

## ABSTRACT AND BIODATA

### **Keynote Speech 1: Efforts of Council of Europe & UNESCO to Foster Reconciliation in Post-conflict Countries**

**Emeritus Prof. Dr. Luigi Cajani  
Sapienza University of Rome**

#### **ABSTRACT**

After the First World War a strong and internationally widespread commitment to peace education gave birth to many initiatives to disarm history education, which was considered biased by nationalism and potentially warmongering. These initiatives developed both at international level, as in the case of the *Comité International de la Coopération Intellectuelle*, set up in 1922 by the League of Nations, and in Latin American states, which in 1933 signed an agreement to periodically review their history textbooks, and at non-governmental level, as in the case of the associations of French and German teachers, who founded in 1926 an international federation for educational collaboration and to prepare for peace through the cooperation of peoples in freedom.

All these initiatives, despite their cultural meaning, were not effective, because in the period between the two World Wars the international political situation was certainly not in favour of moral disarmament and most states were not willing to accept interference in a field as important and delicate as history teaching.

After the Second World War initiatives to radically modify history teaching and turn it into an tool designed to educate people for peace and cooperation were taken up again with more decisiveness, above all by UNESCO and by the Council of Europe.

UNESCO launched a research and educational project on world history to highlight the interdependence of peoples and cultures and their contribution the common human heritage. The scientific side of the project brought about two important world history collections, one published in the 1960s and a second one published in the 1990s. On the educational side UNESCO produced history textbook analysis and guidelines to the authors. A special attention was devoted to the history of Africa, in order to decolonize history textbooks.

The Council of Europe was established in 1949, and one of its missions was the creation of the cultural basis for the unification of Europe: thus it did not deal with the history of humanity, but only with the history of Europe, in order to develop a common European vision of history, which should overcome previous nationalisms. For this purpose several series of meeting were organised gathering historians from all the Council's member states, in order to draw up detailed lists of specific recommendations for the authors of textbooks. After the Fall of the Berlin Wall most states which were previously behind the Iron Curtain joined the Council of Europe: this was the beginning of a new phase on the engagement of the Council in the field of history education, with a special focus of the democratic transition of these countries, on the issues of minorities and on conflicts.

The analysis of the recommendations and of the teaching materials produced by the Council of Europe shows a strategy emphasizing commonalities and interactions among European states, and in this sense one can observe a diversified impact on the curricula and textbooks of the member states: some of them have indeed implemented a European approach, others still keep a focus on the nation. This strategy becomes particularly worth of attention when used for the management of the consequences of past and recent conflicts, as in the case of Cyprus and of the states around the Black Sea: the question is whether silencing tragic past events is effective in fostering peace or it would be necessary to clearly face them with the tools of historiography, in order to achieve a critical approach to the past and start a future free of its burden.

### **BIODATA**

Luigi Cajani is emeritus professor for Early Modern History at the Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia of the Sapienza University of Rome, where he was also responsible for initial history teacher training. He was the president (2012-2018) of the International Research Association for History and Social Sciences Education (IRAHSSE) and is currently an Associated Scholar of the Georg-Eckert-Institut für internationale Schulbuchforschung in Braunschweig (Germany). He is coeditor with Simone Lässig and Maria Repoussi of *The Palgrave Handbook of Conflict and History Education in the Post-Cold War Era*, Palgrave 2019.

Current research interests: History of historiography; History education, Politics of history.

**Panel 1:  
Historical Thinking and Difficult Histories**

**Dr. Mark Sheehan  
Victoria University of Wellington**

**ABSTRACT**

In this paper I explore the implications of a secondary school history curriculum that is framed by the procedural (second order) concepts of historical thinking but does not mandate substantive content knowledge and, in particular, does not prioritise difficult histories. While historical thinking can equip young people to think critically about the past, history as a school subject has a wider role in preparing young people with the knowledge to participate constructively in society and the transformative potential of the subject involves young people thinking deeply about controversial and difficult historical questions.<sup>1</sup> This argument is explored through a case study of the *New Zealand history Curriculum*<sup>2</sup> where history is structured by procedural concepts and is aligned with the specialized disciplinary knowledge of academic history.<sup>3</sup> However, while young people in New Zealand learn to think historically in their history courses, the curriculum does not mandate knowledge and young people seldom engage critically with difficult features of the country's colonial past (or indigenous Māori perspectives on the colonisation process). In a New Zealand context, understanding the nature of these difficult histories is an integral feature of operating in an increasingly diverse society that is working to address historical grievances and reconcile the relationship between Māori and non-indigenous New Zealanders. The low priority of difficult histories in the *New Zealand Curriculum* limits the extent to which history can operate as a transformative, empowering subject that equips young people to be historically literate, critically informed citizens who can understand the connection between the past and the present.

It is argued that a way forward in addressing this issue is for history educators to engage with the question of the purpose of history in the school curriculum. School subjects have a wider purpose than that of academic disciplines and serve wider societal and cultural functions as well as being shaped by pedagogical and assessment imperatives.<sup>4</sup> If history is to be aligned with the broader purpose of education (and operate as a transformative subject, as well as teaching young

---

<sup>1</sup> Ken Nordgren, "Powerful Knowledge, Intercultural Learning and History Education" *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 49. no. 5 (2017): 663-682.

<sup>2</sup>Ministry of Education, *the New Zealand Curriculum* (Wellington: Learning Media, 2007).

<sup>3</sup>Peter Seixas and Tom Morton, *The Big Six Historical Thinking Concepts* (Toronto: Nelson Education, 2013).

<sup>4</sup> Nordgren, 2017.

people to think historically) it needs to develop their understandings of difficult histories. In a New Zealand context this must include the process of colonization (and Māori perspectives on this experience) as this is an especially difficult and contested feature of this country's past.

### **BIODATA**

Mark Sheehan (Faculty of Education, Victoria University of Wellington) has been involved in the history education community in New Zealand for over 40 years as a teacher, lecturer, textbook writer, researcher, consultant, museum educator and curriculum designer. His research interests connect with the intersection between history, education and memory. He is especially interested in questions relating to how young people learn to think critically about the past, the role of history in reconciliation (especially in regards to memory, remembrance and indigenous epistemologies) and how young people are educated to actively participate in society as historically literate, critically informed citizens with a balanced perspective and who can think independently about the challenges they face in the future.

**Panel 1:  
National Identity in History Curriculum: Educating for  
Citizenship**

**Dr. Heather Sharp  
University of New Castle, Australia**

**ABSTRACT**

Creating a cohesive national identity and sense of citizenship is a key motivation for many modern nation states as part of nation building endeavours. For those nations who are in a post-colonial phase, this can also involve de-colonising policies and practices, frequently expressed through schooling and in particular, History education. Even while the world is becoming increasingly globalized through for example, travel, commercial enterprise, and social justice issues, matters of national identity and nationalism are still relevant (see, for example Curthoys, 2002, 2003; Giroux, 1998). Even if there is a trend towards transnational and comparative histories in the research arena or in public institutions such as museums, this is not generally replicated in school curriculum which maintains a firm focus on the history of individual nation states, even if positioned within an international context; for example Australia's involvement in World War I (WWI). Histories of nations are commonly presented to students as distinctly compartmentalized.

In the Australian context, the Ministerial Council of Education, Employment, Training, and Youth Affairs (MCEETYA) developed the guiding document for education goals, *The Melbourne Declaration on Educational Goals for Young Australians* that is used to inform curriculum across Australia. Rather than being overt about the purpose of History education or education in general as being for purposes of nationalism, the Declaration identifies *active and informed citizenship* as an area to develop in students, with Goal 2 stating: "All Australians become successful learners, confident and creative individuals, and active and informed citizens" (MCEETYA, 2008, p. 8). Currently under review, the Declaration explains the concept of active and informed citizenship in a way that can be widely interpreted, including points such as to "act with moral and ethical integrity; are responsible global and local citizens; are able to relate to and communicate across cultures, especially the cultures and countries of Asia" (MCEETYA, 2008, p. 9). This point, which is positioned as the fifth of seven on the list is particularly pertinent to this paper. However, while it is not an overt articulation of nationalism and within the school curriculum, the language around issues of national importance, including ideas of what it is to be *an Australian*, is frequently mitigated through the language of *citizenship*, the idea of creating an ideal *Young Australian* is expressed through notions of active and informed citizenship, detailed above.

In general terms, History education can be seen as a vehicle to promote national identity, especially when it is subsumed with "the politics of remembering and forgetting" (Giroux, 1998, p. 181) in relation to matters of national historical importance and its manifestation in contemporary ideas of what it means to belong

to a nation. While national identity can be seen as fluid or “shifting” (Giroux, 1998, p. 188), how these shifts play out in school curriculum documents and supporting textbooks, with a specific focus on ethnic diversity and ethnic uniformity will be identified in this paper. A view of nationhood as belonging to “...two conceptions of the nation...the political ‘national by an act of will’ (the German *Willensnation*) and the nation defined by culture (*Kulturnation*) which is often linguistically defined and ethnically based” (Wodak et al, 1999, p. 18) will be explored in the analysis with emphasis on the *Kulturnation*. The role history has, and continues to play, in representing the nation-state cannot be underestimated, as Evans writes, “history is important...in constructing national identity” (2002, p. 12). Identity, when discussing the symbolic relationship citizens have to the nation state, can be couched in terms of a *collective*, rather than *individual*, identity. The representations of ethnic diversity (and on the flip side, ethnic uniformity) in History curriculum documents invariably construct these exemplars as part of a *collective* identity. For the Australian context, examples of ethnic diversity as ‘exotic’ will be analysed with a focus on the notion of multiculturalism and the contribution to society of immigrants and of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples (see, for example, Sharp 2012).

Arguably the most prevalent topic in Australia school history education, and a topic that is repeated annually in schooling through ceremonies and other acts of observance is Anzac Day (Anzac is an acronym for Australian and New Zealand Army Corps. During World War I, Australian and New Zealand troops engaged in battle as a united force, under the military control of Great Britain). In recent years, content related to Anzac Day as taught in schools has expanded and with the introduction of the first national curriculum, a section in the Year 9 unit covering WWI expanded to include a critique of the Anzac legend and the military participation of Aboriginal and Torres Islanders. This endeavour to promote ethnic diversity in the school curriculum to a quintessentially Australian and frequently jingoistic topic sees a common point to converge in order to foster a national identity.

In addition to the ethnic diversity of Australia’s first nation peoples, the continent’s place within the geographic region has not always been an easy or straightforward one, and speaks to the uneasiness of Australia’s position in the region, as a nation that is ethnically and linguistically different from the majority of its neighbours, with New Zealand being an exception. How this is represented in school textbooks as a reflection of public discourses is a relevant comparison included in this paper. Australia’s relationship with other nations in the region has been problematic at times. In the 1980s and 1990s Australia was especially on the receiving end of rebukes from Malaysia, arguably as a way to promote their own national identity, and other close by nations, and to pinpoint Australia as a point of difference between other nations in the region—a geographic area that has often been difficult for Australia to belong to due to is predominately ‘white’, however problematic that term is, colonial history. Malaysia’s first Prime Minister, Lee Kuan Yew famously referred to Australia as being or in danger of becoming, the “poor white trash of Asia” (Kerin, 2015, para. 2). Mahathir shared this kind of view and “treated Australia with contempt, exploiting the country’s neurosis and reinforcing the idea

of Australia as a society marginalised in its own location” (Kelly, 2011, p. 464). How the ideas of national identity within History education curriculum aims to educate for citizenship in an ethnically diverse world will be the focus of the paper.

### **BIODATA**

Heather Sharp is a senior lecturer in the Faculty of Education and Arts, University of Newcastle. Heather is a founding member of the HERMES research group. She is convenor of the History Network for Teachers and Researchers (HNTR), Editor of the *Sungråpho* section of the *Agora* journal, and the Special Issues Editor of *Historical Encounters Journal*. Her research investigates historical representations in school curriculum, particularly around topics of significance to a nation’s history. She is currently a recipient of a Swedish Research Council grant as part of a research group investigating historical and moral consciousness.

**Panel 2:  
Portrayals of Ethnic Minorities, Migration and Empire in  
English History Textbooks, 1920-2020**

**Prof. Dr. Stuart Foster  
Institute of Education, University College London**

**ABSTRACT**

For more than a century history, textbooks have played a prominent role in the education of young people in England. Indeed, until the 1970s textbooks typically served as powerful instruments in ensuring that school students acquired a strong sense of collective identity, pride in British achievements and a veneration for the nation's traditions and heritage. Above all, textbooks typically presented an unashamedly white, upper-middle class, Anglo-centric narrative which primarily focused on the accomplishments of male protagonists, military leaders and ruling monarchs. However, during the 1970s (and in subsequent decades) history education in England underwent significant changes and 'traditional' portrayals of British history were seriously challenged. In particular two significant trends emerged.

First, many history teachers, textbook authors and leading organisations (e.g., the Historical Association, Schools History Project), increasingly advocated a 'disciplinary' approach to history whereby students examined historical evidence and actively engaged with different interpretations of the past. Essentially, this new approach dramatically challenged established notions of a singular, official and orthodox historical narrative. Second, advocates of change argued that school history should be more inclusive and respectful of the histories of under-represented groups in society (e.g., the working class, ethnic minorities, women). History textbooks written after the 1970s, therefore, often reflected these significant changes in emphasis and focus. Nevertheless, tensions between 'traditional' and more inclusive 'disciplinary' approaches to history education endured for many decades and continue to co-exist. In fact, many history teachers and textbook authors currently navigate the complex pedagogical path between these competing approaches to historical study.

This paper, therefore, aims to shed light on these important historical developments in history education and history textbook production in England. In particular, it examines the ways in which and the extent to which the history of minority groups and portrayals of migration and Empire have been presented in school history textbooks common in English secondary schools. Analysis is based on the examination of a range of history textbooks used in classrooms in the past 100 years. Specifically, it focuses on history textbook portrayals during three periods: (a) textbooks written before the 1970s (b) textbooks written from the 1970s to the 1990s, and (c) textbooks published since 2000.

In overview the paper will outline how portrayals of minority groups, migration and Empire have been directly influenced by key trends and developments in history



education in England over the past century. It will also offer insights into the implications for these trends and developments for contemporary history education and textbook production.

### **BIODATA**

Stuart Foster is the Executive Director of the Centre for Holocaust Education under the Institute of Education (IOE), University College London. He was a tenured Associate Professor in the Department of Social Science Education at the University of Georgia, USA between 1996-2001. He joined IOE in 2001, and had served as Head of the Academic Department of Arts and Humanities between 2008-2011. Foster is regularly invited to give keynote lectures to international audiences, and in recent years has addressed history teachers and academics in Canada, France, Germany, Portugal, Ireland, Singapore, Spain, Taiwan, Turkey, Sweden and the USA. He has written more than fifty scholarly articles and book chapters focused on teaching and learning history and he has authored or co-authored six books. His most recent book, *War, Nation, Memory* focuses on how the Second World War is taught in schools in different nations throughout the world. He is also series editor of the *International Review of History Education*. Under Foster's leadership, the IOE produced the UK's first ever large-scale national study: *Teaching About the Holocaust in English Secondary Schools: An empirical study of national trends, perspectives and practice* (2009).

**Panel 2:  
History Education in Multicultural Contexts: A Canadian  
Perspective**

**Naomi Ostwald Kawamura  
University of British Columbia, Vancouver**

**ABSTRACT**

Canada defines itself as a multicultural nation, resulting from the unique position of the French-speaking province of Quebec, the prominence of its indigenous nations, and the high rate of inward migration from around the world. This has long provided challenges for the coherence and purpose of Canada's history education efforts. Early attempts to construct a coherent history based around the experience of the Anglo-population have systematically been challenged by each additional layer of diversity. In response, the approach to history education has evolved to incorporate each new diversity as it becomes politically salient. As in other parts of the world, the objective of instilling national identity is part of history education but the multi-dimensional nature of the nation makes it challenging to present history from a singular perspective. This has precipitated different initiatives that try to change unitary approaches to history education. In recent years, the Historical Thinking Project and The History Education Network, primarily in English-speaking Canada, have attempted to grapple with some of the irreconcilable features of Canadian history including 1) addressing issues of representation, 2) reconciling with difficult pasts, 3) and negotiating ethnic and cultural identities within a broader national identity. This article provides a review of debates in Canadian history education approaches, a brief context of present-day approaches to history education, namely in British Columbia, and explores scholarship that examines history education in relation to students' cultural and ethnic identities, including the emergence of community history education efforts by ethnocultural minorities that have originated outside of schools.

**BIODATA**

Naomi Ostwald Kawamura is a PhD candidate in Curriculum and Pedagogy at the Faculty of Education at the University of British Columbia in Vancouver, Canada. She holds a Master's of Education from the Harvard Graduate School of Education. She has served in educational leadership positions at the San Diego History Centre, the California Centre for the Arts, the Museum of Children's Art, among others. She is currently the Executive Director of the Nikkei Place Foundation, a Japanese-Canadian charity based in British Columbia. She serves as the Vice-President on the Board of Directors of the Museum Education Roundtable, which publishes the Journal of Museum Education, and serves as its Chair on its Taskforce on Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility. Her doctoral research examines the changing dynamics of both collective memory and identity over time, the intergenerational transfer of memory, and the role that collectively shared memories play in substantiating group identity in multicultural contexts.

**Panel 3:  
Unity in Diversity or Political Separation Driven by Cultural  
Difference? Textbook Revision in Bosnia and Herzegovina**

**Dr. Falk Pingel  
Georg Eckert Institute, Braunschweig**

**ABSTRACT**

When the Yugoslavian federal state broke down in the course of the 1990s, Bosnia and Herzegovina (BaH), like the other states emerging from former socialist Yugoslavia could look back to a common education system that had made its imprint on students' generations for more than 50 years. Education had been one of the main transmitters of the ideology of "Brotherhood and Unity" which stressed the commonalities in contrast to the different cultural and religious traditions of the South Yugoslav peoples. However, the wars of the 1990s dissolved the common politico-ideological structures and fragmented the former unified and centralised socialist education system. Not only in BaH but also in Serbia and Croatia, no longer commonalities but the differences, which drew the ethnic groups apart from each other, came into focus of newly developed educational material meant particularly for the teaching of history, geography and mother tongue. They legitimized the supposed ethnic-cultural singularity as well as the newly achieved political sovereignty.

The fragmentation of the education system was prescribed by the Dayton Peace Accords which split BaH into two entities, the Republika Srpska (Serb Republic=RS) and the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina which consisted of 10 cantons with either a Bosniak and or Croat majority population. The RS and each of the cantons had their own ministries of education whereas only a coordinating role was bestowed on the Federation's minister of education. Responsibility for decision making in and administration of education exclusively lay with the RS ministry and the Cantonal ministries. This quasi cultural autonomy as stipulated in the Peace Accords was the price for peace. Only under these conditions were the representatives of the so called constituent peoples – the Bosniaks, Serbs and Croats – willing to unite in a common state framework. Thus, the political structure of education was cemented by the internationally controlled peace agreement and formed part of BaH's constitution. Responsibility for the use and abuse of this construction, however, lays totally with the local ministries.

The objective of their political strategy was not to build a system which could bring their multi-ethnic population a common, overarching school education harmonizing difference but the creation of mono-ethnic communities with their own separate education systems.

When the International Community (IC), which had to oversee and support the implementation of the Dayton Peace Accords, became aware that school education geared at fostering rather than dissolving ethnic stereotypes, cultural exclusiveness and derogation of the respective other ethnic communities, it intervened in education legislation and, in particular, the development and approval of textbooks

for history, geography and mother tongue.

The paper describes the interplay between the IC, local politicians and NGOs as the main stakeholders in the struggle for an education that, on the one hand, should guarantee the cultural rights of the constituent peoples and, on the other hand, should be free of discrimination, does not inculcate hatred and othering and lays foundation for cooperative attitudes towards each other. The different measures and stages of textbook revision and their impact on textbook writers will be discussed. How do the three main narratives differ from each other in textbooks and curricula; how do they look at issues of national identity; do they refer to Bosnia and Herzegovina as a focal point of national unity and awareness at all?

Although one deals here with textbook consultations between stakeholders within a country – and not between different states –, also features characteristic of international revision projects came up in the Bosnian case as the international community played a crucial role in the whole process and some of the Bosnian players acted as if they were opponents in an international context.

The IC represented by the lead organizations such as OSCE, World Bank and Council of Europe tried to implement internationally recognized concepts for education in a multi-cultural environment. The BaH ministries of education were eager to mould and adjust them to their own ideas - in most cases without rejecting them openly and in total. The adoption of a common core curriculum (CCC) for all entities and cantons established a common ground which nevertheless gave room to also recognize cultural specificities. How was the CCC acknowledged by the various actors in education? Did it further sustainable cooperation between the ministries and the IC?

Whatever textbook reform has achieved in the last two decades, new developments are challenging the whole process. Recently, Bosniak cantons started to adopt history textbooks which deal with the war of 1992-1995 and its aftermath in detail – topics that were not included in the history curricula so far because of their controversial and identity-sensitive content. With treating the most sensitive issue in each other's relations, namely the wars of the 1990s, textbook authors and textbook revision fall back to positions which stood at the beginning of the reform process at the turn of the century. Narrations of traditional self-legitimizing positions, exclusive victimization and accusation of the other come again to the fore and revive controversies that could be deviated or pushed aside during the reform period but not really be solved.

Although the textbook issue will form the focus of the presentation, the paper will also relate to the broader issue of how to find a peaceful solution to the conflict and to what an extent the peace accords and the political agenda of the international community have contributed to the present, still unsatisfactory situation. Also, the Bosnian case will be placed into the wider context of textbook revision in post-Yugoslavia.

### **BIODATA**

Falk Pingel is an Associated Research Fellow at the Georg Eckert Institute for International Textbook Research in Braunschweig in Germany. He was the Institute's former deputy director for many years. He has been involved in textbook research and revision dealing with the presentation of conflicting identities in numerous countries such as South Africa, in the Middle East and East Asia. In 2003/2004, he was the first Director of the Education Department of the Organization for Security and Co-operation based in Sarajewo, Bosnia and Herzegovina. He also taught contemporary history as well as theory and didactics of history at Bielefeld University. He acts as a consultant on issues of textbook and curriculum research and revision to governmental and academic institutions.

**Panel 3:  
The Teaching of Ethnic Minorities' History in Myanmar's Post-junta  
Context: Curricular Decentralization as an Antidote  
To "Burmanization"?**

**Nicolas Salem-Gervais  
INALCO/CASE, Paris**

**Mr. Mael Raynaud  
Policy Institute for Urban and Regional Planning, Yangon**

**ABSTRACT**

A rich literature has developed on the construction of national identity in curricula worldwide and in Asia (Adam 2005; Lall and Vickers 2009). In particular, states have used history education to transmit their self-legitimizing vision and encourage students to adopt the subject position of citizen (Hein and Selden 2000).

In Myanmar too, successive governments have used schooling, textbooks and history curricula for nation-building purposes, promoting a concept of national identity relying increasingly on heroes, golden eras and national enemies, tightly linked to the historical perspective of the Burman ethnic majority. Famously, under military regimes (1962-2011), three great kings, presented as the "unifiers" of what would become Burma/Myanmar, have featured prominently in the textbooks (and elsewhere), with their successive empires presented as early forms of today's Union of Myanmar.

In such an ethnically diverse country, this narrative has had limited success in terms of fostering nation-building, and was often pointed out as an evidence of political agenda of "Burmanization" orchestrated by a Burman-dominated State. Meanwhile, in the borderlands of the country, several "ethnic" armed-groups have developed parallel education systems, in which they too have been teaching history classes to build their own nations, using similar methods but different heroes, golden ages and enemies (Salem-Gervais and Metro 2012).

In the wake of the political transition which started in 2011, a new national curriculum is in the process of being produced, grade after grade, with substantial involvement of international and foreign institutions, such as Japan International Cooperation Agency and Asian Development Bank. While it is too early to review the whole curriculum, the available history textbooks do not seem to be a complete departure from the narratives taught under the military regimes (Salem-Gervais 2018, Metro 2019).

After discussing the difficulties of producing and teaching a new and more inclusive discourse on the nation's history, we will describe the opportunities and challenges offered by the development of local curricula (for each of the 14 States and Regions) in the context of the decentralization process of the Union of Myanmar. The ongoing production of the local history sections of these curricula, while

undeniably offering an interesting complement and counterpoint to the national curriculum, indeed tend to create debates between local ethnic stakeholders. In many instances, ethnic actors living in the same region have very different perspective on history, one group's hero being often, precisely, the other group's villain.

## **BIODATA**

**Nicolas Salem-Gervais** is a Maître de conférence at the Burmese language section, Institut National des Langue et Civilisations Orientales (INALCO) in Paris, and is affiliated to Centre Asie du Sud-Est (CASE). Since 2007, his research has been dealing with various aspects of education and nation-building in Myanmar. He has been collaborating with Urbanize since October 2018.

**Mael Raynaud** is a political analyst with a strong interest in the history, cultures, identities and languages of the mainland Southeast Asian region. He has worked in Myanmar and Thailand for more than 20 years, and is the co-founder and head of Urbanize: Policy Institute for Urban and Regional Planning based in Yangon. The policy institute currently focuses its research on the process of decentralization in Myanmar, including the education system and its implications on local identity, cultures and languages.

**Panel 4:  
Tribes and Tribalism: Defining Multiculturalism in Taiwan**

**Dr. Alisa Jones  
University of Tübingen, Germany**

**ABSTRACT**

Since Taiwan's transition to democracy in the 1990s, and particularly since the beginning of the twenty-first century, the ethos of multiculturalism has been loudly trumpeted by politicians and policy-makers. The contemporary rhetoric of multiculturalism of course acknowledges an indisputable fact - that Taiwan *is* an ethnically diverse society - which was largely suppressed or ignored while the authoritarian KMT regime was attempting to impose on the Taiwanese populace a totalising vision of Chineseness following the island's hand-over to ROC control. This rhetoric likewise lays claims to liberal progressive values which, implicitly or explicitly, are positioned both as a counterweight to the illiberal and often 'traditional' values espoused under authoritarian rule, to assert similarity to other liberal democracies and, by extension, to emphasise difference from authoritarian China. Unsurprisingly therefore, it is the pan-Green camp that has embraced multiculturalism most warmly and it would be easy (if not observing closely) to assume that this discourse is a fresh idea born of political democratisation, social liberalisation and a desire to repudiate authoritarian Chineseness.

Notions of multiculturalism, however, are not new to Taiwan, nor are they entirely benign or neatly correlated positively or negatively with either the more China-friendly pan-Blue camp or independence-leaning pan-Greens. Taiwan has a complex history with multiculturalism in which ethnic relations are coloured by the time and circumstances in which successive waves of immigrants, mainly from China, have arrived and by the near annihilation of the 'first nations' indigenous peoples who, like their counterparts in many other developed countries, are disproportionately poor and marginalised by the settler community. The one-nation discourse emanating from the KMT-formulated story of a great and glorious Chinese nation (*zhonghua minzu*) born of a peaceful integration of diverse peoples (*minzu ronghe*) can often seem strikingly similar to more recent 'we are all Taiwanese' cries which, while signalling that 'we are not China', often elide or silence minority voices. Recent efforts towards multiculturalism which endeavour to include these voices are, therefore, freighted with old habits of thinking, speaking and acting which may run counter to or even undermine stated efforts to promote diversity. These efforts have been further developed, but, at the same time, complicated by a new wave of immigrants from Southeast Asia.

This paper explores different incarnations and discourses of multiculturalism, diversity, immigration and integration through analysing the ways in which Taiwan's history - and the different peoples who have made that history - has been represented in school curricula and textbooks. It demonstrates that, despite recent reforms, history remains configured for the most part as a teleological process of national formation which legitimises the polity. While this may be almost inevitable



given Taiwan's unique political position as de facto independent, but de jure largely unrecognised, it ensures that defining the outer limits of the nation (principally the island's relationship to China) continues, for the time being at least, to take precedence over the messier and more morally ambiguous history of relations between the different ethnic groups who live there.

### **BIODATA**

Alisa Jones is senior lecturer at the Institute for Asian and Oriental Studies and research development manager at the China Centre at the University of Tübingen. Her research and publications focus on the politics of history and education in East Asia (principally China and Taiwan) and the ways in which they are deployed to cultivate concepts of citizenship and to promote values, ideologies and identities. She is currently researching the relationship between value transformation and public health policies in Taiwan, as well as participating in collaborative projects on entrepreneurship, ethics and corporate social responsibility in China.

**Panel 4:  
Re-constructing the Nation: Struggles in Portraying  
Ethnic Minorities in Chinese Mainstream History  
Textbooks**

**Dr. Fei Yan  
South China Normal University, Guangzhou**

**ABSTRACT**

This presentation examines the changes to the portrayal of minority ethnic groups in Chinese history textbooks since the establishment of the People's Republic of China (PRC) in 1949. It shows that ideological shifts in the Communist Party's stance have led to ethnic minorities being portrayed in changing and even contradictory ways in school textbooks. In the history textbooks of the 1950s, the Chinese nation was largely defined as a Han nation-state, and other ethnic groups were generally represented as non-Chinese who had historically been 'threats' or 'enemies' of the Han/Chinese. It was not until the reform era from the late 1970s that a more inclusive and multi-ethnic conception of Chinese nationhood was adopted, with ethnic minorities incorporated into the narrative of national history and portrayed more positively. However, as the party took an increasingly nationalist turn from the 1990s, messages of socialist internationalism were downplayed, and Han ethno-centrism re-emerged once again in textbook narratives, with ethnic minorities correspondingly marginalised.

This presentation also shows that, although ethnic minorities have been portrayed very differently in history textbooks as the dominant political ideology has evolved, certain themes have remained relatively constant. These include the representation of the backwardness of the minority groups in relation to the more 'advanced' Han. This reflects the persistence of 'Chinese culturalism' at the core of modern conceptions of Chinese nationhood, allied to a Han 'civilising mission' legitimating rule over 'minority' regions and populations.

This presentation argues that while history education has always been used by the Communist party to inculcate a highly state-centred vision of national identity, underlying conceptions of nationhood have been rather fluid, and there has been no consistent progress towards a more inclusive notion of 'Chineseness'. This finding challenges earlier studies which claimed to trace an ever-more 'multi-ethnic' trajectory in official discourse on national identity. This presentation shows that such 'progression' remained acutely vulnerable to shifts in political ideology. Finally, this presentation concludes that the reversion to a more Han-chauvinist, ethnocentric narrative in the recent textbooks, along with persistence of an assimilationist approach towards minority groups, embodies the fundamental dilemma encountered by the Chinese government in its efforts to incorporate minority groups into the national self. That is, China has struggled (and is still struggling), in the words of Benedict Anderson, to stretch 'the short, tight skin of the nation over the gigantic body of its empire'.

### **BIODATA**

Fei Yan is a post-doctoral research fellow at South China Normal University in Guangzhou, China. He completed his Ph.D at the Institute of Education, UCL. His Ph.D thesis examines the representation of ethnic minority groups in Chinese history textbooks and he has published an article (with Edward Vickers) on the topic in *Asian Pacific Journal of Education*. His research interests include Chinese national identity, citizenship education and education for and about minority ethnic groups in China.

**Keynote Speech 2:  
Cure or Disease? History Education and the Politics of Reconciliation  
in East Asia**

**Prof. Dr. Edward Vickers  
Kyushu University, Fukuoka**

**ABSTRACT**

Underlying the long-running 'textbook wars' between Japan and its East Asian neighbours is the premise that, if only the teaching of contentious history could be done 'right,' international reconciliation would follow. But is this the case? Are East Asia's international (or inter-regional) disputes over history education susceptible to resolution through tweaks to curricula and textbooks? Or is conflict over the past actually rendered more intractable by entrenched notions of historical 'correctness' that, ironically, are broadly shared amongst the disputing parties?

In this paper, I undertake a comparative analysis of the politics of history as a school subject across East Asia, discussing cultural and institutional factors that help explain the bitterness of the disputes history education engenders. In the process, I question the validity or relevance of invoking Western Europe's post-war experience of reconciliation (and the role played there by history education) as a model for East Asia. I argue instead that the East Asian pattern, whereby history curricula have become an arena for the competitive assertion of victimhood, is internationally far more typical than that of post-war Europe. In order for this to change, and for history education to support reconciliation rather than hindering it, difficult choices must be confronted not just about what aspects of the past should be taught or commemorated, but also about how and when past suffering should be forgotten or set aside. But an honest engagement with such dilemmas would require a political transformation that is currently hard to imagine. East Asian experience demonstrates that history education can as easily serve to catalyze conflict as to foster reconciliation - and that the role it performs depends largely on political factors with which teachers and textbook writers, on their own, can hardly hope to contend.

**BIODATA**

Edward Vickers is an Associate Professor of Comparative Education at Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan. He researches the contemporary history of education in Chinese societies (mainland China, Taiwan and Hong Kong), with a particular focus on the role of schools and other public institutions (e.g. museums) in political socialization. He also conducts comparative research on portrayals of foreign 'Others', through schooling and other media, in the societies of East Asia, and has recently been involved in coordinating a project looking at portrayals of Japan in other East Asian societies. He teaches a broad range of undergraduate and postgraduate courses related to Comparative and International Education - including a postgraduate seminar on China's education system. He is also involved in the Asia Joint Degree Project run by Tohoku University, of which he is an external auditor.

**Panel 5:  
Negotiating Ethnic Diversity and National Identity in  
History Education: The Case of Thailand**

**Prof. Dr. Thanet Aphornsuvan  
Thammasat University, Bangkok**

**ABSTRACT**

Thai national history was and is the only version of history textbook being taught from primary, secondary, to high school and university level. The paper will discuss the political ramifications of the royal nationalist historiography, the emergence of pluralism and non-Thai historiography and their contribution to the challenge of the national identity.

Specifically, I will argue that history education in Thailand was an ideational as well as ideological component in the process of formation and development of the modern Thai nation-state, making it the homogeneous nation under the absolute monarchy. The historic task of creating a new modern notion and concept of Thai history was undertaken exclusively by the royalist elites in collaboration with Western colonial scholars. The crucial concept in Thai history is its Thainess which meant free people as evident in the foundation of the first kingdom of Sukhothai in the 14<sup>th</sup> century. From early on Thai historiography was groomed along the Orientalist outlook, based upon the structure of royal chronicles to rewrite and delete the other ethnic groups in the north, northeast, and south from asserting their ethnic identities within the Thai narrative. In so doing they were assimilated into the major Thai race, making them all Thai but not equal citizen.

**BIODATA**

Thanet Aphornsuvan is Distinguished Fellow and Professor at the Faculty of Liberal Arts, Thammasat University. He was awarded the Thailand Research Fund (TRF) Senior Researcher Scholar (2013-16), was former Director of the Southeast Asian Studies Program at the Faculty of Liberal Arts, (2004-07) and Dean of the Faculty of Liberal Arts, Thammasat University (2007-10). He holds a PhD from Binghamton University, USA.

He has been Visiting Research Scholar at various institutions such as the Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies at the Australian National University (1994) and Cornell University (2003) and the Asia Research Institute at National University of Singapore (2004). He also has been Visiting Professor at the Center for Southeast Asian Studies at Kyoto University (1997) and the Southeast Asian Studies Program at University of California at Los Angeles (2003). Thanet has done research on the history of the US South, the history of Thai intellectual ideas and the history of Patani. His fields of interest are Thai intellectual history and comparative study of Asian intellectual history.

**Panel 5:  
"Religion First, Ethnicity Second": Representations of  
National Identity in History Education in Indonesia since  
1998**

**Dr. Agus Suwignyo  
Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta**

**ABSTRACT**

The aim of this paper is to examine the representations of national identity in history education in Indonesia since 1998. The writing of Indonesian history by Indonesian historians has developed so vastly over the past twenty years to represent the process of democracy the country has enjoyed since the fall of the New Order regime. However, the ways national history is taught at schools have remained relatively unchanged; it is diffusionist in nature aiming at a state-prescribed identity formation. This paper argues that Islam has become a centripetal theme in Indonesian history education which shifts the negotiation of national identity as sourcing from ethnic diversity to religion. Islamo-centrism has competed with secularist proponents of the state ideology, Pancasila, not so much in the official formulation of the national history curriculum and textbooks as in the practices of history teaching and teachers' training. While recent trends for Islamism in history education have a transnational aspect of Islamic revival, this paper asserts that the Indonesian case reflects a long history of the debates about ethnic and religious identities in the construction of an 'Indonesian race' back to the early twentieth century.

**BIODATA**

Agus Suwignyo is an assistant professor in History at the History Department, Faculty of Cultural Sciences, Gadjah Mada University Yogyakarta. He earned his doctorate degree from Leiden University, the Netherlands in 2012 on the teacher training in Java and Sumatra from 1890 to 1969. His recent publications include 'Diffusionism in World History Teaching in Indonesia 1950 - 2006' in *World History Teaching in Asia: A Comparative Survey*, ed. Shingo Minamizuka (Berkshire, 2019); 'Gotong royong as social citizenship in Indonesia 1940s - 1990s', *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, forthcoming.

**Panel 6:  
Singapore Comes to Terms with Its Malay Past: The  
Politics of History in a Chinese-multiracial City-state**

**Associate Prof. Dr. Michael Barr  
Flinders University, Adelaide**

**ABSTRACT**

Singapore's official historiography is a shifting compromise between competing visions of Singapore, most of which have their origins in the politics of ethnic identity that lay behind its Separation from Malaysia in 1965. The issue of ethnic communalism was a central feature of Singapore's birth as an independent republic and it left the government in a quandary: how to talk about the country's history when the main feature of its birth was mired in contention between its dominant Chinese population and its large Malay minority? Its short-term answers to this dilemma set the stage for a long-term, slow-motion evolution of official approaches to national history, all of which involved holding Malay contributions to Singapore's success at a discount. This was done variously by excluding centuries of Malay agency completely from the record (by refusing to recognise Singapore's pre-colonial history), by presenting episodes of Malay agency as passive responses to British initiatives (notably by distorting the roles of Malay royals in the foundation and the economic development of colonial Singapore), and – for more than a decade – by disparaging and discounting the value of local History per se. Each of these responses was determined in the main by the political needs and fears of the government, buttressed by an implicit Chinese prejudice against Malays, and usually validated by the scholarship of local and international scholars. Yet when there were sudden changes in direction and strategy, the explanation was usually found in politics rather than in scholarship. This chapter explores the shifting phases and drivers of Singapore's official historiography, from the foundational moment of 1965 through to the latest developments of the 2010s – the latest development being the slow collapse over the last two decades of one of the mainstays of Malay exclusion – the refusal to consider Singapore's pre-colonial past as part of Singapore's history. The successful rehabilitation of Singapore's Malay history is not yet complete, but it is a hopeful sign that the latest change is being driven by scholars rather than by politicians. And while politics may have retreated to a more passive role than in earlier periods, it is also comforting to see that establishment figures and institutions are taking public roles in the exercise.

**BIODATA**

Michael Barr was awarded his PhD in History by the University of Queensland in 1998 for his thesis on the development of Lee Kuan Yew's political thought. He received a national award from the Asian Studies Association of Australia for his dissertation and then won a Queensland University of Technology Postdoctoral Research Fellowship, which he used to continue his research on Singapore politics while writing a book on the 'Asian values' debate. He subsequently accepted an ARC postdoctoral research fellowship, which he took at Queensland University. The

second fellowship was dedicated to continuing his research on Singapore. In 2007 he joined Flinders University as a lecturer in International Relations and became the director of several degree programmes and majors. He has been an Associate Professor since 2014.



**Panel 6:  
Evolution of Historical Narratives in Secondary History  
Textbooks Since Independence in Malaysia**

**Associate Prof. Dr. Helen Ting  
Institute of Malaysian and International Studies,  
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia**

**ABSTRACT**

Malaysia is demographically a multiethnic and multireligious society. In terms of policies of national integration and discourses on national identity after achieving independence, the country has undergone stages of changes, which may broadly be summarized as a tension between Malay ethno- and religious nationalism and multiculturalism. The manner in which these changes affected the writing and teaching of history in schools was not a straightforward process. This is because various actors and agents, from the policy makers, education ministry officials from different departments to textbook writers, academics and civil society actors, had all played a part in the production of the final outcome of the history textbooks. This paper is concerned mainly with the historical evolution in the writing of secondary school history textbooks, even though history is also taught in primary schools as well.

Immediately after the independence of Malaya in 1957 and the formation of Malaysia in 1963, the writing of history textbooks was concerned mainly with switching from a historical perspective based on colonialism to a more national centric narrative of history. While concerned with the articulation of a Malaya-centric history, the general thrust of the narrative adhered to a more academic outlook and was relatively inclusive and balanced. Attention paid to minorities suffered progressive erosion as history education became increasingly enmeshed with the overt agenda of promoting incrementally patriotism and Malay ethno-nationalism from the late 1980s. The millennial version of history textbooks in particular had introduced the Malay concept of *ketuanan Melayu* which corresponds variously with the meaning of Malay hegemony or Malay sovereignty. Since 2016, new version of lower secondary history textbooks has been published based on the new curriculum. In 2018, Malaysia voted out for the first time the ruling coalition which had governed the country since independence and ushers in a new federal government. A new Form 4 textbook is to be published by the end of 2019, and one of its curriculum objectives refers to the importance and the role of diverse races and ethnic groups in the formation of the Malaysian nation-state.

This paper will attempt at analyzing and comparing changes in the orientation of historical narratives in successive editions of textbooks using the framework developed by social psychologist, Karina Korostelina who has worked extensively on the promotion of a culture of peace through history education. Korostelina has constructed a framework to analyse how history education could shape social identity at three levels, namely, the establishment of the connotation of ingroup identity, the justification of intergroup relations and social hierarchies, and the legitimization of power structure and mobilization of collective actions.

### **BIODATA**

Helen TING Mu Hung (PhD in Political Science, Sciences Po), is associate professor and senior research fellow at the Institute of Malaysian and International Studies (IKMAS), Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia (UKM). Her research interests are on the politics of national identity, policies of national integration and the identity and agency of collectivities. She has been researching on the history of nation-building in Malaysia as well as the use and abuse of history education to promote social cohesion and a sense of belonging. She has published widely on contemporary history education in Malaysia and spoken in international and local fora on the subject. Her latest publications related to history education are a contribution to the *The Palgrave Handbook of Conflict and History Education in the Post-Cold War Era* and a book chapter entitled, 'Malaysian History Textbooks and Sense of Belonging'.