

Nobuhiro Shiba

ATTEMPTS TO WRITE REGIONAL HISTORY:

In Search of Reconciliation in East Asia and the Balkans

INTRODUCTION

In the Balkan countries,¹ attempts to reconsider their own history textbooks and history education are going forward from the viewpoint of regional history. For example, the Centre for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeastern Europe, a NGO group in Thessaloniki, has published the common alternative history materials shared among eleven Southeast European countries from Slovenia to Cyprus in the form of four common history workbooks. The English version²

1 In this chapter, the Balkans and Southeastern Europe are used with the same meaning.

2 *Teaching Modern Southeast European History: Alternative Educational Materials, Workbook I-IV*. Thessaloniki: CDRSEE, 2005. Translation in Japanese: *History of the Balkans: Common Educational Materials on the Modern and Contemporary History of the Balkans*. supervisor of translation, Nobuhiro Shiba, Tokyo: Akashi Shoten (柴宜弘監修『バルカンの歴史——バルカン近現代史の共通教材』明石書店), 2013.

of these books was published in 2005 after two and a half years' joint efforts of over 60 historians and history teachers, and many subsequent versions in the participants' own languages have also been published.³ These alternative history workbooks are epoch-making materials which encourage each country to review its own national histories from the standpoint of regional history, although they have not been given any official approval by the respective countries' ministries of education. Attempts to make such alternative history materials, rather than a common history textbook are very interesting for us, keeping in mind the history textbook issues in East Asia.

These attempts are also related to the reconciliation of the Southeast European countries after the Yugoslav wars. As Wolfgang Höpken points out, coming to terms with the past has developed into a global phenomenon and a kind of universal principle since the end of the Cold War, going beyond the German and Japanese cases.⁴ In his article, Höpken tries to identify the conditions and variables which seem to determine the role and capacity of history textbooks to shape the process of reconciliation, with some examples mostly from Central Europe and the Balkans.⁵

The aim of this chapter is at first to show the transnational attempts for reconciliation through history education and textbooks in Europe, especially in the Balkans. After that, keeping reconciliation through history education and textbooks in view, I will introduce how regional history is considered in East Asia as a framework beyond national history and what the regional concept of East Asia is like in comparison with the regional concept of the Balkans.

1. FOUR ATTEMPTS AT RECONCILIATION THROUGH HISTORY EDUCATION IN EUROPE

Four attempts at reconciliation through history education are now making progress in Europe. First, there have been significant efforts for reconciliation through dialogues among historians – an approach which was especially promoted by the Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research in Braunschweig, Germany. Typical cases of such an initiative for the reconciliation of historical views in Europe would be the long dialogues that took place between

3 Cf.: Nobuhiro Shiba, "Attempts to Bring about a Reconciliation through History Textbooks: the Case of the Balkan States" (柴宜弘「歴史教育による和解の試み」), *Pacific and American Studies* (『アメリカ太平洋研究』) (The University of Tokyo), Vol. 11, March 2011, pp. 7-17.

4 Wolfgang Höpken, "History Textbooks in Post-war and Post-conflict Societies: Preconditions and Experiences in Comparative Perspective", in Steffi Richter (ed.), *Contested Views of a Common Past*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2008, p. 373.

5 *Ibid.*, pp. 378-392.

German and Polish historians starting in 1972, where there was an attempt to reconcile each other's differences in historical understanding, as well as between Germany and the Czech Republic, Germany and Israel, and also among the Balkan countries. Obviously, there has also been a great development of dialogues for reconciliation between the German and French historians. This process has resulted in common history textbooks between Germany and France, which have also been translated into Japanese.⁶

Secondly, the Council of Europe also plays a certain role in achieving reconciliation among peoples through history education. It has organized international seminars for the history of Europe and in particular tackled the problems of history education in search of a new image of Europe after the end of the Cold War. This includes a special project under the title of "The Other's Image in History Education" supported by the Council of Europe. The Council of Europe, together with UNESCO, has also organized numerous seminars on the Southeast European countries, especially on history education after the Wars in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Thirdly, the activities of EUROCLIO, an Association of European History Teachers, are important. A history teachers' organization from 14 countries was organized in 1992 with the assistance of the Council of Europe for the purpose of supporting the promotion of history education for peace, stabilization, democracy and the encouragement of critical thinking. In 1993, this organization was formally established as EUROCLIO. Since then, it has worked on making materials for history teaching and building a network of history teacher's organizations, playing a central role for building history teacher's organizations in the Yugoslav Successor States, especially Bosnia and Herzegovina. The main office of EUROCLIO is seated in The Hague, and the organization now includes 46 countries and is actively involved in numerous demanding projects.

Finally, I wish to mention an NGO, the Center for Democracy and Reconciliation in Southeast Europe (CDRSEE) seated in Thessaloniki, Greece. This NGO has been making ongoing attempts to change history education for the reconciliation of the Balkan countries which were influenced directly or indirectly by the Yugoslav Wars. It is worthy of note that these attempts are not to implement the project at the request of any International framework such as the Stability Pact for Southeastern Europe after the end of the Kosovo conflicts in 1999, but aim to build their project on their own initiatives. The Joint History Project,

6 Peter Geiss and Guillaume Le Quintrec (eds.), supervisors of translation: Norihiko Fukui and Takahiro Kondo, *Franco-German Common History Textbook (Contemporary History)*. Tokyo: Akashi Shoten (ペーター・ガイス、ギヨーム・ル・カントレック監修、福井憲彦・近藤孝弘監訳『ドイツ・フランス共通歴史教科書(現代史)』明石書店), 2008. Original title: *Histoire/Geschichte: Europa und die Welt seit 1945/ L'Europe et le monde depuis 1945*, 2006.

inaugurated in 1998 by CDRSEE, focused mainly on investigating the possibility of writing and teaching a common history for all Southeast European countries, from Slovenia to Cyprus.⁷ This first voluntary attempt at a citizen's initiative in the Balkan countries began and was conducted by the History Education Committee, whose chair is Prof. Christina Koulouri from Greece. Actually, the History Education Committee includes 17 members consisting of historians and history teachers, representing eleven Southeast European countries.

2. ATTEMPTS FOR RECONCILIATION THROUGH HISTORY EDUCATION IN THE BALKAN COUNTRIES

(1) Attempts by the CDRSEE

The History Education Committee held intensive workshops from 1999 to 2000 on sensitive topics in the history of the Balkans in order to compare the history textbooks and curricula of the Balkan countries. The members of the Committee shared the understanding that the descriptions in the history textbooks were one of the main factors causing their confrontations and conflicts, but that it is possible at the same time to promote reconciliation through the change of the history textbooks.

As is generally known, the modern states in the Balkans after achieving independence from the Ottoman Empire repeatedly came into conflict with each other. This led the Balkans down the road of dividing into sections influenced by the interests of the great powers in Europe. Subsequently, the explanations of the Balkan Wars in the history textbooks are largely different. The chain of Yugoslav conflicts in the 1990s had a great influence not only on relations among the Yugoslav successor states, but also on the relations among all the Balkan countries. How the Yugoslav conflicts were taught in their classrooms constituted a very difficult problem. Especially the Yugoslav successor states generally had ethnocentric history textbooks for the purpose of strengthening the foundations of the new independent states, making the reconsideration of their own history textbooks an urgent task.

In addition to comparing and examining their history textbooks, it is also important to reconsider the history-consciousness and teaching methods of history teachers. The Committee organized workshops from 2000 to 2002 on the topic of the various different history explanations that exist in spite of the

7 The 11 Southeast European Countries include Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Greece, Macedonia, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro (now Serbia, Montenegro), Slovenia and Turkey.

common modern history in the Balkans - such as on the rule over the Balkans by the Ottoman Empire, the Balkan Wars, the First World War and the Second World War - for the purpose of training history teachers. The members of the Committee worked voluntarily as workshop tutors, elaborating on how history teachers from different countries, each of which has a different explanation of these events, could discuss these topics effectively.⁸

After two and a half years of intensive workshops with the participation of historians and history teachers, the Committee resolved to publish a series of thematic books of historical materials from the Balkan countries aimed at helping to achieve a sustainable stability and future reconciliation, and began work on four volumes of history materials for gymnasium students. The virtual anchor of these efforts was Christina Koulouri, who was at once General Coordinator and Series Editor. Considering that the ministry of education generally has great influence in each respective Balkan country and furthermore that there was a common conviction on the impossibility of uniting the history textbooks of 11 countries, the Committee did not attempt to make a common history textbook among them all. Rather, the decision was to strive to publish thematic books of historical materials by which the ethnocentric history textbooks could be relativized in order to urge their own history textbooks to change through this example of a new method of history education.

The following four topics were selected as sensitive themes for the books of history materials: The Ottoman Empire, Nations and States, The Balkan Wars, The Second World War. The four topics belong to periods when the peoples in the Balkans shared their destiny – either living together or in confrontation with each other. Koulouri pointed out that these four topics were most suitable for urging history education to change based on three points. Firstly, Nations and States and The Second World War cannot be taught unless they are put into the context of European history and World history. Secondly, as the thematic historical materials are not classified by country or by nation, it is easy to take a comparative and multi-perspective approach in history teaching, rather than approach the subject matter from an ethnocentric perspective. Thus, two kinds of stereotypes can be eliminated: one is the set of stereotypes that each Balkan peoples hold regarding their neighbors and the other is the stereotype about the Balkans that Western Europe has. Thirdly, the history of the Balkans as a regional history is not conceived

8 Christina Koulouri, "The Common Past of a Divided Region: Teaching Balkan History", in Nobuhiro Shiba (ed.), *In Search of a Common Regional History: The Balkans and East Asia in History Textbooks*. Tokyo: The University of Tokyo, 2006, pp. 11-12. The records of workshops for two terms are the following: Christina Koulouri (ed.), *Teaching the History of Southeastern Europe*. Thessaloniki: CDRSEE, 2001; Christina Koulouri (ed.), *Clio in the Balkans: The Politics of History Education*. Thessaloniki: CDRSEE, 2002.

as a harmonious linear process but as a synthesis of co-existence and conflicts.⁹ It is, I think, very important for the reconciliation of peoples across borders that pupils learn a comparative and multi-perspective approach in their classrooms, as this could create the basis for a common understanding of history.

The editors of each thematic book of historical materials were selected under Koulouri's project leadership and 14 historians worked as contributors from their countries' national archives, libraries and personal collections to collect the materials with the support of the history teachers from the 11 Balkan countries. This cooperation between historians and history teachers resulted in the publication of four volumes of thematic books of historical materials.

(2) Attempts by EUROCLIO

Another attempt to make a teaching book for history was also made among the Yugoslav successor states in addition to the four volumes of thematic books of historical materials from among the 11 Balkan countries. The people who were involved in EUROCLIO activities in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia published a teaching book entitled *Ordinary People in an Extraordinary Country, Everyday Life in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia 1945-1990*.¹⁰ I will briefly explain the background of this teaching book before referring to the contents of the book.

The project began in 2003, when the Danish History Teacher's Association addressed EUROCLIO to launch it with the financial support of the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, with the consideration that the nationalistic history education in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia prevented reconciliation in the post-conflict societies. Later, the project was to be supported by the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs instead of its Danish counterpart and three projects continued under the wing of the initial project until 2008.

The first project in 2003 entitled "To Promote and Support the Development of a Regional History Education Network in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia, and to Identify Ways Ahead for School History, Strengthening Peace, Stability and Democracy", supported by the Stability Pact Program of the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, laid the cornerstone for cooperation in the area.

A second Danish funded project in 2004, which is titled "Enhancing Regional

9 Koulouri, "The Common Past of a Divided Region: Teaching Balkan History", p. 16.

10 *Ordinary People in an Extraordinary Country, Everyday Life in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia 1945-1990: Yugoslavia between East and West*. Belgrade: EUROCLIO, 2008. Bosnian, Serbian and Croatian versions of this book had been published before the English version. See: <http://www.euroclio.eu/new/index.php/resources>.

History Education and Civic Society: A EUROCLIO Stability Pact Project on Common Approaches for Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and the Federation of Serbia and Montenegro”, continued the training of local professionals and started the development of educational materials.

In 2005 the Danish support stopped, due to political changes in Denmark. The Dutch Foreign Office then supported the third project, which was titled “History in Action – Planning for the Future: A Regional Approach for the Learning and Teaching of History in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and the Federation of Serbia and Montenegro”.¹¹ This project continued the regional cooperation until 2008, giving a variety of concrete results.

According to the *EUROCLIO Special Report: Five Years of Projects in the Former Yugoslavia*,¹² the overall aim of the three projects was to support the regional development of history and citizenship education in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia, so that collaborative values, critical awareness and mutual respect, peace, stability and democracy could be promoted.

The projects had three main targets:

1. To enhance the quality of history education in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia and make it contribute to reconciliation.
2. To enhance national and international cooperation, communication and networks of history educators in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia.
3. To reinforce civil society in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia by creating sustainable and professional History Teachers’ Associations.

Throughout the projects for enhancing the quality of history education, training seminars for historians and history textbook authors, trainers, and teachers were held. Participation in international activities on the learning and teaching of history was increased. These steps would help to create a growing awareness of the need for innovative history curricula respecting diversity in society. Altogether, a growing group of trainers and teachers would be updated and trained.

For enhancing national and international cooperation, communication and networks, seminars focusing on diversity in society were organized and a core-group of innovative history educators – representing ethnic, religious and linguistic communities in the three countries – was set up. Furthermore, a national and international inclusive network operating on a local, national and international level was to be created and strengthened. All of these matters would set up and fortify relations with national and international authorities related to history education, such as the Council of Europe, OSCE, UNESCO, EU, EUROCLIO, each respective national Ministry of Education and NGO’s.

11 See; [http:// www.eulocio.eu](http://www.eulocio.eu).

12 See; <http:// www.eulocio.eu>.

To reinforce civil society, professional and active independent History Educators' Associations were created in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia. The existing Association in Serbia was strengthened and became active. Annual meetings were organized to widen the network involved and to develop short- and mid-term policy papers. Workshops were held to develop skills to make the associations sustainable. Fifty-five younger historians and history teachers from three countries participated in the workshops and seminars for over three years. Their efforts were also directed towards compiling the teaching book for history teachers dealing with the way to teach pupils sensitive post-World War II history topics in Yugoslavia.

The teaching book for history teachers entitled "*Ordinary People in an Extraordinary Country - Everyday Life in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia 1945-1990: Yugoslavia between East and West*" was published in 2007 as the concrete result of these projects. This book includes a number of sensitive topics from the socialist period which have little opportunity to be taught in the classroom through each history textbook.

(3) A Contents Analysis of the Teaching Book

The contents of the book are as follows:

Introduction

Part I Political Life

- Workshop 1 Goran Miloradović, The Hot Spot of the Cold War: Yugoslavia
- Workshop 2 Goran Miloradović, The Beginning or End of Democracy?
- Workshop 3 Denis Detling, Forced Labor Camps Even after the End of the World War
- Workshop 4 Denis Detling, The (non)Freedoms of Religion
- Workshop 5 Bahrudin Beširević, "We are Tito's and Tito is ours"
- Workshop 6 Bahrudin Beširević, We or I?
- Workshop 7 Milija Marjanović, Socialism without a Human Image

Part II The Standard of Living

- Workshop 8 Kiti Jurica Korda, „Daddy, Buy me a Car...”: The Appearance of Consumer Society
- Workshop 9 Kiti Jurica Korda, The Position of Women
- Workshop 10 Darko Benčić, Once Upon a Time in Yugoslavia
- Workshop 11 Vesna Dimitrijević, What Could Apartments Tell Us about People Living There?
- Workshop 12 Marija Naletilić, From Classes Against Illiteracy to Computers
- Workshop 13 Elma Hašimbegović, A Healthy Spirit in a Healthy Body!?

Workshop 14 Zvezdana Petrović, "Those Who Have Dollars Swim in the Sea, and Those Who Haven't, in the Bathtub!"

Part III Mass Culture

Workshop 15 Radina Vučetić, Goodbye East, Hello West!

Workshop 16 Radina Vučetić, Between Support and Rebellion

Workshop 17 Ivan Dukić, 'Bekrija si (You Are a Heavy Drinker)!'; The Village is Yelling...: Life in Village and Town in the SFRY 1945.-1990

Workshop 18 Ivan Dukić, "The New Generation Plays Vaguely": Relations between the Young and the Old Generation

Workshop 19 Darko Karačić, Politics and Sports

Workshop 20 Darko Karačić, The Image of Yugoslavia

This book consists of supplemental materials for history teaching in high schools. Different sources are included and several teaching methods and approaches are proposed. As we can see by the contents of this book, Part I is about political life in the Socialist Yugoslavia, Part II is about the standard of living from an economic point of view, and mass culture is treated in Part III. The most important characteristic of this book is, I think, to encourage pupils to imagine Yugoslavia as a common space and to consider the everyday life of ordinary people in the whole of socialist Yugoslavia, not in each republic. I will examine only the chapters about political life.

In Part I, this book intended to give pupils some materials and discuss the following seven points: 1) The position of Yugoslavia in international relationships at the beginning of the Cold War, 2) Democracy in Yugoslavia after World War II, 3) The expulsion of the Volksdeutscher in Yugoslavia, 4) The position of religion in everyday life in Yugoslavia, 5) Tito's role and the cult of Tito in Yugoslavia, 6) The creation and elements of the socialist slogan, "brotherhood and unity" in Yugoslavia and 7) Three cases of mass uprisings and the reactions of the authorities: the students' demonstrations in 1968, the Croat Spring in 1971, and the crisis in Kosovo in 1981.

Chapter 2 tries to show with a view on international factors how the Communist Party constructed the post-war political system in Yugoslavia after World War II and that the expression "democracy" does not have the same meaning in different circumstances and for different actors. On the one hand, the Communist Party was using the expression "people's democracy", believing that they embodied true democracy as the only political representative of the people. On the other hand, civil politicians were using the term "parliamentary democracy", believing that only a multiparty election system of equal political competitors can give truly legitimate power which will represent all social strata.

It is very important that pupils in these countries could be encouraged to think carefully about the meaning of the Communist Party and democracy through the historical materials in this chapter - just as it is interesting for us to know how the vote was carried out in the first parliamentary elections in November 1945. Small voting balls were used instead of ballots in the election – just like in ancient Greece.

Tito's role and his regime's slogan, "brotherhood and unity" in the Socialist Yugoslavia are treated in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6. Tito was, in effect, at the helm of all important institutions in Yugoslavia since the end of World War II. Such a unification of governing functions in the hands of one man led to the creation of a personality cult. Towns, streets and schools were named after him and his portraits were visibly displayed in all public institutions and the homes of most ordinary people. Tito not only left a remarkable trace on Yugoslavia, he also won the reputation of a distinguished statesman in the international arena. In this chapter, pupils are led to consider whether most common people really enjoyed "Tito's justice" or not. For example, material about the Cazin uprising in May 1950 in the northwestern part of Bosnia bordering on Croatia is included. This joint Serb-Bosnian peasants' uprising was instigated by those who had fought on the Partisan side during the war. The situation in this area was terrible and unbearable for the peasants and the reason for the uprising was that the agrarian purchases conducted by the authorities and their arrogant behavior towards the peasants were more than humiliating. It seems that the Cazin uprising, which has been previously neglected in the history textbooks, is an important event for considering the policy of Tito's regime towards villages and peasants in those days.

Regarding "brotherhood and unity" in Chapter 6, pupils could learn the issue of collectivization; for example, the concept of collective consciousness and the collective character of the state. The Pioneer organization, Youth Labor Action (ORA) and the Yugoslav National Army (JNA) are examples of collective consciousness and mass organization. Massiveness, uniformity, discipline, the glorification of revolution and its legacy and "brotherhood and unity", these were the main characteristics of the collectivism in the period after World War II. An individual's rights and position were subjected to collective ones. What kind of impression do today's pupils in these countries gain by learning about the collectivism beyond ethnicity and region? The most impressive material in this chapter is, I think, an interview with a person from Sarajevo called up for compulsory military service in 1989. He remembers the period doing his military service as follows:

When I got called up for military service in 1989, I felt I was going to do something important, to be a part of something big, something in

common to all. My parents were happy and sad. Happy that their boy had grown to be fit for the army, and sad that they would be separated from him the whole year. There was a saying among the people that he, who was no good for the army, was no good for anything. A decade before that time, any boy who did not serve his compulsory term in the army would hardly find a bride; he would have been considered incapable. At the end of the 80s, the situation had changed somewhat; there were boys who simulated illnesses in order to be exempted, and there were rumors that the army was not ours (common to all of Yugoslavia), but Serb only. I, as most of my friends, did not want to believe that the JNA was not Yugoslav, not our national army.

After a farewell party organized by my parents, to which all my friends and cousins had come, I went to serve my term in Batajnica, a small place near Belgrade. Although the barracks housed a small number of soldiers (just over a hundred), they were from all the republics of Yugoslavia and representative of the all nations and nationalities. There were no Albanians there, however; the word was they were not reliable to serve in this important place (there was a central point of JNA communications there). The Army's policy was to send soldiers out of their home region, so that representatives of different nations in Yugoslavia served together and got to know each other, make friends and realize the propagated spreading of brotherhood and unity. I have a feeling that the Army attempted to subdue the individual interests to serve the collective ones - from the smallest military unit to the largest Yugoslavia and we were taught to sacrifice for the group. In the army, the punishments were mainly collective, as well as the prizes. If someone would do something wrong, the whole group would suffer, sometimes the group would 'take care' of the disobeying individual, who would be given a dose of 'blanketing' (the group puts a blanket over the 'victim' and kicks him well, but he does not see a single dispenser of the punishment - the usual thing in the military).

When I think about that time now, this deleting of your own identity bothers me, but, I have to admit, it did not bother me then. (An interview with Edin R. from Sarajevo).¹³

Pupils might come to know from his interview that the JNA was not only a military force, but also a mass institution for generating a real feeling of "brotherhood and unity" in Yugoslavia. It is very interesting for us to see how pupils in three countries learn of Tito's role and "brotherhood and unity" in the

13 *Ordinary People in an Extraordinary Country*, p. 49.

Socialist Yugoslavia in connection with the recent phenomena of Yugonostalgia or Titostalgia.¹⁴

Chapter 7 offers pupils some materials about three mass uprisings and the reactions of the Yugoslav authorities. In spite of the image the official state propaganda created, presenting Yugoslavia as an ideal example of the unity of nations and party leadership, there was a significant amount of dissatisfaction in Yugoslavia among certain social, national and ethnic groups. The materials show that the student critics addressed issues such as privileges, personal enrichment and unemployment, and the most radical slogan was: 'Down with the red bourgeoisie'. This slogan was expressed during the Belgrade university students' demonstrations in 1968. The aim of the Croat Spring movement was greater political and economic stability for Croatia within Yugoslavia, especially in the field of tourism and the foreign currency regime. Croatian students demonstrated their support by organizing a general strike. Due to the massive support expressed by the citizens in Croatia, the movement was referred to as the Massive Movement, or "Maspok". Regarding these two cases, this chapter presents materials written by the parties concerned, but as to the Kosovo crisis in 1981, the sources are about the reaction of authorities towards the mass demonstrations of Albanians.

Chapter 3 treats an example of the persecution of ethnic Germans which has never been enclosed in the history textbooks before and could give pupils the perception of Yugoslavia as just an assailant. Chapter 4 presents the position of religion in everyday life in Yugoslavia, showing that confirming religion as well as negating it was a part of everyday life even in the socialist Yugoslavia.

In conclusion, this teaching book is very useful for the pupils in the three countries to learn about the Socialist Yugoslavia as a common region in a time when the political reconciliation between Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Serbia is making rapid progress. In addition, three points might be raised.

Firstly, this teaching book lacks a chapter on World War II in Yugoslavia – because it is not possible to gain a joint understanding of the Socialist Yugoslavia after World War II without a shared perception of World War II.

Secondly, this teaching book does not include chapters about the constitutional regime in 1974 and the federation system, which are indispensable to learning about the socialist Yugoslavia.

Finally, this teaching book introduces innovative methods for history teaching, for example, oral history and interviews, but it seems that the interviews are limited and insufficient in Chapter 20.

¹⁴ Regarding the terms of Yugonostalgia or Titostalgia, See; Mitja Velikonja, *Titostalgia: A Study of Nostalgia for Josip Broz*. Ljubljana: Peace Institute, 2008.

3. WHAT IS 'REGION'?

These two attempts to make the thematic books of history materials and a cross-border history teaching book are very important, not only for mutual reconciliation, but also for thinking again about the concept of region and regional history; for example, along the lines of a regional concept of East Asia and a history of East Asia for us. Before considering the concept of East Asia, I will refer briefly to the concept of 'region'.

The definition of 'region' is not clear. We can use the term 'regions' not only in the sense of areas of nation state scale, but also beyond nation state scale, as well as on a local level within the nation state (in this case meaning micro-regions). What is the main factor making up 'region'? Bearing nation state scale such as Britain, France and Germany in mind, generally speaking, it may be the unity of homogeneity based on national language.

But 'region' is also formed beyond the nation state scale. We could consider the largest scale like Asia, Europe, America and Africa (these meaning macro-regions) or larger scale like East Asia, Southeastern Asia, Eastern Europe, the Balkans and so on (these being meso-regions or sub-regions). These macro-regions and meso-regions are not homogeneous from the viewpoint of language, religion and ethnicity. Rather, they have each their own diversity. For example, Eastern Europe is extremely variegated in respect of language, religion and ethnicity. Eastern Europe as a meso-region is formed because of its having a kind of unity in relation with Western Europe. So the main factor of unity as a region consists of not only homogeneity, but also heterogeneity if there is a strong interdependent relation with the other regions. The concept of 'region' is made up of homogeneity and diversity.

We cannot treat such a region as a physiographical unchangeable concept when we study it. Because the regions or the states as an object of study each have their own regionality or national character and their characteristics could be historically variable. Furthermore, we cannot research a region as an object of study without considering the international factors surrounding it. As the concept of Eastern Europe is given validity in comparison with the concept of Western Europe, so its comparison and relationship with other regions can become an important way of studying a specific region. And a historical point of view is extremely valid for understanding the relationships among regions.¹⁵

In any case, we should give much attention to the historical variability of the concept of 'regions'. We may say that the reason why we set the concept of 'regions' depends on each researcher's concern. Therefore, I will compare the Balkans with East Asia, as I have an interest in relativizing national histories.

15 Hiroshi Momose, *International Studies*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press (百瀬宏『国際関係学』東京大学出版会), 1993, pp. 212-225.

4. THE REGIONAL CONCEPT OF EAST ASIA IN COMPARISON WITH THE CONCEPT OF THE BALKANS

(1) The Case in Japan

The regional concept of the Balkans is mainly considered from the following three points of view when each researcher sets the concept as a meaningful unit of analysis depending on his concern. The first point is the legacy of a common past; to put it concretely, a common legacy produced by the long Ottoman rule. The second is the arena of interaction, that is, several centuries of contacts, conflicts and co-existence. The third is the framework for comparison on the assumption that societies which share common linguistic, religious, political, economic and historical spaces are the best subject for comparative analysis.¹⁶ Moreover, recently researchers interested in a transnational and comparative approach insist on the notion of 'historical region.' For example, a historian in Holm Sundhaussen, Germany, pointed out that the Byzantine-Orthodoxy and the Ottoman-Islamic heritage were the main characteristics of the Balkans, dividing the Balkans from the other regions in Europe.¹⁷

In Japan, the regional concept of East Asia was generalized after World War II, especially in the 1980s when the economy underwent a remarkable development in South-Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Singapore. East Asia, consisting of China, Korea, Japan and Vietnam, came to be considered as one cultural area where they shared Chinese script (Kanji), Confucianism and Chinese culture. This is because we started to easily find a lot of arguments demonstrating that the reason for the economic and social development in this region may be ascribed to a cultural unity like the Chinese characters and Confucianism. Especially Confucianism, which had been treated as a negative factor for modernization, was re-evaluated, and the unity of the region as a cultural area rather than the mutual differences within it began to be emphasized.¹⁸

There were various kinds of attempts to examine the developments of Japanese history and its cultural formation in the framework of East Asia in the historians' academic circle in Japan. However, the regional concept of East Asia was hardly applied in Korea and China. We could scarcely understand their view point, considering their history and their culture in the regional concept of East Asia -

16 Diana Mishkova, "Regional versus National?: Legacies and Prospects of the Historiography of Southeastern Europe", *European Studies* (『ヨーロッパ研究』) (The University of Tokyo), Vol. 7, 2008, p. 140.

17 Holm Sundhaussen, "Europa balkanica. Der Balkan als historischer Raum Europas", *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 25, 1999, No. 4, pp. 626-653.

18 Lee Sungsi, *Formation of East Asian Culture Area*. Tokyo: Yamakawa Shuppansha (李成市『東アジア文化圏の形成』山川出版社), 2000, pp. 1-2.

including South Korea and North Korea. Rather, they harbored a strong distrust and cautiousness towards the regional framework of East Asia. For example in Korea, they had doubts about the difference between the regional framework of the East Asian cultural area and the Japanese Asianism, that is, the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity propagated by imperial Japan to justify its aggression toward the Asian countries. Moreover, they felt misgivings about Korean history and Korean culture being lost in the concept of East Asia.¹⁹

In the post-war historians' academic circle in Japan, we can say that considering our own history and culture within the region of East Asia was a new academic attempt to surmount the pre-war self-righteous historiography which had isolated Japanese history. This attempt was deeply connected with the post-war international situations, that is, the circumstances in which large amounts of people and goods were crossing over the border. Yet at the same time, Japanese historiography could not get out of the framework of modern national history and Japanese history and culture is considered under the circumstances of one nation. Lee Sungsi, one of the specialist in Korean history in Japan, pointed out that to consider our own history in the framework of East Asia does not mean the enlargement of the space of Japanese history from Japan into East Asia or emphasizing our international relations and cultural exchanges with our neighboring countries. It means, rather, a relativization of the viewpoint of one nation's history and releasing such a viewpoint.²⁰

(2) The Cases in China and Korea

It seems that Chinese society generally lacks a consciousness for East Asia. Sun Ge, a professor at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, majoring in the history of Japanese political thought, explains the background of this lack in her article.²¹ According to her, Chinese intellectuals who are engaged in the research of international relations often think that it is more important to focus on the dialogues between East and West than to burden oneself with 'narrating about East Asia'. The reason is that China, as a country bordering on East Asia, South Asia, Western Asia and North Asia, is difficult to situate completely within the frame of East Asia.

Sun points out that the East Asia narrative in China is not an outgrowth from its epistemic soil of knowledge, but is rather of a transplanted nature. There are

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 4.

²⁰ Ibid., p. 5.

²¹ Sun Ge, "The Predicament of Compiling Textbooks on the History of East Asia", in Gotelind Müller (ed.), *Designing History in East Asia Textbooks: Identity Politics and Transnational Aspirations*. London and New York: Routledge, 2011, pp. 9-31.

two kinds of transplanted: firstly, the ideology of modernization for East Asia in Japan and Korea since the reform and opening up in China in 1978 made it possible to become visible and enter into Chinese social discourse. Secondly, the framework of American area studies also plays a role regarding the East Asia narratives in China, because East Asia is treated as an independent region. But the East Asia view that has emerged in China is relatively weak.²²

In view of this general situation in China, she indicates three kinds of East Asia perspectives accepted in China; the Confucian perspective, the perspective of modernization and the perspective of war memory. Firstly, the Confucian perspective can cover the region where Confucianism had an impact. Subsequently, some countries in Southeast Asia such as Vietnam and Singapore should be also included in this perspective besides China, Japan and South Korea. Secondly, the perspective of modernization is actually influenced by Japan and it is a way of thinking examined by Japan after the Meiji Restoration. Thus it might take South Korea as a perspective for the whole Korean peninsula, covering China, Japan and the Korean peninsula only for a short period when the dynamic balance among the countries is maintained. Thirdly, the perspective of war memories is closely related with the traumatic memories of war caused by Japanese invasion and this forms a challenge for East Asia. In such a way, Sun shows that the East Asia perspective has not been of concrete quality in China until now and that the concept of 'East Asia', which was originally so closely fixed to Japanese history, cannot find its place in their spiritual and ideological world, making it difficult to arrive at the goal of genuine reconciliation among the nation states through 'common history school textbooks'.²³

However, she concludes that, as new historical processes are continually emerging, the East Asia perspective will surely contribute new dimensions of thought and resources of thinking, after analyzing China's ambivalence regarding the East Asia perspective.²⁴

Next, I will introduce the recent tendency concerning the regional concept of East Asia in Korea according to the article entitled "East Asia Discourses in Contemporary Korea" by Lee Eun Jeung,²⁵ who teaches the history of political thought in Asia at the Martin Luther University of Halle-Wittenberg. According to her, the public had become aware of the regional concept of East Asia that had been denied up until that time. This was also related to the changing realities. While the government of Kim Young Sam (1993-97) promoted 'internationalization', Korean companies expanded massively into China and the Southeast Asian

22 Ibid., p. 10.

23 Ibid., pp. 14-15.

24 Ibid., p. 27.

25 Lee Eun Jeung, "East Asia Discourses in Contemporary Korea", in Steffi Richter (ed.), *Contested Views of a Common Past*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2008, pp. 181-201.

countries. At the same time, a flow of labor from other Asian countries, especially from China and Southeast Asia, set in. The reasons why discourses on East Asia spread widely in Korea are the end of the Cold War and East Asia's economic success on the one hand and the dissemination of the post-structuralist critique of modernity and Eurocentrism on the other hand.²⁶

It is said that there are three broad currents, each with their own journal in Korea. The first is a group centered around the journal *Tradition and Modernity*, which perceives East Asia in the terms of a 'Confucian capitalist society'. This group is supported by conservative intellectuals. The second, a group centered around the journal *Creation and Critique*, considers East Asia as a method. This journal is at the forefront of the progressive camp and the authors of the journal insist that the regional framework of East Asia is a method for overcoming the Western-centered capitalist modernity. The third is the group of the journal *Fantasy* which treats the regional concept of East Asia as a cultural heritage. The predecessor of this journal was a journal for literature, and a specialist in Chinese literature leads the opinion of this group. It seems that, concerned about the internal Orientalisms such as Japanese Asianism, Sinocentrism or self-Orientalism, he does not want to strive for the simple solidarity of East Asia on the basis of its common culture, but sets the regional concept of East Asia as a common ground where these countries accept each other as the 'other' and respect their differences.²⁷ Lee concludes that as the Korean peninsula remains divided after the end of the Cold War, the vigor of the East Asian discourses in Korea can be seen as a method by means of which this division can be conquered.²⁸

5. EAST ASIAN HISTORY AS REGIONAL HISTORY

As we see, the regional concept of East Asia is treated separately in each country because of the differences in historical background, bringing about much discussion on various topics of the of historians' concern. It is clear that there is also much difficulty in compiling East Asian history as regional history, but such attempts have already started. For example, the supplementary teaching material entitled *History that Opens the Future: Modern and Contemporary History of Three East Asian Countries* was published in three languages and in the three countries simultaneously in 2005²⁹ after discussion among Japanese, Chinese and Korean

26 Ibid., pp. 184-185.

27 Ibid., pp. 186-190.

28 Ibid., p. 198.

29 The Committee for Common History Materials Amongst Japan, China and Korea (ed.), *History that Opens the Future: Modern and Contemporary History of Three East Asian Countries* (日本・中国・韓国共同編集『未来を開く歴史——東アジア3国の近現代史』高文研). Tokyo, 2005 (second edition, 2006).

historians and history teachers on their history education. Attempts to approach the countries' shared past from the viewpoint of comparative history had already been made in 1980s by a Japanese group of historians and history teachers, but they could not achieve any results. *History that Opens the Future* is a joint modern and contemporary history of East Asia produced after 20 years' effort. This book has sold over 70,000 copies in Japan, 120,000 in China and 30,000 in Korea against the backdrop of the history textbooks issued in all the three countries.

The publication of this book is an epoch-making event, but there have also been some comments on the limitations of this book in Japan. For example, Prof. Ryuichi Narita, a specialist of modern Japanese history, and Prof. Minoru Iwasaki, a researcher of political thought, have criticized this book on the following three points.³⁰ Firstly, the book is written only by historians from Japan, China and Korea without historians from North Korea, Taiwan, Mongolia, Vietnam and Russia, so that descriptions about these regions are scarcely to be found, even though this book is about the modern and contemporary history of East Asia. Also, almost all historical narratives are given by the unit of nation states. Secondly, the authors of this book mainly write about the Japanese Empire's invasions, possibly imparting the impression that the agent in East Asia that performs negative acts is Japan and the ones who are victimized and carry out resistance are Korea and China. Korea and China are always in reaction to Japan's actions. So it seems that this book is not about the modern and contemporary history of three East Asian countries, but about a history of the Japanese Empire's development and invasion. Thirdly, we can hardly find the view of recent colonialism studies in this book. The discussion of colonial modernity is essential, but such perspectives cannot be found. Thus, the book lacks descriptions about the modernity in Taiwan and Korea from the viewpoint of social history.

They point out the above-mentioned limitations of this book and conclude that in order to avoid or transcend national history, it is imperative to recognize "plurality" - plural "Japan", plural "South Korea", plural "China" relate each other within such "plurality" to a plural East Asia. The 'plurality' insisted upon by them is, I believe, very important, but the authors of the critical article do not exactly show the way of describing regional history from this point of view.

The most fundamental criticism on the book was about the parallel style of descriptions of the history of three countries lacking the regional viewpoint of East Asia. So the editors of this book, the committee for common history materials among Japan, China and Korea has just published a new two- volume

30 Minoru Iwasaki and Ryuichi Narita, "Writing History Textbooks in East Asia: The Possibilities and Pitfalls of 'History that Opens the Future'", in Steffi Richter (ed.), *Contested Views of a Common Past*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2008, pp. 271-283.

book titled by *Modern and Contemporary New History of East Asia*³¹ in September in 2012 after five years' preparing. One book is from the viewpoint of the change of international relations and the other is from the thematic viewpoint of some historical topics, for example, constitution, urbanization, railroad, migration, family and gender, education, media, war and people etc. They stop the previous parallel description of history by three countries and one author among three countries writes one chapter. I think the publishing of these two volumes by such an innovative way of description is a landmark event.

In Japan, the discussions about the following question continue even now: from which framework should we consider the regional history of East Asia and how should this be reflected in the class room? In Korea, on the other hand, the government proclaimed before all the other countries in East Asia in 2006 that East Asian history was to be taught as a required subject in their high schools because of the government policy on the reinforcement of history teaching. Subsequently, their high school students must select either World History or East Asian History as a required subject in addition to Korean History from the 2012 school year onwards. Two kinds of textbooks of East Asian history have been published to date and at the same time the editing work is in progress on a series on East Asian history as the supplementary material for the new subject's general readers. It seems that these publications concretely discuss the connection between East Asian history and Korean history or World history, and the definition of the regional framework of East Asia. The incumbent president, Lee Myung-bak³², however, has a negative position regarding the teaching of East Asian history and the subject's status has since been changed from required to optional, so it seems that East Asian history is less interesting to Korea at the moment.

Hiroshi Miyajima, a specialist of modern Korean history who teaches in Seoul as a professor, wrote a book review in the journal *Creation and Critique* about the newest books in two volumes being published in 2011.³³ In it he states that the books entitled *A History of East Asia for Reading Together* by three authors have raised the level of previous discussions considerably. The authors insist that it is necessary for us to overcome the present situation of history teaching based on the dichotomy of national history and world history. Eurocentrism in world history and one's own centrism in national history have the same roots, state the authors, as both of them consider nation state building according to the Eurocentric

31 The Committee for Common History Materials among Japan, China and Korea (ed.), *Modern and Contemporary New History of East Asia*, two vols. Tokyo: Nippon Hyoron Sha (日本・中国・韓国3国共同編集『新しい東アジアの近代史 上・下』日本評論社), 2012.

32 Ms Park Geun-hye took office as a new president in 2013 February. It is not clear for the moment what is her educational policy like.

33 Hiroshi Miyajima, "A Epoch-Making Result That Marks the Beginning of a New Era in East Asian History: Book Review of *A History of East Asia for Reading Together*", *Creation and Critique* (Japanese edition), Vol. 152, Summer 2011.

model as their final aim. The East Asian nations have received this historical view of civilization - the core concept of Eurocentrism - and consequently they have come to close their eyes to each other and despise each other. They stress that in order to avoid such a contradiction, the East Asian nations' world history and national history need to be rewritten on the basis of other principles; and as the first step to writing the regional history of East Asia, this is very important. I think that the authors' clear statement is very important as a critique against the previous method of writing regional history, that is, the enlargement of a national history into the region of East Asia, although it seems that they don't propose a clear new principle to take the place of the criticized historical view of civilization.

CONCLUSION

Diana Mishkova, a researcher of modern Balkan history in Bulgaria, has voiced a similar opinion. She says that we easily fall into a trap when we consider the Balkans as a 'historical region' and think about regional history from such a viewpoint. The trap is that it is not enough to set up a region in place of a nation and that such an approach is only putting up a delineation of a wider space, as the regional history also reproduces the problems of the national history. She points out the following three considerations: Firstly, in order to avoid this, we should synthesize the Balkans by historical study from the viewpoint of social history and cultural history, since national and regional canons are not an alternative, but can complement each other. Secondly, it is necessary to make historiography cooperate with a lot of fields of the humanities and social sciences in order to bring a regional history of the Balkans with all they have in common and all their diversity into existence. Thirdly, we do not consider the Balkans as a special region, yet we do need to compare them with other regions.³⁴

I think that there might be a widespread consensus that regional history can now play an important role in overcoming nations' own national histories, but we still have much to discuss about the discipline and framework of bringing regional history into being in East Asia and also in the Balkans. Mishkova stresses the importance of social history and cultural history, while Miyajima points out the history of thought. Perhaps attempts to describe various kinds of East Asian histories and histories of the Balkans as regional history are required, while at the same time compiling alternative common historical materials from the point of view of historical teaching is also imperative. And we need to have chances for them to be examined together by the historians and history teachers from each country in East Asia and in the Balkans.

34 Mishkova, *op.cit.*, pp. 142-143.