

コメント

シドニー・パッシュユ

Thank you very much, Professor, and I would like to thank the organizers of this afternoon's conference, and the panel. I found this afternoon's presentations particularly interesting, both as a history teacher and as an American.

As an undergraduate at UCLA in the 1980s, and a graduate student at Rutgers in the 1990s, the idea of teaching history and memory was not yet incorporated into our studies so today's information was particularly rewarding for me.

I have a keen interest in today's topic both as a diplomatic historian and as an American. As a diplomatic historian and as a history teacher, I have not adequately considered the connection between the construction of history and international diplomacy, which, for me, was the most valuable lesson that I took from today's presentations.

As an American, today's conference helps me to recognize more about my own country's struggle between the need to use history to bind our very heterogeneous population together and the need to construct an appealing and unifying narrative. As a history teacher, however, I also recognized the need to present a balanced and well-researched narrative which, at times, clashes with this imperative. And I believe all of the papers today indicate that this is a problem that historians share, not only in the United States, but also in Western Europe, the Balkans, Japan, and Korea.

I struggle in particular at my university because we are a historically black college and we stand astride the largest military base in the United States, Fort Bragg, which has been significantly active in the last 10 years. Therefore it is difficult to attempt to construct a unifying narrative which also includes racism and militarism. So once again, today's conference was very valuable to me.

Finally, this afternoon helped me to contextualize my country's struggle with historical memory. As a very young, or maybe not so young graduate student in the 1990s, I first encountered the controversies under discussion today in the context of the 50th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The Smithsonian Institution, the premiere public history organization in the United States, was forced to abandon plans for a 50th anniversary commemoration because of the opposition of veteran's organizations and certain members of Congress. That left a deep impression on me as a graduate student and today, given the controversy over some recent NEH-funded symposia, I realize that my country has not necessarily progressed much in this regard in the last 15 years.

Professor Yaguchi's discussion of his work on Hawaii over the last several years has brought up a new controversy in my country which concerns the Pearl Harbor workshop and this leads me to my first question. Professor Yaguchi, I understand that your work has sought to promote dialogue and understanding, but instead it is generating controversy between the

National Endowment for the Humanities and certain right wing media and political groups in the United States. I would like you to discuss this and also explain whether or not you see a parallel between the current politicalization in the U.S. over the NEH Conference and the textbook controversies in this country [Japan] over issues such as comfort women, Korean colonization versus annexation, and the wartime fall of Nanjing.

For Professor Nam, I found your presentation particularly interesting. In North Carolina, I teach a survey course on East Asian history in which we cover the history of Japan and China from 1600 to the present in about 15 weeks. And during your presentation, I realized that in 9 years of teaching this survey, I had never raised the question of Korean comfort women. So in terms of valuable correctives, perhaps yours was the most valuable for me. I have a question...or two, actually. Do you see any signs in Korea or in other nations in which comfort women were taken, of efforts to construct a common or international history, or are the histories particularly national? In other words, do you see any effort to build a common narrative centered on the history of comfort women?

For the panelists on Europe, this was fascinating and also a surprising topic for me for many reasons. In North Carolina, I teach a survey course on modern global history, and I have always been struck by the historic animosity between Germany and France and Germany and Poland. Also, during the presentation, I remembered that while a graduate student, I actually went to a teach-in on Serbia, in which a professor educated the students about the history of the Balkan conflict, at the time when NATO countries were intervening against Serbia. The professor was a very gentle man....and I remembered that at the end of the conference, he said "Never Again," which is something that is often said in regard to the Jewish holocaust. But this professor said "Never Again" in relation to the Serbian holocaust, which was a topic I knew nothing about before the teach-in. So I am struck by both the discussion of the completion of the common textbook and the common narratives for the history of Germany and France, Germany and Poland, and also the countries of the Balkans. I'm struck that while these governments are able to deeply involve themselves in that project, the Japanese government has so far been less involved in promoting this sort of common approach. And I wondered if you both can comment on why European governments can back such projects while the Japanese government cannot.

My final question is for the panel as a whole. We focused primarily on textbooks but when I first arrived in Japan, there was a museum exhibition at the Tokyo Women's Active Museum. It was a commemoration of the 10th anniversary of the Women's International War Crime Tribunal Investigation into the comfort women question. And I wondered if the panel could comment on the role of experiential or public history in promoting reconciliation. Thank you very much.