level' in his article).¹⁴ Also positive changes in the pre-sentation of contested issues such as 'comfort women' and Korean independence in Japanese textbooks in the 1990s were hardly noted in the public although documented by specialists.¹⁵

In the Western European context, trials, reparation in kind and financial compensation to victims, official apologies and recognition of responsibility for crimes committed in the name of one's own nation as well as positive measures for improving mutual understanding such as textbook revision and youth exchange have complemented each other and formed a package of reconciliation measures for which research has coined the term 'transitional justice'. In East Asia, the various components of transitional justice have not yet formed such a whole. Civil society initiatives, main stream research, political statements are often not coordinated and do not produce added values. As long as reconciliation efforts are seen as isolated activities that are not recognized by the majority of society an atmosphere of mutual trust can scarcely be created in the public.

13 See also Marc Selden: *Center and Periphery in East Asia in three Epochs*. In: *Journal of Northeast Asian History*, 5 (2008) 1: 5-20.

14 'The official apologies made by Japanese leaders have been viewed as formal statements not followed by any efforts to liquidate the past', according to Lee, Dong-hoo: *Media Discourse on the Other: Remembering Japanese Colonialism in Korea*. Conference paper New Dimensions of Cultural Studies, Tokyo University, 11-12 July 2002, p.1; see also Gavan Mc Cormack: *The Japanese Movement to 'Correct' History*. In: Hein/Selden: *Censoring History*: 53-73.

15 See the *Research Abstracts* on content related to Japan in Japanese history textbooks published by KEDI in the last decades. In an official Japanese handbook for authors of history textbooks abroad it is stated that Japanese 'policy of aggressive expansionism, later linking up with Nazism and Facism' led Japan 'to begin the Pacific War', see *Understanding Japan. A Teachers' & Textbook Writers' Handbook on Japan*. Tokyo: The International Society for Educational Information, 2001:76. Many of these improvements disappeared, however, in textbooks of the next generation, see Nishino: *Changing Histories*: 19, referring to Takashima, Nobuyoshi et al.: *Kyokasho kara kesareru 'senso'* ['Wars' disappearing from textbooks]. Tokyo: Shukan Kinyobi, 2004.

It remains to be seen whether the latest curricular developments open promising perspectives for putting more emphasis on East Asia which would promote the use of extra-curricular material on East Asian relations that has been produced by bi- and tri-national teams of authors in recent years. South Korea has made the first step in this direction with the introduction of East Asian History as a special subject into the curriculum (see Chang). Curricular changes in China reflect a broader concept of world and international history (see Bu)¹⁶; the new Shanghai history curriculum has abandoned the separation of world and Chinese history.¹⁷ Although it may, in the first place, aim at expressing China's new role as one of the world's leading economic and political powers, it could also attach more weight to the increasing economic, cultural and political cooperation between the East Asian states as well as between East Asia and South Asia. Even if the need for peaceful conflict resolution and the establishment of friendly neighborly relations have become the aims of teaching modern East Asian relations, Li's article based on practical teaching experience shows that different objectives sometimes compete; the upholding of 'the national spirit' may well come into conflict with the desire to foster international understanding.¹⁸

Therefore, not only the content needs to be revised, also new methods of representation are needed. The analyses show that textbooks focus on facts and military events when dealing with armed conflicts. They are not discursive and do not raise problems of remembering. The concepts of 'event', 'cause' and 'assessment' in textbooks deserve more in-depth examination.¹⁹ Most of the bi- and trilateral textbook work conducted in the region in the 1980s and 1990s focused on the mere texts, the facts that were described or omitted and the obvious values and assessments the text transmitted. That was quite often the case when

16 See also Zhou, Nanzhao/Zhu, Muju: *Educational Reform and Curriculum Change in China: A Comparative Case Study*. Geneva: IBE, 2007.

17 Yang, Biao: *Teaching World History in China. Changing Patterns*. In: *Beyond National Boundaries: Building a World without Walls*. Ed. Center for International Affairs, Bundang-gu: The Academy of Korean Studies Press, 2011: 205-219.

18 See also Edward Vickers: *The Opportunity of China? Education, Patriotic Values and the Chinese State*. In: Marie Lall/Edward Vickers (eds.): *Education as a Political Tool in Asia*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2009: 53-82; Wang, Zhen: *National Humiliation, History Education, and the Politics of Historical Memory: Patriotic Education Campaign in China*. In: *International Studies Quarterly*, 52 (2008): 783-806. For Japan see Peter Cave: *Learning to Live with the Imperial Past? History Teaching, Empire and War in Japan and England*. In: Vickers/Jones: *History Education and National Identity*: 307-333.

19 Dierkes' comparative German-Japanese study *Guilty Lessons* underscores this finding; see also Fukuoka, Kazuya: *School History Textbooks and Historical Memories in Japan: A Study of Reception*. In: *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society*, 24 (2011) 3/4: 83-103.

textbook analysis started. However, with the growing importance of other media addressing particularly the youth, researchers have become more aware of the socio-cultural context in which learning and remembering is embedded. The concluding article of Park puts the textbook issue in the context of the creation of collective memory and shows how textbook critique and official commemoration procedures, even the establishment of memorials, went hand in hand in China and Korea. The anti-Japanese iconography of these monuments evokes hostile attitudes to this day. Therefore, Park argues for keeping a certain ‘distance to the by-gones’ to make people ready to remember and to forgive even if this might involve some - healthy - kind of ‘oblivion’. Or, at least, he speaks out for a more abstract identification with the victims of terror and suppression, in the sense that it should foster the acknowledgement of general human and not foremost specific national values.

Acknowledgement

The contributions collected in this volume date back to a conference jointly organized by the Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research (Braunschweig/Germany) and the Northeast Asian History Foundation (Seoul/Republic of Korea) in 2008. Through a further generous grant, the History Foundation has made it possible to publish an updated and extended version of the papers that now reflect textbook research activities in East Asia of the last two decades. I sincerely thank my co-editors and the authors for their devotion to a subject that is highly controversial in their countries. Academic research cannot solve a controversy over how to commemorate a difficult past; the authors themselves are part of the commemoration process which they have critically examined here. May such a comparative study help clarify one’s own position, offer insight into the ‘other’s’ point of view, and further develop a respectful and meaningful debate.

