

コメント

楊 大 慶

First of all, I want to congratulate the organizers for putting together this symposium of high quality papers. For me, it's been a learning experience. Also I appreciate Prof. Ishida's introduction at the very beginning in which he defined what reconciliation is and it's a very broad definition. I think many would agree that to achieve historical reconciliation, it requires a transformation of perceptions—both self-perception and mutual-perception—on the part of society involved. And here historical education plays a hugely important role, although it is not the only part in transforming perceptions. And secondly, the four papers presented here all deal with one type of reconciliation. That is interstate reconciliation while there are other kinds of intrastate reconciliation. Here we encounter a particular problem. That is the existence of the nation-state. Of course, in some areas the nation-states are being relativised. For example, we have the EU. We have economic interdependence. They all erode the state sovereignty. But at the same time, there are tendencies where nation-states are strengthening. We can think of the recent dispute between Japan and China as one example.

So the four papers deal with different aspects of the history education and reconciliation. The first paper by Prof. Shiba introduces cases that are not widely-known in the existing scholarly literature. And here he emphasizes the power of education ministries in the Balkans which we feel in East Asia as well. So I think that's a very important observation. Another point I learn from the paper is the importance of what he called multi-perspectivity. Here it's not the aim of having absolutely identical narrative, but the existence of the different perspectives. And I think you offered a very good advice for East Asia as well. The questions I have for Prof. Shiba are as follows. The first is to what extent the role of a region is helpful in overcoming national narratives. Here he introduces concept such as West Balkan or South Eastern Europe. To what extent is it possible to imagine such a region both by itself and also as part of the bigger Europe? Now is Turkey supposed to be part of this region? Of course, we know politically the admission of Turkey to the European Union is very problematic. And second question is what is the role between these collaborations among educators on the one hand and collaboration and dialogue among professional historians on the other. As we know, there have been projects such as the Scholars' Initiative which are essentially dialogue among professional historians of former Yugoslavia. And to what extent these two kinds of dialogue and collaboration affect each other, if there is any such interaction. And thirdly how do these common textbooks deal with sensitive, unsettled political issues. Whether we are talking about political boundaries or the question of Kosovo—whether it should be independent or not. And if Turkey is involved, and then Turkey's various invasions of Europe. How are these sensitive issues taken up?

For the next paper by Prof. Kondo, of course, he is really the expert on textbook

dialogues and he provides very clear conceptual framework “内と外” —the inside and the outside. And he argues that because in Europe these two sets of networks work well with each other. Europe is making progress in history education. And he also notes that in Europe the clear distinction between state and society is disappearing. That state in Germany is taking initiatives in encouraging the dialogue. Of course, in East Asia, such phenomenon is not entirely absent. For example, in the case of Korea, the state is taking a strong initiative. For example, there is the Northeast Asia History Foundation. The money comes from, I believe, the state. The question I have is he rightly noted that this kind of history dialogue takes enormously long time even for Europe. And I want to add one other issue; that is, in Europe, this kind of dialogue took place or started in the absence of a debate or controversy over history. So in that sense, the politicians have a certain kind of space to encourage the dialogue across nations, whereas in East Asia I think a major difference is that this kind of history dialogue took place because there was a major history controversy, starting from the textbook controversy in 1980s and then the Yasukuni issue and then the comfort women issue. And therefore there is an entirely different political climate, when it comes to history issues. So if we take this into consideration, I would like to ask Prof. Kondo. How should East Asia look at the European model of history dialogue? And secondly, when we think of this long-term of, you know, maybe 40 years, 50 years, is it impossible to agree on some short-term goals, and then medium-term goals and then long-term goals? Or should we simply wait, essentially, let time take its own course? And thirdly, he mentioned the role of public organizations (公的機関) is very important. Then I would like to know whether such an organization should be in a single nation like in the case of Germany or bilateral or even multilateral or whether an external country—whether public or private organization can play a role in history dialogue. In my view, such external organizations are largely absent in Europe, but maybe in East Asia there could be such a function.

The third paper by Prof. Yaguchi brings back a lot of personal memories. Hawaii was the first place I studied in the United States. In fact, Prof. Osorio who appeared in the presentation, I believe, was a classmate. And also as you know, next year the American Association of Asian Studies will have its annual conference in Hawaii and if I can have a little bit promotion, we will have several panels on East Asia history dialogue at this AAS meeting. Here I think Prof. Yaguchi makes a very important point that even though this kind of dialogue is supposed to promote understanding, it can also magnify the differences between nation states. Even though we do know this kind of multi-perspectivity, for example, there is voice of Hawaii independence in this bilateral dialogue. Here it raises several questions for me. Number one is what is the overall state of reconciliation between the United States and Japan. I mean these are two allies and there has not been a major historical controversy between them. Have they reconciled? Of course, in 1995 the Smithsonian can be considered some kind of controversy. So is it possible to achieve reconciliation without a common understanding of history between U.S. and Japan? And second question again goes back to this relationship between the teachers from middle schools and high schools

on the one hand and professional historians on the other. He laments the fact that very few Japanese professional historians based in universities like Todai actually become involved in the teachers' dialogue. I do know that, for example, at Tokyo Gakugei Daigaku, they have been long involved in history textbook dialogue with Korean counterparts at the Seoul City University and they have produced quite an impressive book. And this may lead to certain kind of possibility among these normal universities or teachers' universities or education universities in Japan, Korea and China. Perhaps they can play the leading role in bridging the school teachers on the one hand and professional historians on the other. So I would like to ask his opinion about this potential. Thirdly, he already mentioned this. It's not sufficient to only consider Pearl Harbor within the US-Japan framework and I entirely agree. In Hawaii itself, there are many Chinese-Americans, Philipino-Americans and to what extent their experience can be incorporated into this kind of dialogue. Or maybe it's necessary to go beyond a bilateral dialogue to embrace wider perspective.

The last paper by Dr. Nam relates to the issue of comfort women in Korean-Japan textbooks. And I have been doing some work in Korea myself and I should mention that Korea in some ways is taking a lead in this textbook reform. For example, Korea would be the first country in the region to introduce East Asian history as an elective course for high schools. As far as I know, neither China nor Japan is doing that. Now if you consider the relationship between Korea and Japan, we can see these two countries that share in the value of democracy and NGOs are playing quite active roles. At the popular level, we have this Hanryû (韓流) phenomenon and at the government level, we are seeing the talk of some kind of security cooperation. Then Japanese Foreign Minister Okada even talked about a common textbook. So in some ways the political conditions seem to be ready, and yet as Prof. Nam pointed out the narrative about comfort women seem to diverge. So my question for Dr. Nam is this. Several speakers talked about this multi-perspectivity textbook as an ideal for common textbooks. Do you think this is possible in the case of Japan and Korea on issues like comfort women? You quoted a passage from Korean National Assembly that talks about the need to teach the truth about comfort women. Now can this truth embrace multiple perspectives? And also does this truth include the fact that when we look at how the comfort women were recruited, there were also Koreans who were involved in such a process. Of course, this brings up very sensitive issues. That's the Korean collaboration. To what extent, should this be included in the future textbooks?

To wrap up, I think these several papers highlighted a very important relationship between government and society in history textbook dialogues, but also the need to consider what kind of conceptual framework we should aim at. Should we simply stop at multiple perspectives or should we try to harmonize the different perspectives? And one last thing is to borrow the metaphor of “外” —the outside, we have to keep in mind that history textbooks in education is only one aspect of transforming popular perceptions. And so in that sense, we need to address what role historians can play in terms of popular education. What about museums or public media? Thank you.