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Abstract:

Just as the failure to reconcile views of the past and to address historical injustice has damaged inter-state relations in East Asia, the Goguryeo/Gāogōuli dispute has harmed relations between South Korea and China. In this chapter, we provide a detailed analysis of the dispute, and explore how this contestation has been reconciled through elite settlement, UNESCO's arbitration and the idea of shared history.
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Introduction

History tends to be written for specific audiences, and the Goguryeo/Gāogōuli dispute between Korea and China is no exception. According to Chase, 'shared stories of the past are a primary source of national identity'. All histories are contemporary histories, or the history of ideas. In the eyes of Oakeshott, historians create history through their writing. If the writing of history is predominantly the remit of state elites, the facts at the heart of nationalist narratives may be fabricated and lack deliberative qualities. And if history is re-imagined and re-written free of competing voices, it is vulnerable to 'mythmaking'. That is, the 'divergence of national memories created by elite historical mythmaking' has 'perpetuated and reinforced the problems of history' in relations between East Asian states. In China, for instance, 'historical writing... has been closely linked to elite political power'.

East Asian history – particularly the legitimacy of national boundaries and political units – has been fiercely contested since the Pacific War (1941–45). The aftermath of the war witnessed the emergence and re-emergence of independent nation-states, which have appropriated that trauma and used it to forge new identities. History plays a significant role in nation building and the construction of identities, but it has also hindered regional integration. The nationalist politics of history is often deliberately subjective, and distorts the past. History may legitimate territorial claims, and nationalists often appeal to historical 'facts', but Renan noted a century ago 'Getting history wrong is an essential part of being a nation'.

The Goguryeo/Gāogōuli dispute is a primary instance of history being a source of tension and animosity in East Asia. The names of the disputed kingdom are based on the same Chinese characters (高句麗) but are pronounced differently in each language. Both sides agree that Goguryeo/Gāogōuli survived for seven centuries, from about 37BC until 668AD. The kingdom is commonly agreed to have occupied territories that are now recognized as Manchuria in northern China and the Korean Peninsula. Goguryeo is of great historical importance to Korea, being one of the kingdoms (along
with Silla and Baekche) that were unified and formed the Goryeo dynasty (918–1392 AD). For Koreans, Goguryeo is intrinsically linked to nationhood and identity formation. China, in contrast, claims that Gāogōuli was but one territory that forms part of the multi-millennial, multicultural Chinese civilizational sphere. In this view, China is a super-state that has absorbed minority peoples. This is a political principle to which most Chinese people subscribe.9

The historical dispute involves the possession – both in the physical and spiritual sense – of cultural assets derived from long-extinct civilizations. China and the Koreas both claim to be the legitimate heirs to a kingdom that occupied certain parts of what are now northern China and the Korean peninsula. In addition to the Goguryeo–Gāogōuli dispute, there are other disputed issues such as the lineage of Confucius, the poet Qu Yuan, Sun Yat-sen and Mao Zedong, traditional medicine, calligraphy and the Dragon Boat (Dano/Duanwu, 端午) Festival between Korea and China.10 What makes the Goguryeo dispute unique is that in securing a claim to the history of an ancient civilization, governments have sought to eliminate competing claims in the present to their sovereign right to the territories where those civilizations existed – and all people, natural resources and other assets within those territories. What Koreans refer to as the Goguryeo kingdom encapsulates territory within China's present borders, but Koreans have not – as yet – sought to reclaim that territory. They have, however, sought to lay claim to the history of the kingdom. China is intent on preventing any claims by Korea to lands now under Chinese jurisdiction. Moreover, the dispute concerns historical memory and legacy: how an ancient kingdom relates to the present-day identities of China and Korea. In seeking to 'gain control of their past and explore their heritages',11 these two states have made competing and seemingly mutually exclusive claims about the history of the kingdom.

After the dispute erupted in an uncontrolled manner via online forums, leaders from both societies attempted to re-appropriate the debate and reach an elite settlement. This fits well a general pattern whereby national leaders and elites have been critical in handling the politicization of the past (see Chapter X in this volume), and the identity conflicts it causes. A collection of essays on the politicization of history confirmed that efforts by political leaders are critical in controlling the retelling of the past and in achieving justice.12 Germany took great efforts to face up to traumatic history of the World War II, openly made an official apology in dealing with the legacies of Nazi fascism.13 Japanese political leaders have also become more conscious of regional reactions to how history textbooks represent events of the war. In 1998, former Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi offered South Korean President Kim Dae-jung 'a written apology… for past sufferings' which Japan caused its neighbors prior to and during the war. Further, 'Kim accepted with sincerity this statement of Obuchi's recognition of history and expressed his appreciation for it'.14 Unfortunately the momentum towards reconciliation did not continue. Former prime minister of Japan, Junichiro Koizumi, made several visits to Yasukuni Shrine between 2001 and 2006, in order to secure the electoral support of right-wing groups such as the Association of Bereaved Families. The current prime minister, Shinzo Abe, also visited the shrine in December 2013. In a comprehensive study of the Pacific War, Japan's Yomiuri Shimbun (see Chapter X) argued that Yasukuni acts as a symbolic impediment to better relations with its neighbors.15 That is, visits to the shrine by Japanese leaders, and the vitriolic response from their Chinese and Korean counterparts, were not conducive to the resolution of history disputes.
In contrast, both China and South Korea have made a conciliatory effort to settle down the Goguryeo/Gāogōuli dispute; this result has not followed the prediction that 'a dangerous cycle of existential conflict is likely to ensue'. This chapter will study how Goguryeo/Gāogōuli became a source of tension between South Korea and how this issue is reconciled and managed. It proceeds as follows. The next two sections review how Chinese and Korean scholars have interpreted the history of Goguryeo/Gāogōuli, and thereby identify how the dispute is situated within the wider memory problems in East Asia. The chapter next analyzes how this seemingly intractable Goguryeo dispute was managed through a compromise between China and Korea. In the conclusion, we account for the three factors or mechanisms that facilitate the reconciliation of historical disputes.

Chinese perspectives on the kingdom

Tang-era (618–907AD) records referred to Goguryeo, Silla and Baekje as 'the three kingdoms east of the sea' (海東三國). The Han and Tang courts did not consider Korea to be part of China, and instead referred to it as an 'eastern barbarian' state. Similarly, Chinese records refer to the Balhae kingdom, the successor to Goguryeo, as a non-Chinese state. Balhae was referred to as 'the flourishing kingdom east of the sea' (海東盛國), adding further weight to the claim that it was separate from China.

In 1934, Lu Simian, a Chinese historian, wrote a book of Chinese nationalities including a lengthy discussion about Gāogōuli. He examined Chinese and Korean sources to trace the origin and evolution of Gāogōuli. Lu mentioned that the Han dynasty established a county government there. Fan Wenlan, a famous Marxist historian, endorsed the principle that because China is a multi-ethnic state, all minorities ought to be treated equally. He called Sui's war against Gāogōuli an invasion and regarded Tang-era Emperor Tachong's war against Goguryeo as unjust, which led his failure to conquer Gāogōuli in 644AD. These two famous historians struggled with the historical question of how to treat Goguryeo. Both regarded it as one of China's nationalities, but they did not define Goguryeo as a 'Chinese regional dynasty' or a 'local kingdom under the auspices of the ruling authorities of ancient China'.

In the late 1990s, Chinese developed a revisionist view of the kingdom's history. At a symposium on Gāogōuli held at Tunghua University in 1998, Han Zhongfu proposed that Gāogōuli was a provincial state (a 'local regime') which an ancient Chinese tribe founded; and that it was a provincial Chinese state that later became a neighboring (non-Chinese) state, following the relocation of its capital from Jian to Pyongyang. Chinese historians 'cite the evidence of tribute and investiture' to argue that Goguryeo shared a 'subordinate relationship' with China. They also, however, reflect China's long-standing self-image as a Confucian moral exemplar to other states, such as Korea. Chinese school textbooks in the 1930s and 1940s, for instance, referred to Gāogōuli and Balhae as kingdoms that Chinese culture 'assimilated' or 'absorbed'. Due to Sinocentrism, the distinction between ethnic minorities and foreign states is often blurred to Chinese eyes.

In particular, the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences has organized the Northeast Project which focused on China's borders with the two Koreas, together with other
research projects on China's borders with Russia and Mongolia, as well as Tibet and Xinjiang. Importantly, three heads of the department of propaganda in three northeast Chinese provinces have been involved in the Northeast Project on Goguryeo.

In response to it, the Korean side berated China for 'stealing' Korean history, and responded by establishing the Goguryeo Research Foundation in 2004. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Culture chaired meetings relating to the history project, underlining the importance of the issue at that time. The dispute intensified due to the competing bids by China and North Korea to have Goguryeo artefacts listed by UNESCO as world cultural heritage sites. North Korea's bid to include Goguryeo murals in the north of the Korean peninsula listed by UNESCO as worthy of world heritage protection in 2003 elicited a response from China, which lodged a claim in relation to Gāogōuli castles and tombs located in Manchuria. The South Korean government supported the North's bid, supplying $100,000 a year in aid for the conservation of Goguryeo tombs. The dispute escalated when South Korean scholars viewed China's claim in light of the expanding Northeast Project, under the aegis of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, which intended to strengthen Chinese claims to Gāogōuli. China refused to allow Korean survey teams to inspect Goguryeo sites and artifacts, and to verify or disprove Chinese assertions that the artifacts were of Chinese origin. Chinese scholars associated with the Northeast Project also claimed that Gojoseon, Gando and Balhae were of Chinese origin, which raised tensions with Korea even further.

Arguably, the main motivation for Chinese claims to Gāogōuli was to strengthen its claims to its northeast territories for fear that a reunified Korea might seek to appropriate some parts of Manchuria. Specifically, China sought 'historical justification for the modern-day inclusion of ethnic Koreans and other minorities, as well as their territories' into the PRC. Modern conceptions of the nation-state, which imply exclusive sovereignty over a fixed territory and a population sharing a common language and culture, were applied to events that occurred at a time when borders and sovereignty were far looser concepts. Yi In-cheol, of the Goguryeo Research Foundation, argued that 'Chinese history precisely is "not" the history of today's China… [this] vision of history… is utterly territory-centered… History is not the sum of past events taking place within a defined area of land, but an aggregate of human actions and affairs'.

The main motivation of China's claim to Gāogōuli is territorial, but the driving force behind it has been associated with Chinese continuing struggle with its own modern conception of national identity. Given the fact that China inherited the territories of Qing dynasty, modern China cannot build its nation upon a narrow Han nationalism. Consequently China has revised historical texts and historical evaluations. For example, Zen Guofan, who served the Qing and defeated a peasant rebellion was regarded as a Han traitor, but now is embraced as a great Chinese national hero. With regards to the Gāogōuli issue, even in the 1930s under the Republic of China, Gāogōuli was treated as an ethnic minority. Those scholars who hold the view that Gāogōuli is China's minority regime just follow the intellectual extreme logic of China's national identity building without considering the feelings of Koreans.
Korean perspectives on the kingdom

Most Korean historians argue that Goguryeo was a kingdom inhabitants of the Korean peninsula founded, and that refugees from Goguryeo proceeded to found the Balhae and Goryeo kingdoms, forerunners to the modern Korean state. For these reasons, they contend that the kingdom was wholly or predominantly Korean. According to Cho Bob-jeong of Woosuk University, 'Korean history developed along the lines of Dangun Joseon-Gojoseon-Yemaek and Buyeo-Goguryeo-Balhae… the Korean view of history has been maintained for more than 1,000 years and the Chinese and Japanese history documents also support this part of Korean history'. Official Korean histories, such as the Memorabilia of the Three Kingdoms and History of the Three Kingdoms (Samguk yusa and Samguk sagi) contain numerous references to the historical continuity of Goguryeo and modern Korean states. These histories refer to battles between Goguryeo and various Chinese regimes and therefore an assertion of Korean identity over the kingdom. In this view, Goryeo's naming was a clear indication that the new state was the successor to the northern origins of Goguryeo.

For then-South Korean foreign minister Ban Ki-moon, the Goguryeo issue 'is directly related to the roots and identity of the entire Korean people'. In other words, the issue relates to historical memory rather than territorial claims. According to one Korean writer, Manchuria 'disappeared from Korean history after the fall of the Balhae kingdom'. Given that Goguryeo occupied a specific physical space, however, territorial aspects of the dispute are also relevant (cf. Chapter X for Koreans' imagination of Manchuria).

Korean historiography depicts Goguryeo as a powerful, independent Korean kingdom. Nationalist historians of the early 20th century, especially Shin Chae-ho, sought to promote a racially defined national identity at a time when Korea's very independence as a people and a state was under threat. For Shin, a homogeneous and inclusive Korean race could trace its historical trajectory back to its mythical Tangun founder, through Goguryeo, and onwards to modern Korea. Korean nationalists have 'de-centered China', and emphasised the Manchurian region's centrality to Korean history and identity: the dynasties of Goguryeo, Gojoseon, Balhae and Goryeo can be traced to the region.

Some Koreans regarded an article published in Guanming Daily as 'a declaration of war'. Park Sun-young from Pohang University of Science and Technology, for example, asserted: 'China has declared a "history war", into which other countries, in particular Korea, find themselves unwillingly being drawn into'. The Northeast Project was a 'politically motivated undertaking' that aims to reinforce 'the political influence of the Chinese leadership in regard to assuring national integrity, unity and stability'. For another Korean historian, 'the project is not simple historical research. Its ultimate goal is to come up with weapons of historical theories for contemporary political needs', such as promoting a sense of unity among ethnic minorities in northeast China and combatting attempts by 'hostile forces' to interfere in what China claims are its internal affairs. Koreans also objected to claims by Chinese historians such as Geng Tiehua (a recipient of support from the Northeast Project), that because Goguryeo was an ancient tribe from northeast China, Korea did not have a legitimate claim to its cultural heritage, despite the transfer of the kingdom's capital to Pyongyang.
A joint seminar by Korean academic societies in late 2003 was held in order to 'counter China's distortions of Goguryeo history'. Korean scholars accused their Chinese counterparts of being in the service of an overtly political agenda. According to Yeo Ho-kyu (professor of history, Hankuk University of Foreign Studies), 'The theory of a unified multi-ethnic nation is nothing more than a "territory-first historical outlook" that attempts to determine the nature and course of history solely on the basis of contemporary domain, ignoring the legitimate movers and flows of history'.

Korean scholars criticized publications sponsored by the Northeast Project for their 'selective and discriminate use of Chinese sources and disregard of epigraphic evidence'. Yi In-cheol claimed that Chinese scholars such as Liu Ju presented a misleading interpretation of Goguryeo history, and one that was intended to convey the impression that the kingdom was a provincial state of China. According to Yi, Goguryeo never entered into tributary relations with China. Claims that Goguryeo belongs rightfully to Chinese history, Korean scholars argued, rely heavily on a short passage in Jin Yifu's *Comprehensive history of the Northeast (Dongbei Tongshi)*, a patriotic historiography written in 1941 when China was at war with Japan: the people of Goguryeo 'came from Puyo and they are a part of our "zhonghua minzu [Chinese ethnicity].'' Koguryŏ is the oldest of the states established in the Northeast region'.

Korean historians noted specific instances of what they claimed were a distortion of Goguryeo history, such as the kingdom's defiance of Chinese orders to join in military action against Xiongnu in 12AD. Ma Dejian argued that Goguryeo was subordinate to China, and that Goguryeo's leader was killed for defying China. An alternative interpretation, however, was that Goguryeo defied the directive of China, retaliated against Chinese settlements, and killed a local governor. Another volume sponsored by the Northeast Project emphasized the tributary relations between China and Goguryeo, and downplayed the kingdom's resistance to Chinese invasions and attacks. Korean scholars such as Im Ki-hwan, professor of history at Hanshin University, argued that tributary relations were 'a diplomatic formality' practiced throughout East Asia at the time (see Chapter X). It was 'logically inconsistent to single out Goguryeo' and treat it as a provincial regime.

A defining feature of the Goguryeo dispute was the intensity of online discussions between Chinese and Korean netizens. South Korean netizens waged campaigns to press Korea's claims to Goguryeo. Chinese netizens responded in kind, leading to a series of highly charged online spats. Rather than engendering a more critical evaluation of the competing historical claims, online debates about the disputed kingdom resulted in the exaggeration of foreign threats, the demonization or mis-characterization of dissenting opinions, and the unwillingness and inability of nationalists to critically examine orthodox views of national history.

**Reconciliation: Shared History and Dual Legacy**

*Elite Compromise*
In early 2004 the South Korean minister for culture and tourism, Lee Chang-dong, criticized the 'heated media coverage' of the dispute. The South Korean and Chinese governments recognized the potential of the dispute to damage bilateral ties. According to Kim Tae-ho of Hallym University, 'Korea and China… understand that the issue, if
left alone, would destroy ties'.\textsuperscript{52} On 22 August 2004, Wu Dawei, Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs from China, visited Seoul, and reached a verbal agreement with his counterpart from South Korea after nine hours of discussion.\textsuperscript{53} China agreed to 'make efforts to correct existing distortions' published on a state-run website, and avoid 'additional distortion of interpretation of Goguryeo's history', as the first steps to implementing the verbal agreement with South Korea. The Korean side monitored implementation of the agreement, and noted corrections to various websites and deletions of offending articles and signage in the vicinity of historical artefacts.\textsuperscript{54}

Since this agreement, China has adopted the following measures including the alteration of the Foreign Ministry website's distorted contents in August 2004, the deletion of the People's Education Press website's distorted contents in September 2004, the correction of Xinhua News Agency website's introductory section in January 2005, and the deletion of Xinhua News Agency internet edition's distorted article in July 2005.\textsuperscript{55}

The reconciliation between two governments has cooled down the scorching dispute. This relatively success is due to the prudent political elites from both China and South Korea. Wen Jiabao, the former Chinese premier, intervened in this matter and gave an order to settle the dispute. It is vital for both state leaders to make a compromise as East Asian states oversee the preparation of school history textbooks, and history as an academic discipline has been used to construct a linearity of collective memory.

\textit{The conciliatory idea of shared history}

The significance of Goguryeo to the formation of national identity in China and Korea contributed to the intensification of the dispute. It is mutually incompatible and irreconcilable for Korea to claim that the kingdom is solely Korean, and for China to argue that it is solely the inheritance of China. Rigidly dichotomous views of history (whereby Goguryeo is purported to belong solely either to China or to Korea) result only in the perpetuation of inter-state tensions. The solution lies in developing a reconcilable and agreeable idea by both sides. Such an idea is that of shared history and dual inheritance.

During a conference in 2004 held in Yanji, Li Sheng, a member of Northeast Project Expert Panel, expressed a conciliatory view of Gāogōuli: that China and Korea share the history of the kingdom.\textsuperscript{56} Jiang Mengshan is credited with proposing the theory of 'one history shared by two states' (一史兩用論), or a 'dual inheritance' that more than one modern state can claim. According to Jiang, Gāogōuli ruled territories situated in modern-day Korea and China, its political, economic and cultural centre shifted from Jian to Pyongyang, its people moved to China after the fall of the kingdom, and it maintained tributary relations with various Chinese dynasties. Scholars who hold this position (most of whom are Korean–Chinese scholars from northeastern China) acknowledge the legitimacy of Korean claims, but maintain that the kingdom 'belongs first to Chinese history and then to Korean history'. For this reason, they argue, the history of Gāogōuli 'should be the "one history shared by two states"'.\textsuperscript{57}

Reconciliation requires the Korean side to be comfortable with the notion of shared history. Fortunately enough, there is limited and conditional support in Korea for this notion. For Park Doo-bok of the Institute of Foreign Affairs and National Security, 'ancient history can be shared'. According to Park, 'complex historical processes… have
occurred during the development of human civilization', and 'existing national boundaries are also a product of such historical developments'.\textsuperscript{58} For another Korean scholar, it was completely understandable that the kingdom should be remembered differently by China and Korea: 'Chinese historians have clearly concluded that the history of Goguryeo is an integral element of Korean history and at the same time also a part of the history of China's northeastern region'. It would be 'unrealistic to attempt to separate the history of Goguryeo from China's historical boundaries, for as long as the northeastern region remains part of Chinese sovereign territory'.\textsuperscript{59} A new history textbook even urged Koreans to revisit their view of Balhae, and to see it as a multiracial empire founded by the heirs and refugees of Goguryeo which had previously subjugated the Mohe/Malgal people of northern China. In other words, Koreans were encouraged to shift somewhat from the conventional view of themselves as a culturally homogenous group.\textsuperscript{60}

Consequently, the history of Goguryeo was reconsidered in less absolutist zero-sum terms. According to Lim Jie-hyun, professor of history at Hanyang University,

\begin{quote}
The battle is very unhistorical. In fact, it doesn't make sense to distinguish between Korean and Chinese surrounding the history. At that time, there existed neither China nor Korea. What existed was only Goguryeo. We have to return the history of Goguryeo to the folks of Goguryeo (not the Chinese or Koreans).\textsuperscript{61}
\end{quote}

The intense debates about relations between Goguryeo and various Chinese dynasties also had the useful effect of highlighting to scholars in both China and South Korea that it is difficult to draw clear and uncontestable links between the long-extinct kingdom and various Chinese dynasties. It is unrealistic and unfair to expect a group of people to willingly cede territories over which they have exercised ownership for a lengthy period of time purely based on competing historical claims.

The problem here is that modern conceptions of the nation-state, which imply exclusive sovereignty over a fixed territory and a population sharing a common language or culture, have been applied to events that occurred at a time when borders and sovereignty were far looser concepts.\textsuperscript{62} It is questionable at best to apply the contemporary ideal-type conception of the nation-state to modes of political organization in the distant past, especially given that the Sino–Korean border was only formalized in its current terms early in the 20th century.\textsuperscript{63}

\textbf{International Implications}

China and South Korea are not the only two states to contest sovereignty of both past and present borders. As Wang reminds us, 'History education is no longer a domestic issue in East Asia'.\textsuperscript{64} To handle historical disputes successfully, it may be necessary to have mediation from the international community.\textsuperscript{65} In July 2004 UNESCO reached a decision that alleviated some of the tensions in the Goguryeo dispute: it accepted both sets of claims in relation to the remains of the capital cities, mountain fortresses and tombs that China and North Korea had submitted. Rather than declaring that Goguryeo belonged exclusively to either one side or the other, UNESCO had declared that both sets of claims had some validity.
The decision provided a degree of international legitimacy for the idea of shared history discussed above; and it helped to reconcile this historical dispute. In contrast, UNESCO's decision on the inscription of Preas Vihear temple on 8 July 2008 intensified the historical dispute between Thailand and Cambodia. Thai Foreign Minister Nappadon Pattama initially supported Cambodia's bid for World Heritage Listing. However, the Thai Constitutional Court ruled that the foreign minister had violated Article 190 of Thailand's 2007 Constitution, which calls for a public debate and Cabinet-level approval. As a result Nappadon Pattama resigned over the listing of Preah Vihear by UNESCO on 10 July 2008. Since then Thai government has claimed its historical territories and even sent over 1,000 troops to defend the temple.

International arbitration helped facilitate a compromise in the Goguryeo/Gāogōuli case, but it was less effective in the dispute between Cambodia and Thailand. Specific issues, such as the loss of several lives on the Thai and Cambodian sides, and the appointment of exiled former prime minister Thaksin Shinawatra as an advisor to the Cambodian government, added a degree of tension to the temple dispute that was absent in the case of Goguryeo/Gāogōuli. Another difference was that the Thai–Cambodian dispute centered on a single tangible site, whereas the Sino–Korean case entailed a much wider expanse and range of artefacts. The temple dispute revolved around a single site, so international arbitration was in essence a 'zero-sum game' in which there could be only one winner. The notion of shared history, by contrast, was developed with the express intention of allowing both sides to 'win' insofar as they could incorporate the kingdom into their own historical accounts.

Conclusions

The outcome of the Goguryeo dispute was a compromise. Three sets of actors contributed to the partial reconciliation. At the international level, UNESCO's judgment that both sets of claims had some validity helped both sides to reach compromise. At the national level, state leaders in China and Korea cooperated to resolve the matter after parallel domestic dialogues – or perhaps more strictly, monologues – degenerated in such a way that bilateral relations were damaged. At the societal level, the Chinese scholars have developed the notion of the 'shared history' of Goguryeo/Gāogōuli; while some Korean scholars were comfortable with and supported it. These three sets of actors worked together to find and develop a fruitful way to resolve issues surrounding ancient kingdoms. So far both sides have managed to control the dispute; for example, the dispute over Goguryeo was not mentioned in the Modern History of East Asia, a historical textbook jointly produced by scholars and civil society from China, South Korea and Japan. The Chinese government has also respected the settlement reached in 2004. The prediction on a dangerous cycle of conflicts does not happen. The successful reconciliation of this dispute may offer valuable lessons to the other historical disputes in East Asia, and the key to reconciliation is the idea of shared history. In this world, East Asians have to share common and overlapping history to reduce conflicts.
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