

# **History Textbooks of Transitional States in Central Asia: Comparison of Kazakh and Uzbek Perspectives of Contemporary Korean History**

**Lee Wan Bom**

---

This paper examines how Kazakh and Uzbek textbooks deal with the Korean War after the collapse of the USSR in 1991. Rich in natural resources, these two countries are not only inhabited by a large number of ethnic Koreans but also have close relations with South Korea. The two countries show differences in the transitional process from a closed socialist system to a market economy system. In the case of Kazakhstan that opened its doors to the world and moved away from one-sided relations, its textbooks reflect post-Cold War politics and have removed many of the former USSR's influences. In dealing with the Korean War, the textbooks maintain a neutral position that tries not to assert any one-sided view. In contrast, being a relatively more homogeneous nation and, consequently, more nationalistic, Uzbekistan retains many of the former USSR's influences in its textbook narratives. According to these textbooks, South Korea is very much dependent on the U.S., and in dealing with the independence movement, the North Korean influence is noticeable as only Kim Il-sung's struggles against the Japanese are highlighted. The two countries' textbooks are critical of the bourgeoisie characteristics of South Korean democracy. In particular, Uzbekistan points to the problems of inequality in wealth, labor policy, social welfare policy, and the unification policy. Certainly, these comments are a valuable feedback for South Korea. More exchanges and dialogues with an open mind will improve relations and help everyone gain objectivity and fairness in understanding each other's country in the post-Cold War era. Specifically, correcting any fallacies and misinformation contained in each other's textbooks will improve understanding.

Keywords: central Asia, Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, Korean War, textbooks, Republic of Korea, North Korea

---

## I. Introduction

This paper examines the impact of the transitional process on textbooks; in particular, the transitional process of former USSR countries that are changing from a socialist system to a capitalist system. Central Asian countries have gone through a rapid transitional process of opening and the introduction of a market economy through privatization and Foreign Direct Investment (FDI). Nevertheless, existence of socialist elements like a central government and authoritarian state control makes these countries essential objects of study on transitional states. Aside from this, Central Asia has received the world's attention as a new source of energy in the era of high oil prices and an important area in the war on terrorism against fundamental Islamists.

Among the central Asian countries in the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), Uzbekistan (200,000 ethnic Koreans) and Kazakhstan (100,000 ethnic Koreans) have the highest concentration of ethnic Koreans and have significant trade with South Korea, making them important countries politically to South Korea.<sup>1</sup> Also, many Koreans consider these ethnic Koreans as diplomatic assets who can play an important role in bridging South Korea and the region.

Why then choose textbooks as the object of research? Textbooks are the last line of defense for a state system. For this reason, they tend to be conservative and difficult to revise. Nevertheless, they do change with the times and with changes to a nation's political system. It may not coincide with the actual changes and may even be delayed, but it will eventually change.

### 1. History of Kazakhstan and Its Transitional Process

#### 1) History

Kazakhstan is the ninth largest country in the world, and it is the largest land-locked country rich in mineral resources and with enormous economic potential. The territory spans from the Caspian Sea to its border with Mongolia. Native Kazakhs, a mix of Turkic and Mongol nomadic tribes who migrated into the

---

1. South Korea (Republic of Korea) established diplomatic relations with Kazakhstan on January 28, 1992, and opened a diplomatic office on July 12, 1993. With Uzbekistan, South Korea established diplomatic relations on January 29, 1992, and opened an embassy in Tashkent in December 1993. The Uzbek embassy in South Korea opened in January 1997.

region in the thirteenth century, were rarely united as a single nation until they were conquered by Russia in the eighteenth century. After the demise of Tsarist Russia, it briefly became an independent state before being incorporated into the USSR as the Kyrgyz Autonomous Oblast in 1920. In 1925, its status was elevated to the Kazakhstan Autonomous Republic (Kim et al. 2008:22) and then became a Soviet republic in 1936. It claimed independence after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. During the 1950s and 1960s Virgin Lands program, Soviet citizens were encouraged to help cultivate Kazakhstan's northern pastures. This influx of immigrants—mostly Russian, but also some other deported nationalities—skewed the ethnic mixture and enabled non-Kazakhs to outnumber natives.<sup>2</sup> Independence in 1991 also caused many of these newcomers to emigrate. Kazakhstan's economy is larger than those of all the other Central Asian states combined, largely due to the country's vast natural resources and a recent history of political stability.

## 2) Politics after Independence

Nursultan Abish-uly Nazarbayev came to power in June 1989 as the first secretary of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan and became chairman of the Supreme Soviet on February 1, 1990, and president in April 1990. He was re-elected after the break-up of the Soviet Union on December 1, 1991.<sup>3</sup> Considering the fact that the current president has reigned for the last twenty years, Kazakhstan is hardly a democratic country. However, a direct presidential

---

2. Ethnically, the country is diverse with Kazakhs making up over half the population, Russians comprising just over a quarter, and smaller minorities of Ukrainians, Germans, Chechens, Kurds, Koreans, and central Asian ethnic groups accounting for the rest. These groups generally live in harmony, though ethnic Russians resent the lack of dual citizenship and having to pass a Kazakh language test in order to work for government or state bodies (*BBC News* 2009). On the other hand, according to the Korean Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, the ethnic composition of Kazakhstan consists of Kazakh (57%), Russian (27%), Ukrainian (3.4%), Uzbek (2%), and German (1.6%) as of January 2009. According to the CIA's 1999 census it is 53.4% Kazakh (Qazaq), 30% Russian, 3.7% Ukrainian, 2.5% Uzbek, 2.4% German, 1.7% Tatar, 1.4% Uyghur, and 4.9% other (CIA 2009). The BBC and South Korean reports show that the number of Russians decreased while the number of natives increased. Nevertheless, compared to Uzbekistan the return rate of Russians to their home country and the growth rate of natives are not significant.

3 With the failure of a coup d'état in Moscow in August 1991, a treaty to dissolve the Soviet Union and to create the CIS was signed by eleven countries in Almaty on December 21, 1991.

election is set to take place upon the end of the presidential term. The seven-year term president can only run for re-election once but with the May 2007 constitutional amendment, the first president became an exception and the term was reduced to five years. A referendum in 1995 extended President Nazarbayev's term of office and in 1999 he was again elected president in elections from which his main rival was barred from standing on a technicality. Only he can initiate constitutional amendments, appoint and dismiss the government, dissolve Parliament, call referenda at his discretion, and appoint administrative heads of regions and cities.

Elections on December 4, 2005, returned Nursultan Nazarbayev for a further seven-year term with more than 90% of the votes. The opposition protested that the ballot had been rigged and the observers from the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) declared it to have been seriously flawed. Nazarbayev said the election had been fair and showed that people wanted evolution not revolution. His supporters say he has preserved inter-ethnic accord and stability during the reform years. Nazarbayev has concentrated extensive powers in his own hands and has been accused of suppressing dissent. Although he says he advocates democracy as a long-term goal, he warns that stability could be at risk if change is too swift. Parliament voted in 2007 to allow him to stay in office for an unlimited number of terms. When he does step down, he will have a permanent seat on the defense council and a role as head of the People's Assembly, which unites members from different ethnic groups. The president merged his Otan Party with his daughter Dariga's party, Asar, in July 2006. The move created a vast ruling coalition and was seen as consolidating the president's power. Otan was subsequently renamed Nur-Otan in honor of Nazarbayev (*BBC News* 2009).

Despite being under a one-man dictatorship, politics of Kazakhstan are relatively stable. Economically, it successfully implemented relatively reformist policies during the transitional period. Critics may say differently but the fact that there is criticism implies the country is not a totalitarian state. In fact, there was a democratic movement led by former officials and opposition party politicians in November 2001. In June 2003, Prime Minister Tasmagambetov was forced to resign because of tension between Parliament and the government over the law on the privatization of farmlands. Such political tensions brewing within official politics and the continued survival of the opposition party even in political repression go to show that some degree of political freedom exists in this authoritarian

state. After the landslide victory of the pro-government parties including the Otan Party in the general election of September 2004, the government continued to push forward its policy of ‘evolutionary democracy with stability.’ The CIA calls the country a republic but under authoritarian presidential rule with little power outside the executive branch (CIA 2009). Be that as it may, the future of democracy in Kazakhstan is bright compared to other central Asian countries.

### 3) Transitional Period

Kazakhstan has the most natural resources in central Asia: it has the world’s 17<sup>th</sup> largest oil reserve and will become the 7<sup>th</sup> largest oil producer by 2015. Since independence, there has been major foreign investment in the Caspian oil sector and oil development has brought rapid economic growth.

The break-up of the USSR and the collapse in demand for Kazakhstan’s traditional heavy industry products resulted in a short-term contraction of the economy, with the steepest annual decline occurring in 1994. From 1995-97 the pace of the government’s program of economic reform and privatization quickened, resulting in a substantial shifting of assets into the private sector. Kazakhstan enjoyed double-digit growth in 2000-2001—8% or more per year from 2002-2007—thanks largely to its booming energy sector, but also to economic reform, good harvests, and foreign investment. Inflation, however, jumped to more than 10% in 2007.

In the energy sector, Kazakhstan wants to expand the development of its vast energy resources and to export them to world markets. The opening of the Caspian Consortium pipeline from western Kazakhstan’s Tengiz oilfield to the Black Sea in 2001 substantially raised export capacity. In December 2005, Kazakhstan completed the Atasu-Alashankou portion of an oil pipeline to China (1,000 km), which will eventually extend from the country’s Caspian coast eastward to the Chinese border. Moreover, construction of pipelines connecting Turkmenistan, Kazakhstan, Russia, and further into China are under way. As such, the energy export route mainly concentrated in Russia and the West is now spreading to the East.<sup>4</sup>

---

4. In contrast, Uzbekistan’s energy export, natural gas, is concentrated to Russia. As landlocked countries, central Asian countries rich in natural resources have difficulty exporting via a sea route. This is why they have a keen interest in pipeline construction (Kim 2008:90).

Ninety percent of the Kazakh industrial sector rests on the extraction and processing of these natural resources. Because of this, energy nationalism is bound to emerge in order to protect its natural resources. The country has embarked upon an industrial policy designed to diversify the economy away from overdependence on the oil, gas, and mining sectors by developing its manufacturing potential. The policy also aims to reduce the influence of foreign investment and foreign personnel. The government has been engaged in several disputes with foreign oil companies over the terms of production agreements.

Kazakhstan is exploring ways toward achieving a sustainable economic growth. Upward pressure on the local currency continued in 2007 due to massive oil-related foreign-exchange inflows. Aided by strong growth and foreign exchange earnings, Kazakhstan aspires to become a regional financial center and has created a banking system comparable to those in central Europe. In 2007, its GDP per capita reached \$11,000. Considering the fact that it was \$2,708 in 2004, it has achieved rapid economic growth through the development of natural resources, making it the most dynamic country in central Asia. It aims to reach \$20,000 by 2015.

Nevertheless, poverty is still widespread and Kazakhstan continues to face major economic challenges, particularly with unemployment. At the same time, an elite group of people have grown very rich since independence through privatization and other business deals which opposition figures allege to have been corrupt (*BBC News* 2009).

#### 4) Maintaining Good Ties with Russia and Forging Flexible Ties with the U.S.

Kazakhstan has a 7,500 km long border with Russia and with Russian immigrants accounting for a little more than 25% of its population, it cannot help but be cautious with Russia. Such an approach comes from the fact that it was the last country to declare its independence (December 1991) in central Asia.<sup>5</sup> Russian and Kazakh leaders meet more than ten times a year, officially and unofficially. The two countries' annual trade is worth more than \$10 billion

---

5. In contrast, Uzbekistan introduced its presidential system in March 1990, making it symbolically equal to the presidency of the USSR. This was amid the height of nationalist movements that emerged in the Soviet republics after Gorbachev took power in 1985. Uzbekistan declared its sovereignty in June 1990, and subsequently declared independence in August 1991 (Daewoengje jeongchaek yeon-guwon jijeok jeongbosenta 1994:3).

(Kim 2008:91). Nevertheless, Kazakhstan is trying to move away from the shadow of the former USSR. It is actively engaged in omnidirectional diplomacy with China, the U.S., and the EU based on its geopolitical position of having rich natural resources like oil, gas, and minerals (world's tenth largest copper producer, the largest tungsten reserve, the second largest uranium reserve, and the third largest chromium reserve) and a transport route (Kim 2008:29). Kazakhstan continues to strengthen relations with neighboring states and explores good ties with other foreign powers such as Korea.

Its attempt to establish flexible ties with the U.S. is especially noteworthy. After automatically becoming a nuclear power state along with Ukraine and Belarus after the fall of the USSR in 1991, Kazakhstan secured protection from the U.S. and Russia and abandoned its status as a nuclear power state after receiving financial support from the U.S. to dismantle its nuclear arsenals.<sup>6</sup> As a result, it established a good working relationship with the U.S. in nuclear non-proliferation. It also aids the U.S. in the war in Afghanistan by allowing the passage of U.S. war planes through its air space and participating in the restoration of Afghanistan. It also sent a company of peacekeeping troops to Iraq in 2003. However, perhaps being conscious of Russia, it did not provide a base for U.S. troops. The U.S. has also granted Kazakhstan the status of strategic partner as it recognizes Kazakhstan to be not only an important energy and natural reserve but also an important ally in maintaining security in central Asia. The U.S. also regularly participates in small-scale joint military exercises for anti-terrorism and anti-drug trafficking called Steppe Eagle (Kim 2008:31, 36).

Although Kazakhstan is a Muslim country, it is tolerant of other religions. And due to its rapid economic development, fundamental Islamists have not gained a firm ground in the country, another reason why it was able to establish flexible relations with the U.S.

Kazakhstan has a geopolitical important position as it not only bridges Europe and Asia but is also rich in natural resources. While China and Europe

---

6. In 1991, Kazakhstan had 104 nuclear missile launch mechanisms and two continental nuclear missile launch bases with 1,040 nuclear warheads. In 1990, it closed a nuclear test site in Semipalatinsk. In addition, through its Supreme Council, it declared denuclearization in September 1991. Having done so, it stopped the operation of all its strategic nuclear weapons and disposed of them in 2000. Strategic nuclear weapons were sent to Russia (Daewoe gyeongje jeongchaek yeon-guwon jiyek jeongbosenta 1994:147-8). Some experts argue that its denuclearization efforts and negotiations with the U.S. to receive support can be a useful model for dealing with the North Korean nuclear program (Kim 2008:30-3).

compete to secure oil from it, Kazakhstan is maximizing its advantages. Therefore, aside from the instability coming from authoritarian rule, the future of Kazakhstan is relatively bright.

## 2. History of Uzbekistan and Its Transitional Process

### 1) History and Politics

The Uzbeks, who make up 80% of the Republic of Uzbekistan, lived a nomadic life under the Kipchak Khanate until the fifteenth century. They migrated southward with the fall of the Kipchak Khanate, and in the early sixteenth century, under the leadership of Mohammed Shaybani Khan, they grew in size and took over Transoxiana (today's Uzbekistan) and advanced to Khorasan by defeating the Kazakhs and Moghulistan Khan and destroying the Timur dynasty. But when Shaybani Khan was defeated in the Battle of Marv by the Safavid dynasty, its expansion came to an end, settling down in the central Asian region to form the Khanates of Bukhoro and Khiva. Two hundred years later, in 1709, an additional Khanate of Kokand was formed. At the end of the nineteenth century, they were attacked by the Russian Empire, who were pursuing a southward policy, and subsequently incorporated into the empire. Resistance to the Red Army after World War I was suppressed and a socialist republic was set up in 1924. However, nomads and Muslims strongly resisted Stalin's collective farm system. Immediately after the collapse of the USSR on December 8, 1991, Uzbekistan emerged as a sovereign country after more than a century of Russian rule and joined the CIS. While the period of Russian rule was relatively short, there have been other periods when it was ruled by foreign forces but it maintained independence after the sixteenth century. As a result, observers say that national homogeneity of the Uzbeks is stronger than that of Kazakhs.

Uzbekistan is the most populous central Asian country and has the largest armed forces. There is no real internal opposition and the media is tightly controlled by the state. A UN report has described the use of torture as "systematic." Long-term leader Islam Abduganiyevich Karimov (from the People's Democratic Party, a successor of the Communist Party) tolerates no opposition, and political and rights activists have fled. He shows no signs of giving up power.

President Karimov keeps a tight grip on the country. He has dominated the leadership since 1989 when he rose to be Communist Party leader in then Soviet Uzbekistan. On March 24, 1990, he was elected president by the then Supreme

Soviet and continued in the post after independence. A referendum held in 1995 extended his term until 2000, when he won the presidential elections unopposed. A further referendum in 2002 extended the presidential term from five to seven years, but the expiration of his term in January 2007 went largely unnoticed. He gained another term following elections on December 23, 2007 which opponents dismissed as a sham.

Karimov takes a ruthlessly authoritarian approach to all forms of opposition. The few Western observers who monitored parliamentary elections in 2004 condemned them as having failed to meet international standards and pointed out that all the candidates supported the president.

Karimov has been accused of using the perceived threat of Islamic militancy to justify his style of leadership. Observers say the combination of ruthless repression and poor living standards provides a fertile breeding ground for violent resistance in a volatile region. However, while curtailing the rise of extreme nationalism and Islamic fundamentalism, Karimov pursued nationalist policies to unite the people (Daewoe gyeongje jeongchaek yeon-guwon jiyek jeong-bosenta 1994:95-6). In other words, he is willing to use nationalism but not extreme nationalism.

## 2) Economy

Uzbekistan is one of the world's biggest producers of "white gold" (cotton)<sup>7</sup> and is rich in natural resources, including oil, natural gas (world's 9<sup>th</sup>), uranium (world's 6<sup>th</sup>), and gold (world's 9<sup>th</sup>). Natural gas is an especially big attraction abroad. Uzbekistan is now the world's second-largest cotton exporter and fifth largest producer. However, rigid political control is mirrored in the tightly centralized planning of the economy. Economic reform has been painfully slow and poverty and unemployment are widespread.

The World Bank announced in early 2006 that it would make no new loans to Uzbekistan for the foreseeable future. The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) announced in 2004 that it was slashing aid to Uzbekistan because of the country's failure to reform and its poor human rights record. The national income per capita was estimated to be \$2,400 in 2007.

---

7. However, when there was a surplus of cotton but a shortage of food, the government pushed for wheat farming instead of cotton.

### 3) Leaning toward the U.S.

The U.S. did not have diplomatic relations with Uzbekistan until February 1992, when U.S. Secretary of State James Baker III visited the country and received a promise for democratization. On March 15, 1992, with the normalization of relations between the two countries, they agreed to establish embassies (Daewoe gyeongje jeongchaek yeon-guwon jiyek jeongbosenta 1994:141).

Although Uzbekistan considered friendly relations with Russia and other CIS countries important, it was passive in its efforts to integrate in the Russian-centered CIS. Eventually, it left the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO) of the CIS in April 1999. Its relations with the U.S. improved after President Karimov's visit to the U.S. in 1999 and especially with its active cooperation in the U.S. war in Afghanistan following the September 11 attacks.

The fact that Uzbekistan borders Afghanistan is important to the U.S. from a strategic point of view and Uzbekistan was willing to maximize its geopolitical position. Uzbekistan won favor with Washington by allowing American forces a base in Uzbekistan, affording ready access across the Afghan border. U.S. aid increased for a time. However, the Uzbek Ministry of Foreign Affairs stated on July 7, 2005, that the use of the Karshi-Khanabad airbase was only for the duration of military operations to drive out the Taliban in Afghanistan and it had not signed any treaty with the U.S. allowing the use of the base afterwards (*Jungang ilbo* July 15, 2007). Soon the Uzbek government forbade night flights and limited the number of flights of U.S. jet fighters stationed at the Khanabad airbase. At first, the U.S. government protested officially that it could not accept the demands of the central Asian government to withdraw its troops. However, in 2001, the U.S. military had to move some of its reconnaissance and cargo planes stationed at the Khanabad airbase to the Bagram airbase in Afghanistan and the Manas airbase in Kyrgyzstan. On July 30, Uzbekistan asked the U.S. to remove all of its aircrafts, personnel, and equipment from the base within 180 days (*Voice of America News* July 30, 2005).

### 4) Andijan Unrest: Leaning toward Russia

Why did the U.S. have to remove all its military forces so quickly? The answer is the Andijan unrest. The most recent violence erupted in the eastern city of Andijan on May 13, 2005, when troops opened fire on protesters protesting the jailing of people charged with Islamic extremism. Witnesses reported a blood-

bath with about 500 civilian deaths. The Uzbek authorities criticized terrorism by Islamic extreme militants and put the overall death toll around 180. The EU imposed sanctions and the U.S. threatened to withhold aid when Uzbek authorities rejected calls for an international inquiry. When the U.S. criticized the Uzbek government's handling of the event, Parliament voted to demand that U.S. forces leave their base in the south of the country. Opponents of President Karimov blamed the authorities' brutal determination to crush all dissent. The president blamed fundamentalists seeking the overthrow of constitutional order and the establishment of a Muslim caliphate in central Asia. The president's uncompromising policies have at times created friction between Uzbekistan and other central Asian countries and Uzbekistan has been wary of moves toward closer political integration.

After its independence in 1991, Uzbekistan tried to decrease the influence of its former ruler Russia and form an equal relation. But after the U.S. and other Western countries criticized Uzbekistan's human rights violations in responding to the unrest in May 2005 while Russia supported it, Uzbekistan naturally leaned toward Russia. President Karimov described Russia as Tashkent's "most reliable partner and ally." In November 2005, the two countries signed an agreement paving the way for much closer military and economic cooperation (*BBC News* 2009). Russian businesses have shown an increased interest in Uzbekistan, especially in mining, telecom, and oil and gas. In 2006, Uzbekistan took steps to rejoin the CSTO and the Eurasian Economic Community (EurAsEC), both organizations dominated by Russia. Uzbek authorities have accused the U.S. and foreign companies operating in Uzbekistan of violating Uzbek tax laws and have frozen their assets.

Uzbekistan's position changed from pro-America beginning in 2001 to pro-Russia in 2005. Some experts report that using the improved relations with Uzbekistan, Russia was able to buy natural gas at half price and sell it to European countries for a huge profit. On the other hand, Uzbekistan suspected that the U.S. was behind the unrest and had plans to instigate a civil revolution by constantly raising the issue of human rights violations and supporting the democratization movement. The Uzbek government has tried to instill anti-Americanism into the Uzbek people. In contrast, after stabilizing the political and economic situations, Russian President Putin actively sought to improve Russia's ties with former Soviet republics. Also, Russia not only continues to support the leaders of central Asian countries like the Uzbek president who is doing everything to maintain his authoritarian regime but also cooperates eco-

nomically with these countries. As a result, more and more authoritarian regimes of central Asia are leaning toward Russia both politically and economically.

### 5) Political Situation and Prospect

Currently in Uzbekistan, political freedom is greatly infringed upon as anyone who supported the 2005 unrest is imprisoned. Human rights activists are known to have been jailed. Human rights groups estimate that thousands of ordinary Muslims are in jail accused of plotting against the government. According to a CIA report, Uzbekistan is a republic but has authoritarian presidential rule with little power outside the executive branch (CIA 2009). Although President Karimov will be in his mid-seventies when the next presidential election comes around in 2015, there is no sign of him stepping down. Nevertheless, the Uzbek people believe no one can predict the future.

In fact, starting January 31, 2008, Uzbekistan has allowed the transit of U.S. troops through its southern airbase of Termez to Afghanistan on a 'case by case' review. On March 27, 2008, Richard Norland, U.S. ambassador to Uzbekistan, stated "Afghanistan is a very important issue and both the U.S. and Uzbekistan are interested in this issue" (*Daum News* 2009). In addition, Uzbekistan is vacillating between Russia and the U.S. by withdrawing its membership from the pro-Russian EurAsEC in 2008. Pointing to such moves, observers are commenting that Uzbekistan is turning back to being pro-American. BBC had this to say about Uzbekistan's balancing act: "Karimov is an ally of Washington in the U.S.-led war against terrorism, as well as enjoying the backing of the Russian government" (*BBC News* March 28, 2008).

## II. Deconstruction of the Cold War in Kazakh Textbooks

In Kazakhstan, different historical periods are taught in different classes and grades: 1640-1914 in 9<sup>th</sup> grade modern history, 1914-2000 in 9<sup>th</sup> grade world history, and 1945 to the present in 11<sup>th</sup> grade world history. In Uzbekistan, the period between 1870 and 1914 is taught in 9<sup>th</sup> grade while 1914-1945 is taught in 10<sup>th</sup> grade and 1945-1999 is taught in 11<sup>th</sup> grade. Considering the fact that twentieth century contemporary history is taught in the 9<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> grades in Russia, Kazakhstan has not yet broken from the Russian style of curriculum and grade system (11 years of elementary and secondary schools and 4 years of college).

However, it is reported that it will introduce the western style of 12-14 year grade system beginning 2008 (Kim et al. 2008:51). As for the curriculum, a change started in 2005.

Let's look at the 11<sup>th</sup> grade world history textbook since it covers the time period of the Korean War. In Kodzaxmet-uli et. al (2004a), there is no separate section on South Korea. In Section 13 "Asian Socialist Countries" there are paragraphs on the DPRK.<sup>8</sup> Chapter 4 titled "Japan and other Asian NICs," where one might expect to find some information on South Korea, only covers Japan, ASEAN countries, India, Pakistan and the south Asian countries of Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and Nepal.<sup>9</sup> There is a subsection on the division of the Korean Peninsula (pp. 9-10) and "The Korean War" (pp. 18-20). How South Korea is covered in Kazakh textbooks can be traced to the Russian textbook system. Nevertheless, the division and the war are explained in detail. For example, it states that the division of Korea is a result of the Potsdam Conference:

As agreed upon at the Potsdam Conference, Korea was temporarily divided at the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel. The U.S. occupied the south and the USSR occupied the north. Two superpowers were against reunification and in 1948, two separate governments were formed. The Republic of Korea had Seoul as its capital and Syngman Rhee as its head of state and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea had Pyeongyang as its capital and Kim Il-sung as its head of state. (Kodzaxmet-uli et al. 2004a:18-9)<sup>10</sup>

---

8. This Russian language textbook shows two pictures of Kim Il-sung and of North Korean leader Kim Jong-il welcoming South Korean President Kim Dae-jung at Sunan Airport in Pyeongyang before the Inter-Korean Summit in 2000 (Kodzaxmet-uli et al. 2004a:111-3). In the second photo, Kim Dae-jung is holding Kim Jong-il's hand with two hands suggesting it is highly irregular for Kim Jong-il to come out to the airport to greet him. One extreme interpretation is that Kim Dae-jung was awestruck.

9. There is only a brief mention of South Korea as a successful example of economic development and modernization, but in the 9<sup>th</sup> grade world history 2002 edition and the 11<sup>th</sup> grade world history 2004 Kazakh edition written by the same author, South Korea is covered extensively (O 2004:115).

10. Identifying the Potsdam Conference as the cause of the division of Korea was first made in Russian textbooks. Bak Gil-ryung, senior researcher at the Institute of Oriental Studies at the USSR Academy of Sciences, argued that the superpowers agreed to draw the military demarcation line along the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel at the Berlin Conference in the summer of 1945. He adds that according to the decision made in Berlin, the Japanese surrendered to the Soviet army in the north and to the U.S. army in the south. This argument is repeated in another publication by the USSR Academy of Sciences in 1985 (Soyeonbang gwahakakademi segyesahoejuui

Interestingly, the authors show a neutral position when introducing the U.S. and USSR occupation of Korea. They then provide details of the division:

The fate of the division of Korea turned tragic. Neither the U.S. nor the USSR wanted to reunify the country. In the north, communists led by Kim Il-sung, a captain in the USSR army, took power. Soon, the People's Army was created. Philosophers and activists from the USSR including ethnic Korean scholars from Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan were sent to teach Marx-Leninist theories to Kim Il-sung and other leaders. Officials from different institutions visited the USSR.

In contrast, the Americans brought Syngman Rhee from the U.S. He was one of the Korean bourgeoisie expatriates who fled the repression after the 1919 uprising. The U.S. helped him to set up an administration in South Korea. Various forces proposed an agenda for inter-Korean meetings. The idea of carrying out a general election was raised. But none were agreed upon by both sides. The Cold War and the confrontation of two superpowers on the Korean Peninsula had the most negative impact on the unfolding of the situation in Korea. Just like Germany, preparations were underway to create two separate states under the wings of Moscow and Washington.

As a result of the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers, a joint commission to make recommendations for a single government in Korea was established. But by the spring of 1946, it was clear that two separate governments would be created. North Korea established interim people's councils. Land reforms and nationalization of industries were carried out. Women were granted equal rights with men. America also carried out some reforms in South Korea but was unwilling to give up its power. Two-thirds of the population lived in South Korea, which was mostly rural. Most of the people were farmers with small plots of land and all wanted the redistribution of feudal lands.

In order to involve the UN, the U.S. proposed the Korea question to the UN General Assembly in 1947. The UN commission for Korea was com-

---

gyeongjeyeon-guso 1988). One could conclude that the argument is made without serious consideration since it is not supported by any Potsdam Conference documents, and, thus, is not treated as an accepted argument among scholars.

missioned to supervise a free election. However, the commission was active only in South Korea because North Korea refused to participate. In May 1948, South Korea held a general election to create the National Assembly. Once established, the National Assembly declared the founding of the Republic of Korea and adopted its constitution for all of Korea. However, the Joseon Workers' Party (starting October 1945, the Communist Party was called by this name)<sup>11</sup> held its election for the Supreme People's Council. In September 1948, the Supreme People's Council declared the founding of the DPRK. Thus, the division of Korea was made. (Kodzaxmet-uli et al. 2004a:9-10)

The above explanation of the division of Korea is a relatively neutral one boldly mentioning facts that were taboo in the former USSR during the Cold War era such as the fact that Kim Il-sung returned as a captain of the USSR Army. The paragraph following the above excerpt clearly states that "On June 25, 1950, the DPRK invaded South Korea." However, the sentence immediately following that one says "Pyeongyang, Moscow, and Beijing criticized the South Korean regime and demanded an immediate stop of the war" suggesting that it was South Korea who invaded the North. Perhaps, this is a technical error of forgetting to omit the old argument that South Korea invaded. In reality, it was North Korea who invaded South Korea and blamed the South for the start of the war. For example, the textbook correctly states that "Upon getting the agreement from the regime in Moscow, the DPRK started the war on June 25, 1950." "However, as usual, fabricated reports were propagandized. False reports were accepted as true in all socialist countries and they blamed Syngman Rhee and his party of traitors who followed the instructions of their master, the U.S. Many people were skeptical of how South Korea who planned so carefully to 'eat up' North Korea could fall into the hands of North Korea within three days" (Kodzaxmet-uli et al. 2004a:19).

---

11. This is incorrect because the name North Korean Workers' Party (*bukjoseon nodongdang*) was first used in August 1946 after the merging of three political parties. The Korean Workers' Party became the official name when the North Korean Workers' Party absorbed the South Korean Workers' Party in June 1949. Another minor mistake is found in the chronology graph on page 282 where the date of the founding of the DPRK is indicated as February 1948. The main text correctly records the date as September 1948 but perhaps the graph confused the date with the date of the creation of the People's Army.

But, after three days, North Korea occupied Seoul. The West through the decision of the UN Security Council sent aid to South Korea in the form of an international army from sixteen countries. Mainly composed of Americans, this [UN Forces] pushed back the North Korean army and in turn occupies most of North Korea. At this moment, upon a request from Moscow, the People's Republic of China entered the war. The Soviet air force and artillery were sent. In the spring of 1951, the frontline got entrenched along the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel. This continued until the ceasefire in mid-1953. (Kodzaxmet-uli et al. 2004a:10)

In addition, some repetition of the above excerpt is made on pages 19-20. But this time it gives an exact figure, more than 90%, of the Americans in the UN Forces that is said to have landed at Incheon on September 15, 1950. It clearly suggests that the decision to send the UN Forces was a harsh decision and expanded the war. Nevertheless, it is more critical of the USSR for trying to conceal the truth about the Korean War. On Stalin and Kim Il-sung, the authors give a scornful comment that they were responsible for darkening the international politics for a long time. As such, the above textbook clearly shows a neutral position that moves away from the Cold War mentality and has critical views of both the U.S. and the USSR. The authors mention that the North Korean army once occupied Seoul while the UN Forces once occupied Pyeongyang. Considering the fact that both sides called the occupations liberations, the authors' view is neutral. Basically, one can say occupation when an army advances into a foreign territory and say liberation when an army reclaims its territory occupied by a foreign force (O 2004:142). As such, the textbook labels June 1950 as "the occupation of Seoul by the DPRK army" and October 1950 as "the occupation of Pyeongyang by UN Forces" in a chronology of the Korean War (Kodzaxmet et al. 2004a:283-4). This is a change from previous textbooks from the Soviet era that defined the two events as liberation and occupation, respectively. It is a change from the position of pro-North Korean to neutral.<sup>12</sup> Nevertheless, the caption to the picture of the 2000 inter-Korean Summit calls

---

12. Similarly, December 1950 is labeled as "the liberation of Pyeongyang from UN Forces" and January 1951 as "the occupation of Seoul by the DPRK and PRC armies," and March 1951 as "the liberation of Seoul by UN Forces," thereby showing consistency in the definition of liberation.

North Korea by its official name (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) whereas South Korea is not (Kodzaxmet et al. 2004a:112). Such are the pro-North Korean narratives found throughout the textbook that must be amended.

In addition, the textbook suggests that the Korean War is the biggest war since World War II where two superpowers confronted each other militarily. It also adds that the war was a tragic event that left a deep scar on the minds of the Korean people and is yet to be settled. Lastly, it criticizes North Korea saying "Korean communism based on the idea of Kim Il-sung and his son Kim Jong-il has become a synonym for poverty, totalitarianism, and militarism" (Kodzaxmet et al. 2004a:10).

In the 2007 edition, some revisions were made according to maintaining a neutral position. However, the equation that the UN Forces equals the US army is deleted. Kazakh textbooks tend to be neutral without leaning toward a North Korean or South Korean side. They are also not pro-American or pro-West. There is mention of the Soviet air force and artilleries dominating the aerial warfare against the U.S. Air Force. However, considering the fact that the USSR denies its involvement in the Korean War, such a statement can be interpreted as a critique of the USSR. But to be fair, the USSR's attempt to conceal its involvement and encouragement of China to enter the war can be understood as its intention to avoid a direct confrontation with the U.S., which could have resulted in World War III and the weakening of the U.S. and China at the same time.<sup>13</sup>

In dealing with South Korea after the war, textbooks state that a dictatorial regime was maintained with the support of the U.S. during the Syngman Rhee, Park Chung Hee, Chun Du-hwan, and Roh Tae-woo administrations (O

---

13. Such a view is put forth by Kim Donggil, professor of history at Beijing University, who found the secret document "Letter from Filipov (Stalin) to Soviet Ambassador in Prague, conveying message to CSSR leader Klement Gottwald" in the Russian State Archive of Socio-Political History (RGASPI) in 2005 and published an article titled "Stalin's Letter to Gottwald and the Origin of the Korean War" (*Jungang ilbo* June 25, 2008). According to Kim, the USSR who was confronting the U.S. directly in Europe with the creation of NATO wanted to divide the U.S. forces in Europe by creating a distraction in the Pacific. In the document, Stalin identifies the following reasons for Soviet withdrawal from the Security Council: to show the relationship between the Soviet Union and China, to protest the recognition of the Guomindang as representative for China, to devalue the decisions made by the Security Council (because of the absence of a major world power), and, finally, to bait the U.S. into abusing its newfound power, thus losing its worldwide popularity in the process. Stalin discusses the Korean War and gives his predictions for the end of the war, which sees the involvement of China and the eventual shift in power from the U.S. to the USSR.

2004:115). Such an interpretation about U.S. support, which originates from anti-American Soviet textbooks, can also be found in the Uzbek textbooks discussed below. However, they indicate that South Korea moves toward procedural democracy after the Kim Young Sam government. They also highlight the prosecution of former presidents Chun and Roh during the Kim Young Sam government. They suggest that a bourgeoisie constitutional system is established as the South Korean political system experiences a qualitative change. This is a socialist interpretation based on the dichotomy of the bourgeoisie and proletariat.

On the other hand, a Kazakh textbook still portrays the South Korean political system as based on military dictatorship because: 1) isolated from the USSR and international communist movement, South Korea adopts a bourgeoisie democracy and 2) the occupation by Japan and the U.S. encourages the formation of a military dictatorial system (O 2004:116). In reality, it is hard to find any link between the short-lived U.S. occupation (1945-1948) and South Korea's military dictatorship. However, it is a fact that the U.S. supported the dictators not fully but in a selective and limited way and always emphasized democratization. Similarly, as for Japan, there is a link between Japanese colonial rule and Park Chung Hee who used Japanese capital and Japan's development plan of Manchuria to modernize South Korea, but there is no direct connection between Japan and South Korea's military dictatorships. Such an interpretation can be understood as written by a socialist and thus a remnant of Soviet interpretation.

In addition, pointing out the political changes after the 1990s, the textbook discusses the instability of South Korean democracy. However, it is somewhat outdated, not reflecting the two peaceful regime changes in the 2000s (the election of Lee Myung-bak in 2007 and the election of Kim Dae-jung in 1997). Of course, there are political and economic instabilities such as the candle light movement against the import of U.S. beef during the Lee Myung-bak government and the global economic crisis that originated in the US. Nevertheless, these factors do not downplay the prospect of South Korean democracy.

In the revised 2005 edition of the 9<sup>th</sup> grade contemporary world history (1914-2004) textbook, South Korea is introduced in relation to the events in the Asia Pacific region in the mid-twentieth century with highlights on politics and economic development. It mentions that democratization of South Korea took several decades. According to the textbook, a people's government was formed in the 1980s, and from that point on active liberalization of political activities began. It deals with the high economic growth rate of South Korea, and it also identifies foreign investment, agricultural reforms, and the development of

human resources as factors in the development of South Korea (Kodzaxmet-uli 2005a: 265).

The 2007 edition of the 11<sup>th</sup> grade textbook also covers South Korea after the Korean War in depth. This is a positive change from the 2004 edition written in Kazakh which recognizes South Korea as a country developing into a light and heavy industrialized country in the 1960s but dependent upon U.S. and Japanese economic aid and having problems with chaebols, a faction of monopoly capital (Kodzaxmet-uli 2004b:83-4). In this sense, one could argue that the 2004 edition did not completely break with Soviet textbooks that were anti-American and anti-Japanese.

The revised 10<sup>th</sup> grade world history textbook for the social science and humanities track draws students' interest to the end of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century Korea. In this section, Japan's victories in the Sino-Japanese War and the Russo-Japanese War after Korea was annexed by Japan are introduced along with the U.S.'s active diplomatic support for Japan (Kodzaxmet-uli and Mazitov 2006:15). In the supplement of the revised 9<sup>th</sup> grade world history textbook, materials on the partisan movement in South Korea in the 1930s, especially, the revitalization movement, are presented (Kodzaxmet-uli 2005b). These narratives are similar to that of the former Soviet textbooks.

In the new 11<sup>th</sup> grade textbook, a brief description of South Korea's agriculture and industrial reforms is provided. In addition, internal political developments are analyzed with great interest. It covers the development from a dictatorial regime in the 1950s to the declaration of a parliamentary republic in the early 1960s, to the period of military dictatorship and to the democratic changes within the elite power groups in the early 1990s.

Inter-Korean relations are also mentioned. It introduces reunification as the top priority for both North and South Korea while introducing a proposal to create a federal democratic republic first and then proceed to complete unification. In the case of a complete unification, it explains, Korea would be a new country with a population of 70 million or more and a potential to change the geopolitics of the region. It also adds that the sunshine policy implemented at the end of the 1990s played an important role in the reconciliation of North and South Korea.

Interestingly, the 11<sup>th</sup> grade textbook describes in detail North Korea's nuclear program and other current issues. The authors agree that the nuclear issue must be resolved in consideration with the security of the involved parties, especially, the Korean nation (Saduiikov et al. 2007:158). The nuclear issue is also discussed in the 11<sup>th</sup> grade world geography textbook for the social science

and humanities track. It notes that the centralized state planning, national industry, and limited trade with the international community defines the economy of North Korea (Akhmetov et al. 2007:119).

Kazakh textbooks published through the government designated publication system<sup>14</sup> where the state controls the contents and the publishers—Atamura and Mektep—have moved away considerably from the former Soviet textbook narratives. Considering the fact that the Kazakh government started to publish its own textbooks instead of using the former Soviet textbook in 1997, it is significant progress for the Kazakh textbooks to make such post-Cold War changes in less than ten years.

One can see that Kazakh history textbooks cover South Korea with relative importance (Mazitov 2008:21-8). In addition, there is no serious misinformation or out-dated fallacies found in the Cold War era. The contents on South Korea were revised in response to the direction of the state's transition. Other than minor mistakes related to the contemporary history of South Korea, there is nothing to recommend for revision.

### **III. Continuation of the Cold War Perspective in Uzbek Textbooks**

This section examines Uzbek history textbooks, which will provide an interesting comparison to the Kazakh textbooks. Immediately after its independence, Uzbekistan started to publish its own textbooks. After 1997, it enacted a law introducing competition in textbook publication which came into full effect in 2002. Compared to Kazakhstan, the process of textbook publication and distribution in Uzbekistan is complex and slow in opening its market. An unstable economy and politics may well be the cause. However, insisting on the state controlled publication system while publishing textbooks in seven different ethnic languages may also have slowed down the process.

First, the 10<sup>th</sup> grade world history textbook (Khidoyatov 1999:265-7) has a section about the Korean Peninsula, including South Korea from 1918 to 1939.<sup>15</sup> In Chapter 5 “Political and Economic Development of Asian Countries from 1918 to 1939,” South Korea is introduced in the section on Vietnam, South

---

14. For a more detailed discussion of the textbook publication system, see Park 2007:9.

15. The pages are the same for the 2000, 2001, 2002, 2004, and 2006 editions.

Korea, and Indonesia under a separate subheading:

From ancient times, Japan claimed the rights to the Korean Peninsula as if it was part of its empire. Having defeated Russia in the Russo-Japanese War (1905), Japan annexed Korea in 1910. Korea was ruled by the Governor-General of Japan who had limitless power. To support the colonial government, Japan stationed a navy fleet, two army divisions, and one field operation military police corps. The state apparatus created by Japan was used to plunder the rich resources of Korea and exploit its people. (Khidoyatov 1999:265)

The assertion that Japan claimed the rights to Korea since ancient times originates from the theory of the Japanese conquest of the Gaya kingdom (*Imna ilbonbuseol*). However, *Imna ilbonbuseol* is a modern theory (O 2004: footnote 112, 95). Therefore, the following recommendation for revision is suggested:

During its imperial period, Japan claimed its right to Korea by arguing that the Korean Peninsula was under its influence since ancient times. However, this is a crude historical interpretation made by Japan to justify its colonial rule. According to Korean historical interpretation, since ancient times, advanced cultures of the mainland were transmitted to Japan through Korea and there were times when migrants from Korea belonged to the ruling class of Japan. However, Korea was never ruled by Japan before 1910. Nevertheless, Japan fabricated the history in order to invade northeast Asia, which became the battleground of imperialist powers in the late nineteenth century. Eventually, Japan used its victory over Russia in the Russo-Japanese War (1905) to illegally annex Korea. Having opened its door to the West first, Japan illegally occupied the Empire of Korea that was slow in receiving western civilization. Korea was ruled by the Governor-General of Japan who had virtually limitless power. To support the colonial government, Japan stationed a navy fleet, two army divisions, and one field operation military police corps. The state apparatus created by Japan was used to plunder the rich resources of Korea and exploit its people.

It is also recommended that the following paragraph is revised to the second paragraph.

Brutal colonial oppression generated strong resistance from the Koreans. On March 1, 1919, massive demonstrations against Japanese colonial rule took place throughout the nation. In Seoul alone, over 300,000 people participated in the demonstration. Demonstrators were mainly students supported by workers, peasants, office workers, artisans, and merchants. Massive and nation-wide demonstrations by workers against Japan also took place in 1930. Students in cities such as Seoul, Busan, and Wonsan also demonstrated. All the demonstrations were repressed by the army. (Khidoyatov 1999:265-6)

Brutal colonial oppression generated strong resistance from the Koreans. On March 1, 1991, massive demonstrations against Japanese colonial rule took place throughout the nation. In Seoul alone, over 300,000 people participated in the demonstration. It was truly a national movement as the leadership of the movement was represented by all religions in Korea such as Christianity, Cheondogyo, Buddhism, and Confucianism and people from all walks of life participated in the *manse* demonstration. As a result, Japan was forced to change its imperial policy toward Korea from a military police rule to a cultural rule. Nevertheless, the new policy was nothing more than a means to divide the Korean nation and conceal the brutal colonial rule. Soon, the Koreans resisted again, culminating in the June 10 *manse* movement in 1926. In 1929, workers in Wonsan struck and students in Gwangju demonstrated against Japanese rule. All demonstrations were repressed by the army. After the Manchu incident in 1931, Japan strengthened its militarism in preparation for war, reversed its imperial policy to military rule and destruction of the Korean nation. Despite such repression, the Koreans continued to resist on a small scale and overseas independence movements began to rise.

The next example is from the 11<sup>th</sup> grade world history textbook which has more detailed descriptions of Korea than that of the 10th grade textbook. Chapter 1's (Origin of the Cold War) Section 4 "Failure of the Power Advantage Policy"<sup>16</sup> deals with the Korean War.

---

16. Most likely the U.S. is omitted from the original section title "Failure of Power Advantage Policy."

Together with NATO, the U.S. convinced its allies of the real threat of communism. To get them involved deeper in its foreign policy, the U.S. intervened in crises that were taking place in various regions. Its first intervention was the Korean civil war, which started in June 1950. The act of war began on June 25, and by June 27 South Korea was already being supported by the U.S. navy fleet and airplanes. The U.S. then requested the UN to respond against *North Korea who had invaded the South (a view of American diplomats)* [emphasis added]. Soon after, the UN Security Council decided to send military forces to South Korea to stop the advancement of the North Korean army. The U.S. carried out the war under the flag of the UN. However, the intervention of China forced the U.S. forces to retreat. On July 27, 1953, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and South Korea signed an armistice treaty and created a demarcation line and a demilitarized zone at the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel, the old border. (Khidoyatav 2000:226-36)

In addition, the textbook writes in detail and in length (Sections 35-36) about the history of Korea from 1945 to 1999 under the title "Divided Korea." The Korean War is narrated as follows.

The Korean War: Border disputes increased between the two Koreas and in June 1950, the North Korean army invaded South Korea by crossing the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel. As a result, the U.S., the UK, Australia, Turkey, and other countries participated in the war under the UN flag. The UN Forces led by General MacArthur stopped the advancing North Korean army and pushed it back all the way to the northern border with Manchuria. At the end of 1950, China sent its troops in support of North Korea forcing the U.S. to retreat. In the end, the frontline returned to near the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel. On July 27, 1953, representatives from China, North Korea, and the U.S. met to sign an armistice treaty. The number of Americans who died is 142,000<sup>17</sup> and 17,000 for the UN Forces. (Khidoyatov 2000:227)

---

17. The Royal Institute of International Affairs (1953:210) also estimates American casualties to be around 140,000. However, this figure may include the dead and wounded altogether or also the missing.

It is worth noting that it explains the Korean War as a civil war that developed into an international crisis with the intervention of the U.S. military. It highlights the fact that on June 27 the U.S. sends its navy fleet and airplanes to support South Korea. Indeed, the U.S.'s participation early on in the war is a well accepted fact. However, it is far from sending support to South Korea; instead, they were reconnaissance missions for future intervention. In addition, concerning who started the war, writing to suggest that the North invasion is nothing more than a biased assertion of the U.S. is a Cold War perspective. Although it writes "In June 1950, the North Korean<sup>18</sup> army invades South Korea by crossing the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel" (Khidoyatov 2000:227), a chronological table toward the end of the book uses the label "The South Korean army invades the territory of the DPRK and a civil war starts in Korea" (Khidoyatov 2000:401), which suggests the opposite (O 2004:100). Considering the fact that the textbook was written after the release of classified documents of the former USSR (1994-1995), the suggestion of the South invasion is clearly outdated and must be corrected.

Another interesting aspect of Korea is dealt with in sections 35-36:

The U.S. had no intention of leaving South Korea even after World War II. The U.S. stationed its 40,000 troops in South Korea with its own bases, roads, towns, ports, borders, armories, and military storages, creating another state within a state.

Under such circumstances, the struggle to reunite the country changed to a struggle to evict U.S. troops. North Korean leaders presented new proposals for reunification every year. In 1975, the 30th General Assembly of the UN resolved to guarantee the reunification of Korea and demand the withdrawal of all foreign forces in Korea. However, the U.S. and its allies and the South Korean regime disregarded the decision. (Khidoyatov 2000:228)

Clearly, the above explanation is critical of the U.S., which can be traced to North Korea's influence and the continuation of old socialist historiography (O 2004:101). Nevertheless, this can be revised using a post-Cold War perspective.

---

18. Here it does not use the country's official name but simply uses *Severokoreyskie*,[0] which means North Korea; elsewhere it only uses the country's official name like the Kazakh textbooks.

After the end of World War II, U.S. troops remained in the region south of the 38<sup>th</sup> parallel upon agreement with the USSR. Based on the protocol decided at the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers at the end of December 1945, the U.S. discussed with the USSR the creation of a trusteeship and a single free government in Korea. However, when two meetings of the joint commission in 1946 and 1947 produced no result, the U.S. revoked the Moscow decision and transferred the Korea question to the UN. The UN then called for a general election for the creation of a government under UN supervision. However, the USSR refused the entry of the UN Commission for Korea to North Korea. A general election took place only in the South. As such, with the backing of the UN, the Republic of Korea, the first democratic republic government in Korea, was founded on August 15, 1948. Subsequently, U.S. troops withdrew from South Korea a little less than one year after the establishment of the South Korean government on June 1949 without a clear plan of strengthening the South Korean Army in case of North Korea's provocation. Eventually, North Korea invaded without warning on June 25, 1950, and started the Korean War. U.S. troops returned to Korea and are still stationed in South Korea as a deterrent to another war.

Under such circumstances, North Korea has repeatedly demanded the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Korea. In 1975, the 30<sup>th</sup> General Assembly of the UN adopted a resolution by North Korea for the dissolution of the UN Command headquarters, withdrawal of all foreign troops from South Korea, and transition from armistice treaty to peace treaty. With the resolution, North Korea increased its pressure in demanding the withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Korea and a peace treaty with the U.S. However, another resolution moved by the U.S. and western countries—accepting the proposal to dissolve the UN Command but demanding appropriate measures to maintain the armistice treaty—was adopted at the same time. In the end, the UN Command was replaced by the Combined Forces Command (CFC) of the ROK and U.S. The CFC will also dissolve in 2012 when not only peace time but also war time operational command will be completely transferred to the South Korean Army.

In addition, the 2002 and 2004 editions state that “the Korean War was the climax of the U.S. containment policy. The U.S. lost 142,000 soldiers, a half of the total dead during World War II. However, the rise of conservatism at home and

the defeat in Korea did not lead to the U.S.'s reconsidering its policies" (Khidoyatov 2000:41). This follows the past argument put forth by socialist researchers suggesting that the origin of the Cold War was the U.S.

Regarding South Korea's economic growth, the textbook is critical of the growth centered on chaebol (conglomerates) and the poverty of workers.

The leaders of South Korea were not interested in developing all sectors of the economy. Resources were concentrated in shipbuilding, automobile, electronics, and construction. The economic development strategy aimed at finding foreign markets for exports and securing foreign capital for the development of domestic productions. As a result, South Korea became one of the top trading countries.

During this period, South Korea developed rapidly. Over two decades it maintained an average annual industrial production rate above 10%, the highest in the world. All industrial developments were dominated by four giant corporations: Daewoo, Hyundai, Samsung, and Lucky-Goldstar. They were responsible for more than half of the nation's exports.

Despite its astonishing economic growth, the living standards of South Korean workers were far from being affluent. Between the 1970s and the 1980s people living under absolute poverty increased from 17% to 21%. In other words, one out of five was living under what Europe would define as poverty. (Khidoyatov 2000:232)

It is recommended that the above narration be updated to indicate that the living standards of the Korean people as a whole have improved and highlight certain aspects of the Korean economy as follows.

Instead of developing all sectors of the economy, the leaders of South Korea took an uneven development strategy which concentrated on the shipbuilding, automobile, electronics, and construction industries. It was a successful economic development strategy aimed at finding foreign markets for exports and securing foreign capital for the development of domestic production. As a result, South Korea became one of the top ten trading countries.

In the 1960s and 1970s, South Korea developed rapidly. In these two decades, its average annual industrial production rate reached 10%, the highest in the world. Four giant corporations, Samsung, Hyundai,

Daewoo, and Lucky-Goldstar, led industrial development. They were responsible for more than half of the nation's exports.

Despite its astonishing economic growth, the living standards of ordinary people were far from being affluent. Between the 1970s and the 1980s people living under absolute poverty increased from 17% to 21%, meaning one out of five were living under what Europe would define as poverty. However, after the 1990s, as a result of the economic growth, absolute poverty almost disappeared and a social welfare system was extended to all citizens approaching the level of Europe. The economic growth improved the living standards of Koreans as a whole.

Reunification is covered in "Struggle for the Reunification of Korea."

Regardless of North or South, all Koreans desire reunification. However, the North Korean leadership opposes the German-style reunification where West Germany more or less absorbed East Germany. Currently, both Koreas are attempting to overcome any obstacle against free communication by creating joint organizations that bridge the two countries and meetings that support the reunion of separated families.

On the other hand, the South Korean government has a different position about reunification. It does not oppose reunification but is deeply concerned with its aftermath. *The reunification of Korea implies the withdrawal of U.S. troops in South Korea that guarantee the survival of the current weak regime.*

*Accordingly, the South Korean government passed the National Security Act and punishes anyone who speaks positively about North Korea or supports it as a political offense. It mobilized 25,000 policemen to repress students gathered on the day of Kim Il-sung's funeral and prohibited any act of paying condolence to the North Korean leadership. [emphasis added]<sup>19</sup>*

In 1994, representatives of North and South Korea met at Panmunjeom. The meeting was limited to affirming their hope to continue working toward improving mutual relations and reunification. Nevertheless, the meeting was the first of its kind. (Khidoyatov 2000:233-4)

---

19. The emphasized negative remarks about South Korea and U.S. troops are found in the 2000 edition but were deleted in the 2002 edition when Uzbekistan improved its relations with the U.S. The 11<sup>th</sup> grade textbook was also revised without significant changes, but after 2002, the contents about South Korea and the U.S. changed in a similar direction.

The statement that the South Korean government “does not oppose reunification but is deeply concerned about its aftermath” suggests that the Republic of Korea is against reunification. There is also a pro-North Korean nuance. The above section should be revised to the following.

Regardless of North or South, all Koreans desire reunification. However, the North Korean leadership opposes the German-style reunification where West Germany more or less absorbed East Germany. Currently, both Koreas are attempting to overcome any obstacle against free communication by creating joint organizations that bridge the two countries and meetings that support the reunion of separated families.

On the other hand, the South Korean government has a different position about reunification. However, as seen through the 2000 Inter-Korean Summit where North and South Korea discussed their common ground for reunification, the possibility of both parties approaching agreement is not unrealistic. North Korea did not demand the withdrawal of U.S. troops as a precondition. Instead it showed realistic acceptance to the existence of U.S. troops in Korea.

As a result of multilateral dialogues between North and South Korea since the 1970s, channels of dialogue are in place, thereby relieving the tension between the two countries.

South Korea continues to provide humanitarian aid to North Korea, who is suffering economic hardship according to its co-existence and co-prosperity policy. On the other hand, North Korea has created disagreements with the international community over issues like nuclear missiles and testing. The situation may change with six-party (South Korea, North Korea, the U.S., Russia, China, and Japan) talks.

Zijaeva (2008:15), a history researcher at the Uzbek Academy of Science, argues that the writing of textbooks has moved away from the old Soviet-style writing with strong communist ideology propaganda. Nevertheless, it is difficult to say that the narratives on South Korea have completely done away with the Cold War perspective. It would be a problem if textbooks changed all of sudden just because the USSR collapsed. The revision of textbooks normally takes time, but this paper recommends some revisions of outdated contents.

The narratives on the independence movement are especially dependent on North Korean materials. Consequently, the Uzbek textbooks valorize without

question North Korea's highest leader Kim Il-sung's anti-Japanese struggles. They also remark that the U.S. supported South Korea's dictatorial regimes. However, the understanding that the U.S. actively supported the dictators is an influence of Cold War historiography. In other words, they must clearly point out that the Republic of Korea is not a puppet regime of the U.S.

In addition, a college textbook analyzes the Korean War as a proxy war between the USSR and the U.S. in dealing with Korea after the division (Khidoyatov and Gulamov 1999:252-61). It describes in detail the military actions of the U.S. and China, the role of the UN in trying to end the war, and how the U.S. bombarded North Korean cities and villages to total destruction, which received strong criticism from the international community. However, it would be more precise to say that the strong criticism came not from the international community but from the socialist bloc. Bombing of defenseless North Korean cities and villages is certainly not a good thing, but some argue that it was an act of self-defense as North Korea invaded South Korea first.

The college textbook also deals with South Korea's enormous economic growth and its dark side such as the spread of corruption and social dissatisfaction. It is interesting to find a socialist perspective in the comparison between South Korea and North Korea, which is in economic crisis but has a social welfare system for all people. It is not that there is no corruption or social dissatisfaction in South Korean society. However, it is noteworthy to mention that with the real-name system introduced by the Kim Young Sam government and political reforms of the Kim Dae-jung and Roh Moo-hyun governments, the level of corruption has decreased. As for social dissatisfaction, the South Korean government is trying various ways to remedy the situation. Although there is no intention to criticize the North Korean system, it is somewhat biased to say that North Korea's social welfare system is better than that of South Korea. The current social welfare system of South Korea is not on par with that of Europe but it is approaching.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan both share a common background in that they both have a long standing authoritarian political system since their independence from the USSR. Nevertheless, Kazakhstan has deconstructed the old Cold War narratives found in Soviet textbooks more than Uzbekistan has.

Why the difference? The reasons are complex and multifaceted. First, economic backwardness—according to CIA figures, the 2007 GDP per capita of Uzbekistan was \$2,400 whereas Kazakhstan had \$11,000—may have delayed the swift revision of textbooks. In addition, the conservatism of textbooks is also associated with the homogeneity or heterogeneity of a nation which may or may not lead to inflexibility in international relations.

During the Soviet era, the Soviet republics all saw South Korea as a dependent of the U.S. However, after their independence from the USSR, they entered a transitional period, moving away from Cold War stereotypes and deconstructing Soviet influences. They also sought to normalize relations with South Korea, but the same cannot be said for their textbooks. The conservatism in the revision process of textbooks is most notable in Uzbekistan. In the case of Kazakhstan, its relatively consistent positive relation with the U.S. is reflected in the positive narration of South Korea, an ally of the U.S. In addition, for Kazakhstan, where more than half of the population is non-Kazakh, developing a cohesive national identity is one of the top priorities. With Russians composing a quarter of the population, it is especially important for Kazakhstan to maintain good relations with Russia. Being a multi-ethnic nation, Kazakhstan also maintains good relations with other western countries, especially the U.S.<sup>20</sup> In other words, Kazakhstan is fairly open to the world and has flexibility in international relations; thus, its textbooks are revised with various perspectives.

In contrast, 80% of Uzbekistan is Uzbek according to the 1996 CIA estimate, making the country relatively homogeneous.<sup>21</sup> Therefore, national integration or inclusion of multi-ethnic groups is not a big concern. Instead, Uzbek nationalism has risen. As for religion, the absolute majority (88%) of the population is Muslim. This is in sharp contrast to Kazakhstan which has a relative balance with 47% Muslim and 44% Russian Orthodox. This is why Uzbekistan is not deeply concerned with maintaining good relations with foreign countries. Under

---

20. Sharing a border, Kazakhstan tries to maintain good relations with China in many issues including oil. It also tries to take advantages of the competition between China, Russia, and the U.S.

21. The ethnic composition of Uzbekistan is Uzbek 80%, Russian 5.5%, Tajik 5%, Kazakh 3%, Karakalpak 2.5%, Tatar 1.5%, Korean 1.0%, and other 1.5% (CIA 1996). In an informal interview, the ethnic Korean Elena Choe, who studied at the Academy of Korean Studies, told the author that people felt that the future of Uzbekistan was unclear so many Russians, including her family, left Uzbekistan after the collapse of the USSR. Thus it is more likely that the national and religious homogeneity of Uzbekistan will increase in the future.

such circumstances, an authoritarian leader would be free to decide foreign policy. As a result, it has a history of swinging back and forth like a pendulum from pro-Russian to pro-American. Having unstable foreign relations and internal politics, Uzbek textbooks still retain influences of pro-Russian and Cold War politics. More important, most of the textbooks were written in 1999, before Uzbekistan's relationship with the U.S. improved. Therefore, they contain critical views of the U.S. according to the Cold War dichotomy. The textbooks need to be updated with current affairs since the textbooks currently used state that South Korea was hit by an economic crisis in 1997-1998 and is still suffering from the shock as workers barely make ends meet despite South Korea having completed its IMF program earlier than expected. As for the revised textbooks, the reason for finding the same misinformation could be blamed on partial and not full revision.

What can be done about the Uzbek textbooks with their one-sided narratives? Most importantly, there must be contact with textbook authors to provide the most recent facts and data about South Korea and, as suggested above, to change the perception that South Korea is a colony of the U.S. As for the Kazakh textbooks, although there are not many recommendations regarding revision, it would be useful to provide the authors with diverse information on South Korea so that they can evaluate and write about South Korea with open minds.

It is also important for Koreans to pay attention to the problems identified by foreign textbooks such as democracy, inequality of wealth, labor policy, social welfare policy, and unification policy. More exchanges and dialogues will improve the situation and help everyone to gain objectivity and fairness in understanding each other's country in the post-Cold War era.

## Reference

- Akhmetov, K. M., et al. 2007. *Geografiya sovremennogo mira: Hrestomatiya Uch Posobie dlya 11 klassa obsch-gum napravleniya obscheobrazovatel'noy shkoly* (Contemporary World Geography: Selected Humanities Track 11<sup>th</sup> Grade Textbook Supplement). Almaty: Mektep.
- BBC News. 2009. [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/country\\_profiles/1298071.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/country_profiles/1298071.stm).
- Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). 2009. *The World Factbook*. <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/kz.html>.

- Daewoe gyeongje jeongchaek yeon-guwon jiyek jeongbosenta. 1994. *Ujeubekiseutan pyeollam* (A Review of Uzbekistan). Seoul: Daewoe gyeongje jeongchaek yeon-guwon jiyek jeongbosenta.
- Khidoyatov, G. A. 1999. *Vsemirnaya istoriya 10 klass* (World History 10<sup>th</sup> Grade). Tashkent: Sharq.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000. *Vsemirnaya istoriya 11 klass* (World History 11<sup>th</sup> Grade). Tashkent: Sharq.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002. *Vsemirnaya istoriya 11 klass* (World History 11<sup>th</sup> Grade). Tashkent: Sharq.
- Khidoyatov, G. A., and H. G. Gulamov. 1999. *Vsemirnaya istoriya. Noveishiy period. Evropa i USA posle vtoroy mirovoy voyny 1945-1995 gg.* (World History: Contemporary Europe and the US after World War II 1945-1995). Tashkent: Sharq.
- Kim, Il-su, et al. 2008. *Jungangasiaui geoin Kajaheuseutan* (A Giant of Central Asia, Kazakhstan). Seoul: Gungni.
- Kodzaxmet-uli, K., et al. 2004a. *Vsemirnaya istoriya 1945-2002* (World History 1945-2002). Almaty: Mektep.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004b. *Dunie juzi tarihy* (World History). Almaty: Mektep.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005a. *Noveyshaya istoriya mira 1914-2004* (Recent World History 1914-2004). Almaty: Mektep.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005b. *Hrestomatiya. Noveyshaya istoriya mira 1914-2004 gg. Uchebnoe posobie dlya 9-h klassov obscheobr. shkol* (Selected Recent World History 1914-2004: 9<sup>th</sup> Grade Textbook Supplement). Almaty: Mektep.
- Kodzaxmet-uli, K., and Rechenzent Mazitov. 2006. *Vsemirnaya istoriya. Uchebnik dlya 10 kl* (World History: 10<sup>th</sup> Grade Textbook). Almaty: Mektep.
- Mazitov, Satta. 2008. *Kazahstanskoe koreevedenie: realnost nauchno-pedagogicheskoy sistemy v Kazahstane* (Korean Studies in Kazakhstan: The Reality of the Academic-Educational System in Kazakhstan). Paper presented at the Mutual Understanding through Textbooks: Korea-Central Asia Textbook Seminar, Seongnam.
- O, Man-Seok. 2004. *Leosia mit jungangasia gyogwaseoui Hangukkwalleon naeyong bunseok* (Analysis of Korea-Related Contents in Russian and Central Asian Textbooks). KU-CR-04-05. Seongnam: Hangukjeongsinmunhwayeon-guwon.
- Park, So-Yeong (Park, So Young). 2007. *Jungangasia gyogwaseoui Hangukgwalleon naeyong bunseok* (Analysis of Korea-Related Contents

in Central Asian Textbooks: Uzbekistan and Kazakhstan). KU-CR-07-05. Seongnam: Hangukjeongsinmunhwayeon-guwon.

Royal Institute of International Affairs. 1953. *Survey of International Affairs, 1953*. London: Oxford University Press.

Saduiikov, T. S. et al. 2007. *Vsemirnaya istoriya. Uch. posobie dlya 11 kl. gum. napravleniya obscheobr. shkol* (World History: Humanities Track 11<sup>th</sup> Grade Textbook Supplement). Almaty: Mektep.

*Voice of America News*. 2005. <http://www.voanews.com/Korean/archive/2005-07/2005-07-30-voa19.cfm>.

Zijaeva, Dano. 2008. *Istoriya Korei v uchebnikah Uzbekistana* (Korean History in Uzbek Textbooks). Paper presented at the Mutual Understanding through Textbooks: Korea-Central Asia Textbook Seminar, Seongnam.

---

**Lee Wan Bom** received his Ph.D. in political science from Yonsei University with a dissertation titled “U.S. Decision-Making of the 38<sup>th</sup> Parallel of Korea, 1944-1945.” He is currently a professor of political science at the Academy of Korean Studies. His areas of academic interest are Korean history, especially modern history, and U.S. foreign policy toward Korea since 1945.