

Scientific History or History for Education?

Paper presented at APRIHS (The Asia Pacific Research in Social Science and Humanities Conference) Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Nov 7-10, 2016., with small changed. Original Title of this paper is Analysis of Japanese Government-Approach Middle School Textbooks presented at International Workshop on Texts Books, Seoul, 30, 2015. This paper is revision verse of Workshop report, based on actual issues, broaden and deepen studies of the topic

I Ketut Surajaya

Professor of Japanese History, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Indonesia

Abstract: *There is currently an ongoing controversy in Japan concerning the contents in school textbook referring to Japanese military actions during the Pacific War and colonization of neighboring countries. In this context the author suggests that such contestation regarding textbooks occur as history education provides insight to the future, and reaches deeply into society. This paper is written based on library or literature studies, especially an Analysis of Japanese Government-Approach Middle School Textbooks and actual controversy and fluctuated of the issues in global media.*

Keyword: textbook, Japan, Korea, ideology, controversy

1. Introduction

In Japan, every four years each public and private school selects one history textbook from a list of seven or eight authorized by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (Monbukagakusho=文部科学省). This screening process lasts one year. Japanese textbook companies submit manuscripts to the Ministry of Education, to be examined by appointed committees to ensure they follow government prescribed criteria. The Ministry offers the textbook companies opportunities to revise their drafts, and copies of the Ministry-approved manuscripts are then available for consideration by local districts. Review and censorship of school curriculum by Ministry of Education is a process that must be done before textbooks are delivered to every school around the country to be used.

The New History Textbook (one of eight junior high school history textbooks authorized by the Ministry of Education in April 2001) has caused debates in Japan over the past year. There are many harsh criticisms in the internet following the authorization of the textbooks. Their voices were equally supported by an international group of scholars. They aimed to "ensure that textbooks are consistent with values of peace, justice, and truth." It declared "the New History Textbook unfit as a teaching tool because it negates both the truth about Japan's record in colonialism and war and the values that will contribute to a just and peaceful Pacific and world community."

[<http://www.jca.apc.org/JWRC/center/english/index-english.htm>]

In 1982 the screening process in Japan became a diplomatic issue when the media of Japan and neighboring countries extensively demanded changes required by the Ministry of Education. In my opinion, misleading of phrase or terminology in historical explanation of textbooks must therefore be avoided, as these historical phrases or terminologies represent the truth of historical events, facts and realities. Historical events, realities and facts are not only in historical document, but also exist within the collective memory of the society or person who involved in a certain historical event.

China and Korea issued a pressure against Japan, criticizing historical terminology used in 1982 textbook, where by the Japanese army was referred to "advance into" China instead of conducting "aggression to" China, and where there were utilised "uprising among the Korean people" instead of "March First Independence Movement". In my perspective narrative of "Advance into China" and "Uprising among the Korean people" are categorized as not scientific phrase of historical fact, "the terminology is chosen instead to provoke a more nationalistic ideology." but more top phrase of nationalism ideology hidden in historical terminology. "Advance into" is not a synonym of "aggression", "occupation", or "colonialism". The government philosophy concerning the contents of these textbooks should display a degree of understanding and respect towards international harmony in their treatment of modern and contemporary historical events must be based on objective historical fact rather than subjective ideology views.

On the other side, as a nationalist predominant, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, criticized an American textbook that he said inaccurately described Japan's actions during World War II. "I just looked at a document, McGraw-Hill's textbook, and I was shocked... this kind of textbook is being used in the United States, as we did not protest the things we should have, or we failed to correct the things we should have", Abe said. Abe pledged to increase efforts to fight what he called mistaken views abroad concerning Japan's wartime actions, when the Japanese military conquered much of Asia that he said contained the sort of negative portrayals that Japan must do more to combat. In particular, he objected to a description of women forced to work in Japanese military brothels during the war elsewhere in Asia [See, Martin Facker, as published by The Japan Times quoted Mr. Abe as saying during a meeting of a parliamentary budget committee, The New York Times, January 29, 2015. <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/01/30/world/asia/japan-premier-disputes-us-textbooks-portrayal-of-comfort-women.html>] I think that, this kind of view and argumentation tending on political and ideological subjectivities of historical setting.

Volume 6 Issue 11, November 2017

www.ijsr.net

Licensed Under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY

By early 2000, Fujioka and his group had joined others informing the Japanese Society for History Textbook Reform, "the terminology is chosen instead to provoke a more nationalistic ideology." then headed by Kanji Nishio. Nishio summarized the views of the Society in an article in the August 2001 JAPAN ECHO, a bimonthly journal of opinion on a wide range of topics of current interest in Japan. The author stated that rather than asserting the Society members' personal views of history, the textbook aims to restore common sense to the teaching of the subject. Nishio insisted that, "history should stop being treated like a court where figures and events of the past are called for judgment" (Nishio 2001, 33).

2. History and Ideology of Textbook

Here the author raises a question concerning history as a part of social humanities sciences. Can history be used as an applied ideology? To what extent are all types of ideologies usable as a tool to mobilize people, especially young generation of a society or nation? This question is relevant to explore how far ideology was actually involved in an author's preparation towards a text book by filtering basic material of historical resources for the textbooks. It seemed that "selected resources" helped the author in designing the content, defining phrases, as well as choosing illustrations and photos for document of textbook. This kind of textbook was a real ideology biased textbook by selected data or filtered document.

The question is; in today society, how far do various system, norm, was just a product of the past? Are the behaviours and lives of young generation reflect a portrayal of the behavior and lives of their former generation? History tells us that changes in society are based on many crucial factors. The process of change in a society also caused changes of value, creativity, human behavior and event. Although this is not a linear event in every period of time, but these events have correlation according to the path of each change in certain time, occasion and societies. In other word, historical processes and dynamics are not the same as conjunctures in economic cycles based on dynamic transaction of society in certain period. It must be remembered that history only occur or happen once in time, occasions and situation, depends of paradigm of society in the related times. History does not tend to recycle or returned like economic conjuncture.

Now, I raise another question. Why does history need to be taught in Junior High School? And why is this subject deemed sensitive concerning individual, society, and nation identities and pride? We must find the answer in many different dimensions. From perspectives of age and emotion in psychological context, students of Junior High School are "genius" in adopting stimulus concerning societies, as well as their imagination about the past and present. If the argumentation can be used as basis of thought, studying history is an important aspect in building character, value and personality of a person. In a broader context, understanding history has a large impact of people's consciousness "mobilization" concerning their countries in order to inculcate their main set of thinking, consciousness, and responsibility of their duties to the nation

and humanities. In the case of history textbooks, the history is not based on scientific terminology, but instead represents aqueasy history based on selected document or historical resources, which is suggested to function as a strategy or method in engineering young generation to build the future of their nation.

Based on the argument mention above, the author is driven to assume that, understanding the idea of Junior High School History Textbook in Japan could help understand the past of the society as history have an importance meaning to understanding today's societies. Although there will be little knowledge of what would happen in the future, history gave us a recollection about the past. The past would never return but is useful just as a remembrance, reflection and lesson learning for imagine and creating better future. Understanding history of nation essentially means understanding the national identity of nation. Understanding "ideology" of textbook therefore means understanding "the objective of history education as a tool in engineering people's character building for the sake of nation." This, however, does not mean understanding history as a subject of social and humanities science itself.

In March 27, 2015 Mombu Kagakushou (文部科学省) published *Chugakkou Shakai Rekishi* = 中学校社会歴史 [Chugakkou Shakai Rekishi = 中学校社会歴史 (2015) Tokyo Soseki]. This paper was focused on the analysis of chapter 57, concerning China-Japan War, chapter 58 Russia-Japan War, chapter 59 Annexation and Colonization of Korea, chapter 73 The Second World War, chapter 74 Pacific War and chapter 75 on Japan Advanced into Asian Countries. The description of each chapter is translated into plain and simple English. As content comparison of Japanese textbook, I try to compare it based on general History of Korea, and then my comment and suggestion.

3. Content of Textbook

Below is comparison of historical substance in Japanese Middle High School History Textbook:

A. Textbook content: Korea Peninsula and Japan-China War (朝鮮半島と日新戦争)(p.188) translated into English: *After Nicho shuikou jyouyaku (日朝修好条約) Japan discerns Korea as an independence state, but Ch'in (China) discerns Korea as their protectorate state. Japan assisted Korean in reform their military system. Dokuritsu tou (独立党) (independence Party) in Korea which is intended to learn from Japan to modernize their country, opposed The Jidaitou (事大党) which support the relationship with Ch'in (China). In this condition military riots who opposed the military reform occurred (Jingo Jihen = 壬午事変) in 1882. In 1884 Kim Ok-kyun of the Independence Party carried out a coup d'etat (Koushin Jihen = 甲申事変) which then oppressed by Ch'in military powers.*

Epecially at the Koushin Jihen our country (Japan) was anxious to Ch'in military oppression and cannot support Kim Ok-kyun. As a result, Ch'in get significant victory. After

this incident, Korea fell under Ch'in power and influence of Japanese power in Korea decreased.

Other resources stated that in 1868 Japan dispatched a delegation to Korea to propose normalization of the relationship between Korea and Japan. The Korean government reluctantly accepted the Japanese delegation. For this reason, Japan sent their troops and invaded Korea in 1870. Korea also faced military invasion from France and United State of America at the same time [Namh, Andrew C., Panoramic of 5000 years History of Korea Translated by M.G.Windu Saskara, p. 73-80]. France invaded Korea as response of assassination of a France Clergyman in 1866. USA invaded Korea as response of an attack against American's trade ship at Taejon River which killed its crewman in 1866. In October 1866, France troops invaded Korea and a short battle occurred in Chunghwa, an area between Seoul and Chemul'po (Incheon). In May 1871, American mariner invaded Korea and a short battle occurred at Chunghwa Island [Nahm, ibid Andrew C., Panoramic of 5000 years History of Korea]. In 1875 Japan sent a navy fleet to Pusan and advanced to Chunghwa Island to attack Korean troops that stationed there. Japan forced Korea to renew a diplomatic agreement between the two countries. Finally, Korea signs the agreement with Japan and after that, Korea signed agreement with America. The Korean government in 1881 sent a mission to Japan, and in 1883, sent a mission to America. The objective of these missions was to establish cooperation for mutual benefit and maintain peace. In 1886, the Korean government employed Japanese military instructors to train Korean army about firearms and modern military strategy and tactics.

In author's analysis, the presented sub-chapter did not describe Japan's intention in assisting Korea clearly. Reasons behind the Kim Ok-kyun coup d'état and China's oppression were not found in this section. After Korea fell into China's power, the influence of Japan in Korea decreased. It seemed that a more basic explanation was needed in this section. The author here has also compared the article with description in Namh books [Nahm, Ibi., d., p. 73-80].

In 1868 Japan dispatched delegation to Korea and proposed normalization of the relationship between Korea and Japan. But Korean was reluctant to accept the Japanese delegation. For this reason Japan then sent their troop and invaded Korea in 1870.

B. Textbook content: The beginning of Japan-China War (日新戦争の始まり) translated into English: [Textbook p.188]

In 1894, a large scale peasant riot against the government and foreign power occurred (甲午農民戦争、東学党の乱). China-Japan war broke out because China invaded Korea for their protectorate state. For this reason Japan then sent their troops to Korea. Manchuria (in the North East of China) and also in the south become battlefield and Japan troop defeated China troops in many battlefield. As the result in 1895 the Shimonoseki Peace Conference between China and Japan concluded. In this conference, China declared that Korea should be recognised an independent state and not under Ch'in protectorate. Ch'in also handed

over the Liaotung peninsula and Taiwan and was forced to "the terminology is chosen instead to provoke a more nationalistic ideology."

Other resources related to this event stated that the *Tonghak* sect continued to oppose a corrupted government and elite class. They advocated exploitation against peasants and poor Korean peoples. Poor economic and social condition of Korean people was the reason behind the *Tonghak* sect revolution. In February 1894, the *Tonghak* revolution, led by Chon Pong-Jun, broke out. They appealed for an economic and social reformation to government [Nahmn, p.83]. Unable to suppress the struggle of the *Tonghak* peasant forces, the Korean government requested assistance from Ch'ing in China. Perceiving this as an opportunity to strengthen its position in Korea, China dispatched a force of 3000 men under Yeh Chih-ch'ao to Assan Bay. This action was then reported to the Japanese government, in accordance with the term of Convention Tientsin [Ki-baik Lee, p. 288-289].

Like China, Japan also saw an opportunity to expand its influence in Korea. Japan did not only hope to restore its political position but was also aware of the need to ensure Korean market for its products. Japan considered China's policy in dispatching troops as a sign for opportunity. Accordingly, under pretext of protecting its citizens in Korea, Japan sent a large force of 7000 troops at Inch'on, backed by seven warships. After Chinese troops entered Korea in June 1894, 500 Japanese mariner and 20,000 Japanese troops entered Korea. Considering the potential of war, Korean Government asked China and Japan to withdraw their forces, but both parties ignored the withdrawal request. In July 1894, China-Japan war broke out in Korea which also ended the *Tonghak* revolution.

The China-Japan (Sino-Japanese) war broke out after China invaded Korea to become their protectorate state. For this reason, Japan also sent troops to Korea. The real background of China and Japan war in Korea, was based on political conquests over Korea, and anti government and foreign power peasant riot in Korea. The background of China and Japan war in Korea did not appear in the textbook. The Shimonoseki Peace Conference between Japan and Ch'in gave Japan more chances to control Korea.

C. Textbook content: Japan-Russo war (ロシアとの激突日露戦争), p.190, translated into English

Concerning Japan's victory in China-Japan war and after signing Shimonoseki conference, Russia who intended expand their power into Manchuria, then invited Germany and France to force Japan and push them in returning Liaotung Peninsula to China (intervention of three state=三国干涉). Japan has no power to counter the three countries and obeyed them. Russia then controlled Liaotung, while the Germans control Liuchow bay, England control Kyuliou bay and Kauai, and France control Guan Chou bay.

In 1900 big mass rally shouted "let's decrease foreign power aid to China." The Chin military force notified and surrounded many foreign embassies including Japanese embassy in Beijing. The alliance of big powers, also protested against Japanese military force conquest the

rallies (義和団事件). After the incident all big power military force in Beijing withdrew from Beijing. In this situation Russia sent their troops to Manchuria and occupied the region. Japan at last cannot avoid collision with Russia, for that reason Japan in 1902 concluded an alliance with England (日英同盟)

Other resources related to this event stated that Korea's development was based on the rivalry between Japan and Russia. When Russia annexed northeast Asia, Russia launched a powerful drive to penetrate into Korea as well. Japan pursued a compromise policy in Korea in order to precede economic penetration while searching for an aggressive opportunity in the future. As the outbreak of war between Russia and Japan became imminent, Korea formally proclaimed its neutrality in January 1904. Japan displayed its military strength by sending troops into Seoul and occupied a number of buildings.

When Boxer Rebellion broke out in China, Russia sent a large force into Manchuria. After the rebellion was subdued, Russian troops were not withdrawn. This situation constituted a suspicion not only to Japan but also to England, which already had confrontation against Russia. Japan and England then signed the Anglo-Japanese Alliance in January 1902, an agreement to face Russian threat. England's rights and interests in China were recognized by Japan and, as exchange, England also acknowledged Japan's special interest in Korea. [Resources: Ki-baik Lee, A New History of Korea, translated by Edward W. Wagner with Edward J. Shultz, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England, 1984, p.306]

In the author's suggestion, all resources related to this event had lost part of an important event, especially on information concerning Korea's "neutrality" over Japan-Russia War. Korea's developed an important background on rivalry between Japan and Russia. As Russia marched into Northeast Asia, Russia launched a powerful drive to penetrate Korea as well. Meanwhile, Japan's policy in Korea was a compromise: economic penetration while looking for an opportunity to commit overt aggression in the future [Ki-baik Lee, p. 308-309]. This information was important related to proportional historical resources and could be used as an important point of view for students on the dynamic of relationship between the nation in the past.

D. Textbook content: Japan-Russo War (日露戦争) translated into English:

Decision of war with Russia has many reasons: Japanese government's growing worry of Russian action, which strengthened their military power. On February 1905 Japan-Russo War break out. The battle spread widely and Korean peninsula and Manchuria became Nogi Maresuke battlefield as Japanese military (gunshireikan), sent large military troops and occupied Liaotung, also in the Laotian battle, Nogi get big victory. Tougou Heihachiro commander of Japanese joint naval forces defeated Russian's Baltic Naval at Tsushima Strait. On the other side, Japanese military, victory in Japan-Russo war in 1905, ended with the concluded of Portsmouth Treaty initiated by America. In this treaty, Japan's special position in Korea and also Japan have right to hold and lease Liaotung,

Dairen, and have the right to manage the South Chou sun Railway, right to manage the northern sea fishery, and get half of southern on Sakhalin

In my finding, the Japan-Russia War was caused by Russian move which was considered as potential enemy by Japan. Russia built their military power in East Asia in preparation of southward invasion. This development worried Japan's special interests in Korea. As the logical reason, Japan invested its potential country's power to meet Russian threat over Pacific.

There was a description in textbook (translated in English), where "As the outbreak of war between Russia and Japan became imminent, Korea formally proclaimed its neutrality, in January 1904. In spite of this Japan displayed its military might by sending troops into Seoul and occupying a number of building."

The textbook mentioned that, Japan and England formed an alliance because they saw Russia as common enemy. England decided to recognize Korea as protectorate state of Japan while Japan recognized England's rights and interests in China.

The Japanese-American relations, amid of Japan-Russia War, Japan decided to recognize America's position in the Philippines while America recognized Korea as protectorate state of Japan. Based on the interests of England, America, Russia, and Japan as imperialist powers, the statement in textbook where "Western power didn't have any intention in intervening Japan on Korean Peninsula problem" was a logic reason. Another statement of "resistance movement from Korean peoples broke out and governor general authority oppressed its movement", also a sufficient description.

In this chapter, explanation concerning historical events and power struggles between imperialist countries are more than enough.

E. Textbook content: Annexation of Korea (韓国合併) translated into English:

In the beginning of Russo-Japan, Japan and Korea concluded a treaty Japan-Korea Protocol (日韓義定書). The substance of this protocol suggests that, to maintain Korean territory from other country invasion (Russia), the development of Japan army in Korea was recognized. In developing Japanese-American relations, amid of Japan-Russia War, Japan recognized American occupation the Philippines, and America recognized Korea as protectorate state of Japan.

Renewal of Japan-Anglo Alliance, and the Portsmouth Treaty, the position of Korea as Japan's protectorate right was also recognized. Later, based on Japan-Korea Treaty, Japan also has right to determine foreign policy of Korea, establish resident general, and Itou Hirobumi proceed as first governor general. Soon the authority of governor general intervened Korean domestic politics. As the result, resistance movement from Korean peoples broke out, and the governor general authority oppressed it. In 1910 Japanese government begin annexing Korea, and

establishing government general. Western power did not have any intention to intervene Japan concerning Korea's problem of Japan annexation of Korea.

Other resources related to this event stated that the scheme for imperial Japan to annex Korea was planned long before and was waiting for time-based decision to be carried out. In May 1910, Japan appointed General Terauchi Masatake as the new Residence General, and explicitly entrusted him the mission of the annexation. Immediately upon arriving in Seoul, he ordered suspension over publication of *the Hwangsong Simun, Taihen Minbo, Taihen Maeil Sinbo* and other Korean newspaper. Together with Prime Minister Yi Wan-yong, he formulated the term of the annexation treaty, and finally, on August 22, 1910 secured the prime minister's signature to it. On August 29, 1910, Sunjong was forced to issue a proclamation yielding up both his throne and his country. Thus the Korean nation, against the will of its entire people, was handed over to the harsh colonial rule of Japan by coterie of traitors [Ki-baek Lee, p.313].

In the author's finding, the textbooks describe no specific or general information concerning Korean's economic exploitation, social, education, and human right violation, assimilation or "Japanization=日本化" program in education. The reasons of banned newspaper and number of peoples who were killed and arrested are also unclear.

F. Textbook content: (Mobilization (動員) translated into English :

In 1943, state mobilization system enacted by Government, concerning several things: University students mobilized for army, (gakuto shujin). Almost all of the men mobilized to war, students of primary high school and above, take part in arms and munitions factories (kinroudouin). Bronze statue and temples bell delivery to factories and smelted as weapon. There are many regulation in many field concerning restriction of rice consumption of the peoples for purposed of war, peoples must used plain or simple clothes, limitation usage of English language in government institution, all kind of media, newspapers, and films must support the war. [Textbook, p. 238] All kinds of news, information, must be controlled by government regulation. Government which have been controlling Korean peninsula, also created a policy incontinuing Japanisation (citizenships assimilation) by change of citizenships of Korean full name into Japanese style names. Amid of the war, the Japanese Government also implemented tight regulation of Conscription for Korean and Taiwanese people. There was also severe force labor for Korean and Chinese peoples in Japanese mining and factory.

Other resources related to this event stated that after the war outbreak between Japan and the U.S. in 1941, the emphasis in the mining industry shifted from gold to minerals directly required by Japan's war industry, such as tungsten, graphite, magnetite and molybdenum. As a consequence, production of iron ore rose over six times between 1930 and 1944, tungsten about 700 times, graphite 5 times, molybdenum 29 times. Here it is evident that the role of Korea was as raw material supplier to Japan's war machine. In prosecuting this war, Japan carried out a so-called total national mobilization policy and even in Japan itself a variety of extraordinary

measures was put into effect. "Japan and Korea are One Entity" (*Nai-Sen ittai*) was a slogan that Japan launched; a sweeping campaign to eradicate Korean national identity. As a first step in carrying out its assimilation policy, Japan banned all forms of cultural expression that might be considered nationalistic. Publication in han'gul such as *The Tonga Ilbo, Choson Ilbo* newspaper, and magazines like *Literature (Munjang)* were all suspended. Not only that, the study of Korean Language but also Korean History was regarded as dangerous [Ki-baik Lee, p.352-354].

In the author's analyses, there was not enough data of Korean war victims during Okinawa War, or Japanese occupation in South East Asia, whilst the number of Japanese people were mentioned specifically. For example, there was an account of about 180,000-190,000 Japanese war victims; half of them were Okinawan civilian peoples. Students of junior high school and girls that fought alongside the army, were either killed in the fighting or committed suicide because of fear of being captured. (p.236). There was also no data concerning Korean People who were forced to military conscription and sent to occupy countries.

G. Textbook Content: Pacific War (p.238)

In this sub chapter of the textbook, there was only three-important information concerning Japanese military government treatment or behavior to Korean peoples, especially; Japanization (citizenship assimilation), conscription for Korean, and regulation concerning force labor for Korean and Chinese.

一方わが国が統治していた朝鮮半島では姓名を日本式に改める創氏改名など朝鮮人を日本人に同化させる政策が進められました。

Governments that have been in control in the Korean peninsula, has also created policies to continuing Japanization by changing of citizenships of Korean full name into Japanese style names.

戦争の末期には朝鮮や台湾にも徴兵徴用が適用され、人々に苦しみを強いることになりました。

Amid the war, Governments also implemented tight regulation on Conscription for Korean and Taiwanese peoples.

日本の鉱山や工場などに徴用され、きびしい労働を強いられる朝鮮人や中国人もいました。

There was also severe force labor for Korean and Chinese people requisitioned in Japanese mining and factory.

In the author's finding, there were no data concerning how many people were dead in forced labor work in Thailand and Burma's railway construction, including Indonesians, Koreans, Chinese, and others Asian peoples. A number of Korean and Chinese people became victims of forced work in Japan mining and factory in one side, but in the other side quantities data on Japanese victim concerning The casualties of Tokyo air raid (*Toukyou Daikuushuu=東京大空襲*) In March 1945 about 100,000 people's dead, and 270,000 house hold was burned. Using quantities of data in textbook, it should be based on real data without discrimination.

4. Conclusion

Criticism about history textbook is mainly rooted on perspectives and connotation to nationalistic bias. There was also the problematic view of historical terminologies that are used in textbooks and interpretation of historical facts and incidents. Korea and China criticize the text books as a tool to “weekend” Japanese young generation perception of Japanese brutality in colonization of Korea and China. Historiography must reconstructed based on scientific methodology and balance of historical fact. People must be educated based on “truth” history. Study on history was a never-ending process especially in pursuing academic truth and human justice in the past for better future of human kin

[13] Yoshihiko Nozaki, Mark Selden, (2009), Japanese Textbook Controversies, Nationalism, and Historical Memory: Intra- and Inter-national Conflicts (The Asia Pacific Journal, Japan Focus), Volume 7, Number5, June 15,

References

- [1] Andrew C, Nahm, (1990), Panorama of 5000 Years: Korean HistoryHollym International Corporation
- [2] 新しい社会中学校 教科書（歴史）（New Social Junior High School Textbook (History),(2002), Tokyo, Shoseki
- [3] Caroline Rose, (1999) "The Textbook Issue: Domestic Sources of Japan's Foreign Policy," Japan Forum 11, no. 2
- [4] 中学校日本歴史教科書（Japanese History TextbookUsed in junior high school of Japan), (2007), Tokyo, Yamakawa.
- [5] 中学校日本歴史教科書（Junior High School Textbook), (1987), Tokyo, Shoseki.
- [6] Hiroshi Mitani and TeruyukiHirota, (2007) 歴史教科書問題初半、リディングス日本の教育と社会（RekishikyokashoMondai, Shohan. ed., Ridingusu Nihon No Kyoiku to Shakai)(Tokyo, Nihon Tosho Senta.
- [7] Ki-baik Lee, (1984), A New History of Korea, translated by Edward W. Wagner with Edward J. Shultz, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and London, England.
- [8] Gregg Brazinsky(2007) "Nation Building in South Korea: Koreans, Americans, and the Makings of a Democracy." University of North Carolina Press
- [9] Tomoko Hamada, (2003) "Constructing a National Memory: A Comparative Analysis of Middle-School History Textbooks from Japanand the PRC," American Asian Review XXI, no. 4, P111. 8
- [10] Yamawaki, Keizo, (1994) 近代日本と外国人労働者-1890年代後半と年代1920前半における中国人朝鮮人労働者問 Modern Japan and Foreign Laborers: Chinese and Korean Laborers in the late 1890 and early 1920s , Akashi-shoten.
- [11] Yuka Hayashi, “Japan’s Textbook Changes Get Failing Grade From Neighbors”Tokyo makes publishers soften descriptions of its wartime activities involving China, South Korea, The Wall Street Journal, (Updated April 7, 2015 7:36 a.m. ET)
- [12] Yoshiko Nozaki, (2008), War Memory, Nationalism and Education in Postwar Japan, 1945-2007: The Japanese History Textbook Controversy and IenagaSaburo's Court Challenges (Routledge Contemporary Japan, Vol. 20)