

Mapping World History in Korea

Yeongjo HWANGBO

Kyungpook National University
Daegu, Korea (Republic of)
hbvision@knu.ac.kr

Abstract

It has been about twenty years since world history in a new sense was introduced to Korean academia. At first, it was the educators who showed a lot of interest in world history. But, before long, world/global history came to exert an important influence on history research and teaching in Korea. Even though certain unfavorable conditions still exist, the need for world/global history is growing and a number of academic institutes and scholars are putting in a great deal of effort to advance it in Korea. Here, we examine the changing meanings of world history on the basis of the history of concepts and provide a general idea of its introduction and diffusion in historiography and history education in Korea.

Keywords

world history, global history, glocal history, big history, eurocentrism, globalization, globality, history of concepts

I. CHANGING MEANINGS OF WORLD HISTORY

In a response to Comments on the *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*

(Basic Concepts in History),¹ the German thinker Reinhart Koselleck presented a proposition full of meaning: “The original contexts of concepts change; so, too, do the original or subsequent meanings carried by concepts.”² We may apply this proposition to the concept of World History. That is to say that, while the original contexts of the concept of World History have changed, the original or subsequent meanings that the term had carried within itself have also changed significantly.

The study of world history did exist in ancient times. In Ancient China, Sima Qian wrote a Chinese World History based on the dynastic cycle. In Ancient Greece, Herodotus presented the customs, geography and history of the Mediterranean peoples. However, these kinds of world history were not truly global but regional in that they were limited to only the regions known to the historians.³

In the Christian world up to the time of the Enlightenment, the Christian tradition provided its version of world history, as have done other cultural traditions worldwide. After the Enlightenment, the Christian tradition of world history was replaced by other forms of world history, Voltaire, Hegel, Marx and Ranke attempting “to grasp the history of humanity as a whole” through a secular perspective.⁴

However, according to David Christian who is well known for having created the new interdisciplinary approach called Big History, this tradition of world history disappeared in the late 19th century in Europe. Why did this happen? Christian emphasizes two aspects. One, historians who became “disillusioned” with the attempts “to develop universal laws of history” were

¹ Otto Brunner, Werner Conze and Reinhart Koselleck, eds., *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur Politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland* [Basic Concepts in History. A Dictionary on Historical Principles of Political and Social Language in Germany], 8 vols. (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1972).

² Reinhart Koselleck, “A Response to Comments on the *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*,” in *The Meaning of Historical Terms and Concepts: New Studies on Begriffsgeschichte*, eds., Hartmut Lehmann and Melvin Richter (Washington, DC: German Historical Institute, 1996), 62.

³ Marine Hughes-Warrington, ed., *Palgrave Advances World Histories* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 4-19; William H. McNeill, “The Changing Shape of World History,” *History and Theory* 34, no. 2 (May 1995): 8.

⁴ David Christian, “Why Global History?,” *Korean Journal of History of Historiography* 20 (December 2009): 153-55.

more likely to focus "on getting the details right." Second, with the growth of nationalism, historians focused "on the history of a particular nation rather than on humanity as a whole."⁵

It was in the 1980s when the tradition of world history emerged again. Already in 1962 the Greek-Canadian historian Leften S. Stavrianos had proposed a history emphasizing a planetary perspective, that is to say "a perspective from the Moon."⁶ Thereafter, certain American historians introduced the agenda of a new world history while criticizing the existing world history, maintaining that it was basically European history. They tried to reconstruct historical discourses by rejecting so-called Eurocentrism which had a tendency to interpret the histories of non-European societies from a Western perspective.⁷ "To see the history of human beings as a single, coherent story rather than as a collection of the particular stories of different communities"⁸ is one of their major aims.

Why did the meaning of world history change like this? The reason is that the context of the concept changed, mainly through the impact of globalization. Advances in transportation and telecommunication are major factors contributing to globalization in recent years, intensifying the interdependence of social and economic activities. Another change has been the establishment of a new world order after the end of World War II. Colonies became independent, while the empires collapsed. Furthermore, people's awareness of events elsewhere and compelling scientific advances contributed to the construction of the alternative perspectives. In particular, attention to environmental issues is stimulating global awareness; this may serve to give an impulsion to world history.⁹

⁵ Christian, "Why Global History?," 156-58.

⁶ Leften S. Stavrianos, *A Global History of Man* (Boston: Allen and Bacon, 1962), 1.

⁷ For a good overview of this tendency, see Ross E. Dunn, ed., *The New World History: A Teacher's Companion* (New York: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2000); Bruce Mazlish and Ralph Buultjens, eds., *Conceptualizing Global History* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1993); Patrick Manning, *Navigating World History: Historians Create a Global Past* (New York: Palgrave/Macmillan, 2003). Some scholars such as Kenneth Pomeranz, Roy Bin Wong, Andre Gunder Frank, and Jack Goldstone have criticized the older tradition that saw world history from the viewpoint of Euro-centrism.

⁸ David Christian, "World History in Context," *Journal of World History* 14, no. 4 (December 2003): 438.

⁹ Raymond Grew, "Expanding Worlds of World History," *Journal of Modern History* 78, no. 4 (December 2006): 879-80.

In 1982, American historians motivated by these historical changes founded the World History Association to promote the study of world history, launching the *Journal of World History* in 1990.

These understandings of world history also gained currency in Korea, but the process has been rather slow. The first textbook of world history published by Koreans was *Mankukyaksa* (a Shortened History of All Nations). Hakbu, a kind of education department of the government, launched a project of compiling books and published this book in 1896.¹⁰ Looking at the purposes behind their writing we may make a rough guess how the compilers saw world history at that time. One of their chief aims was to provide readers with information about the histories and circumstances of all nations, assuming that world history was a collection of the chronicles and historical relics of the countries all over the world.

However, the perspective had changed. A China-centered perspective remained a major tradition in historical scholarship in Korea as late as the late 19th century. But these compilers hoped to “enlighten” Korean people and highlight Europe and Japan, thereby emphasizing the advanced technology of the West. Other books of world history published around this time also reiterated this kind of point of view.¹¹

School textbooks changed tremendously since 1955 when the Syngman Rhee government established a modern educational system, the purpose of education being the training of human resources for nation-building. With a view to accomplishing this purpose, the government began to regulate textbook contents. It was at this time that the government introduced world history as a regular subject in the secondary curriculum. World history came to be a matter of debate, being considered to be not a field of study in itself but a subject for learning in secondary schools.¹²

Why was world history devalued? The late Ji-hyung Cho has

¹⁰ Gul-Sun Park, “The Education of National History and the Compilation of the History Textbook in the Empire of Korea,” *Journal of Humanities* 20, no.1 (2000): 187-88; Yeongjo Hwangbo, “The Political Uses of History of the Franco Regime and the Park Regime,” *Comparative* 24, no. 5 (2014), 127.

¹¹ Ok Kyoung Baek, “Korean World History Writings from Late 19th Century to Early 20th Century,” *Study of Korean History of Thought* 35 (2010): 173-210.

¹² Ji-Hyung Cho, “World History, Global History, and Postmodernism,” *Korean Historical Review* 173 (2002): 337-38.

pointed out three major premises or discourses¹³ that could be found in the writing and teaching of history in Korea ever since. First, there has been a discourse of separation disconnecting Korean history from world history, one reproduced continuously through the writing and teaching of history.

Second, nationalism began to be promoted in Korean society in the 1960s. Therefore, many Korean historians made their efforts to "build up new images of Korea based upon a nationalistic perspective on history."¹⁴ This nationalistic view discriminated against world history while favouring Korean history, seeing the nation as "the absolute good" and regarding world history as "the absolute other." Therefore, world history became the "history of the rest." The Strengthening Plan of National History Education launched under the Park Chung-hee regime in the early 1970s also reflected this view of history.¹⁵

Last, in this situation, world history ironically performed the function of universal history.¹⁶ That is to say that, on the one hand, world history, as a macro-discourse, provided standards of historical generality, rationality and objectivity, and, on the other hand, it suppressed specialty, individuality and contingency of particular history. Strictly speaking, this sort of universal history is not really the "universal history" but the history of western supremacy underscoring the logic of world domination of superpowers.

This concept of world history has been deeply rooted in the field of history and culture in Korea until recently. However, changes in the concept of world history that have occurred in the US have impacted on historiography and the teaching of history in Korea also from the early 1990s on.

¹³ Ibid., 338-44.

¹⁴ Chanseung Park, "Korean History in Time of Division," in *Historians and History in Korea II*, eds., Youngwoo Han, Donggul Cho, and Chanseung Park (Seoul: Changbi, 1994), 332-33; Hwangbo, "Political Uses of History," 133.

¹⁵ As a result, Korean history became a separate subject for the first time in secondary schools. Ibid., 132.

¹⁶ Sungsoo Lee, "Characteristics and Education of World History," *Korean History Education Review* 4 (1959): 13.

II. INTRODUCING AND EXPANDING WORLD HISTORY

1. Introduction of World History

It was by Korean educators in history that the concept of world history in a new sense was introduced to this country. Wonsoo Kim, professor at Seoul National University of Education, was one of the pioneers publishing the article entitled “Prospect for History Education in Elementary Schools-Concerning to the Historical Consciousness on a Global Scale” in 1995.¹⁷ This was the historical result of post war multi-polarization, international cooperation and the emergence of the Third World, all of which worked together to open the “era of global history.” As a matter of fact, the ever-increasing interdependence among nations was a salient feature of that time, especially for Korea and other countries which had their doors open to the external world. Those tasked with reorganizing the curriculum of world history were interested in studies of interdependence and cross-cultural interactions that scholars such as Jerry Bentley, Philip Curtin and Kirti Chaudhuri promoted.¹⁸ Korean educators in history began to accept global history as an educational concept.

It was under such circumstance that the Korean Historical Association, in commemoration of its 50th anniversary in 2002 organized a conference dealing with issues of world history in collaboration with the American World History. Scholars in the Korean academy for western history started discussing issues relating to global history, one of them being Ji-Hyung Cho, professor at Ewha Womans University who presented global history to Korean academic societies through a number of articles and books.¹⁹

¹⁷ Actually, the first work which dealt with global history appeared in 1991. Chongwook Park presented master’s thesis entitled “Study on the New Perception of World History” to Ewha Womans University. The author has analyzed the strengths and weaknesses as well as the theoretical backgrounds and characteristics of global history here.

¹⁸ For the introduction of this concept of world history, see Sunjoo Kang, “Cross-Regional Interaction as an Organizing Principle of World History,” *Korean History Education Review* 82 (2002); Seon-Young Jung, “Approach to Global Perspective-based World History Teaching,” *Korean History Education Review* 85 (2003); Young-Hyo Lee, “Reading Others in World History Teaching-Against Eurocentrism & Ethnocentrism,” *Korean History Education Review* 86 (2003).

¹⁹ Cho, “World History, Global History, and Postmodernism”; Cho, “What is Global History?” *Western History Review* 92 (2007); Cho, “Reconceptualizing History and the Fu-

Cho showed a tendency to use the terms "world history" and "global history" in much the same sense, although he sometimes differentiated between them by indicating that, while the former concentrated on transnational human experiences, the latter focused on the history of globalization. Furthermore, he said, "Both world history and global history are interested in the history of globality, a prerequisite of humankind, which reflects experiences that the humankind has lived in a global society since the appearance of the human being."²⁰

By and large, there are two different ways of studying world/global history. Cho differentiated between them as follows:

One is a synchronic method to examine historical mechanisms such as contact, conflict, exchange, resistance, transformation or renovation through the medium of goods, languages, values, religions or cultures from the perspectives of connection and/or comparison. Secondly, the diachronic method should be used to search for historical commonness or diversity between transnational, regional, and hemispheric areas from the perspectives of convergence and/or divergence.²¹

Cho presents four main categories for world/global historical analysis. These are: the world history of cross-cultural diffusions, the world history of global networks, the world history of environments and ecologies, and finally the world history of global experiences such as cross-cultural contacts, power relations, family, gender, the NGOs, and so on. These categories reflect the intellectual orientation and analytical assumptions of world/global historians, with no rigid boundaries among them.

While world/global historians show a variety of presuppositions and methodologies, by and large they display similar tendencies "to reject the concepts of universality, objectivity, and totality; to avoid essentialism, Eurocentrism and Orientalism; to abstain from technological determinism, simplification, and dichotomy through the linguistic turn and multiple/global perspec-

ture of Global History," *Korean Historical Review* 200 (2008). He also co-edited two books *New World History in a Global Age* (Seoul: Hyeon, 2008) and *Challenges of Global History* (Seoul: Seohaemunjip, 2010).

²⁰ Cho, "World History, Global History, and Postmodernism," 368.

²¹ Cho, "Reconceptualizing History," 229.

tives; and to present the new concepts of culture by means of the ecological/interactive understanding of cross-cultural contacts.”²²

In short, Cho gave a systematic and salient presentation of world history, founding the Institute of World and Global History at Ewha Womans University on December 1, 2008. The purpose of the Institute is “to avoid Eurocentrism in world/global history research and writing in Korea and to play a leading role in advancing a new world/global history research and education from more critical world historical perspectives.”²³ One of the major initiatives of the Institute was to invite David Christian of Macquarie University who conceptualized and popularized “big history,” as part of the World Class University Project sponsored by the Ministry of Education, Science and Technology of Korea. Christian’s big history/world history presented a challenge for Korean historians.

Cho contributed to organizing the Asian Association of World Historians (AAWH) and publishing the *Asian Review of World Histories*. The AAWH which was established in 2008 tries to analyze and criticize traditional historical narrative, to deconstruct the absolute centralisms in history and to study histories on the basis of inter-connections among the many cores in Asia. The AAWH held the second international congress at Ewha Womans University in 2012, focusing on the study and education of world history in Asia. The AAWH’s mouthpiece is the international *Asian Review of World Histories*, the publisher being the Institute of World and Global History at Ewha Womans University. The first volume was published in January 2013.

We also need to examine Jie-hyun Lim’s activities. Professor Lim established the Research Institute of Comparative History (RICH) in 2004 when he was a professor of the History Department at Hanyang University in Seoul. RICH seeks “to critically envision the individual and society from the perspective of transnational humanities, deconstructing the categories and boundaries of ‘nation’ and ‘state.’”²⁴ Since its establishment, RICH has

²² Cho, “World History, Global History, and Postmodernism,” 369.

²³ Cited in the working paper, “Writing World/Global History in Korea,” which Hyun Hur, managing editor of the *Asian Review of World Histories*, presented at Osaka University in 2014.

²⁴ The website address for RICH is <http://www.rich.ac.kr>

organized many domestic and international conferences with themes such as "Mass Dictatorships," "War Commemoration," "Transnational History," and "History of Everyday Life." RICH is currently carrying out the Humanities Korea Project of Transnational Humanities as its flagship project, its goals being removing the nation-state paradigm from the Humanities and to create a transnational paradigm based on Korean realities or issues of the Korean peninsula and transmitting it to the world. With a view to accomplishing these goals, RICH brings together scholars from around the world and collaborates on Transnational Projects in the Humanities with them. It is clear that RICH plays a leading role in seeking to establish a transnational humanities perspective at home and abroad.

It is by virtue of these pioneers that world history in a new sense was introduced and diffused in academic circles of history in Korea.²⁵ Now let's take a look at the historiography of recent research and education in world history in Korea.

2. Recent Research

Recent research shows that, first of all, a number of scholars have tried to go beyond Eurocentrism in history by deconstructing such discourses in history and reconceptualizing history in the process. As part of its efforts, the Korean Society for Western History held a conference on "What is the West to Us?: Beyond Eurocentric Western History," in 2006, searching for alternatives to conventional history discourse and related issues such as the various facets of Eurocentrism and reconsideration of Eurocentric world history.²⁶

From the 1960s onwards Korean historians accumulated extensively knowledge of Korean history even expanding it to include other national and regional histories. Most of them thought that Korean society should follow European way of development considering European historical development as the

²⁵ In addition, there are other scholars who have showed a special interest in world history. They are Yong-Woo Kim, Hye-Jeong Park, Sunjoo Kang, Haedong Yun, and so on.

²⁶ At that time the president of the Korean Society for Western History was Gab-soo Choi who is a professor at Seoul National University. The papers were published into a book *World Histories beyond Eurocentric World History* (Seoul: Purunyeoksa, 2009).

norm of modern developments. This Eurocentric approach tends to stand up for a singular and unilinear process of modernization from the West to the rest of the world.

However, from the early 2000s some Korean historians began to bring into question the Eurocentric view of history that had been prevalent in Korean academia. Their change in position is thought to have been originated not only from their growing perception of world history but also from changes of historical context such as globalization, post-modernism, post-colonialism, and so on.

Sang-u Yim, professor at Sogang University, states that three countries in East Asia—Korea, China and Japan—were not asked to accept the Eurocentric view of history; they introduced it voluntarily. While Japan used it for justifying their conquests of Asian countries as well as for proving their superiority, Korea internalized it of their own accord as a way of confronting Japan's colonial aggression.²⁷ Ultimately, he recommends a comparative history of multiple cultural contexts as an alternative way of study.²⁸

Meanwhile, Cho asserts re-conceptualizing and restructuring history through “linguistic turn” of history terminologies, development models and historical narratives that maintain and strengthen Eurocentric discourses.²⁹ Yong-Woo Kim has suggested a universal history which focuses on global exchanges and interactions of “the universal” in thought and practices. In global history of “the universal” he searches for any possibility of overcoming all kind of centrism including Eurocentrism. He has mentioned the Haiti Revolution for a concrete example. He has placed emphasis on the reason why Haiti achieved universal liberation. That is why there were some Haitians who participated in the “global human discursive communities.”³⁰ Seung-rae Cho

²⁷ Sang-Woo Lim, “Beyond Eurocentric Conception of History in East Asia,” in *Challenges of Global History*, eds., Ji-Hyung Cho and Yong-Woo Kim (Seoul: Seohaemunjip, 2010), 49-52, 62-63.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 77-78.

²⁹ Cho, “Reconceptualizing History,” 218-21.

³⁰ Yong-Woo Kim, “Reconfiguring the Universal for Global History,” *Bulletin of the Ewha Institute of History* 40 (2010): 73-79. Nick Nesbitt gave this name to the network for discourses and practices about the universal rights of human beings such as freedom and equality. Nick Nesbitt, “Troping Toussaint, Reading Revolution,”

holds the same view with these scholars in that Eurocentrism should be overcome. All the while, he warns that, deconstructing Eurocentrism, one should not deny European uniqueness as well as historical fact that European modernity forms a nucleus of world system.³¹ In this respect, he deems highly of Greg Denning's study.³² Greg Denning, Australian historian of the Pacific, has tried to write an alternative history that is not caught by another centrism criticizing Eurocentrism.³³

These are some of the representative scholars in Korean academia who are trying to search for alternative discourse in place of the existing Eurocentrism. They are groping for the alternative in world/global history. But, there are still not a few who doubt validity of world/global history as an alternative historiography, although they agree in principle that it is urgent to overcome Eurocentric approaches in history.

Another new attempt is at transnational history, rising from the Humanities Korea Project of Transnational Humanities of RICH, which was selected in 2008 for funding by the National Research Foundation of Korea for ten years until 2018. Some of the project's aims are to rescue the Humanities from the nation-state paradigm and to offer a transnational Humanities open to all humankind; to identify new ethical and practical tasks based on the values of global responsibility and solidarity, from the perspective of an "alternative globalization" or "globalization from below" counter to capital-led globalization, and to create a transnational paradigm based on Korean realities or issues of the Korean peninsula and transmitting it to the world.³⁴

As is well known, transnational history appeared in the US in the early 1990s, the result of a burgeoning enthusiasm for history across frontiers and proposed as "an alternative narrative to the national history paradigm" which has been criticized on two grounds.³⁵ On the one hand, it has worked as an ideology justify-

Research in African Literatures 35, no.2 (2004): 22.

³¹ Seung-rae Cho, "Debates on Eurocentrism: for New Historical Consciousness in the Age of Globalization," in *Challenges of Global History*, 229-30.

³² Greg Denning, *Mr. Bligh's Bad Languages: Passion, Power and Theatre on the Bounty* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

³³ Seung-rae Cho, "Debates on Eurocentrism," 230-33.

³⁴ See the website for RICH.

³⁵ Jie-hyun Lim, "Transnational History as a Methodological Nationalism: Compara-

ing state power. On the other hand, it does not correspond to past historical realities.³⁶ From past to present there have been explorations of exchanges, crossings, transfers and migrations of people, products, technology and ideas across national frontiers. Transnational history reflects these realities, being very similar to world history.

Meanwhile, the volume *Beyond Myth of National History* (compiled by Jie-hyun Lim and Sungsi Lee, 2004) created a sensation within Korean academia generating a vigorous debate between nationalist and transnational historians.³⁷ Lim accepted world/global history as an alternative response to the question of how to reconstruct the past after deconstructing the national history paradigm. But he also had some apprehensions of the political implications of world/global history, feeling that world/global history is also not free from accusations of Eurocentrism in that it is likely to be considered as both a product of capital-led globalization and as a means of justification. Cho too had been concerned on this issue citing Charles Hedrick and Jerry Bentley.³⁸

Secondly, some scholars have shown a tendency to apply these new approaches to their study of Korean history. For instance, Hae-dong Yun asserts that a transnational perspective can be very useful to examine Korean modernity,³⁹ arguing that Korean modernity should not be interpreted in a nation-centered perspective. He rejects as too narrow arguments such as “Korea was stripped and raped by the Japanese imperialism” or that “Korea actually went through modernization during the Japanese ruling.”⁴⁰ Therefore, in place of “traditional and conventional studies of international relationships and comparative studies dealing with multiple nations,” Yun proposed a transnational history perspective that aspires to understand the connections and overlap-

tive Perspectives on Europe and East Asia,” *Seoganginmunnonchong* 24 (2008): 85.

³⁶ Jie-hyun Lim, “Mapping Global History—A Conference Report on ‘Global History from a Global Perspective’,” *Yeoksabipyong* 83 (2008): 409-10.

³⁷ Jie-hyun Lim and Sungsi Lee, *Beyond Myth of National History* (Seoul: Humanist, 2004).

³⁸ Cho, “What is Global History?,” 322-23.

³⁹ Haedong Yun, “The Possibility of Transnational History—Korean Modern History as a Center,” *Korean Historical Review* 200 (2008).

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 64.

ping relations between multiple regions and races in the world.⁴¹ Furthermore, he reintroduces the concept of an East Asian consciousness contributing to cooperation and interdependence among countries.⁴²

Meanwhile, Lim has proposed "Victimhood nationalism" as a working hypothesis to explain "competing national memories over the historical position of victims in coming to terms with the pasts." He points out that "the victimhood becomes hereditary and thus consolidates the national solidarity beyond generations," once we put it into "the dichotomy of victimizers and victims in national terms." In order to evade this, we need to take an interest in the transnationality of victimhood which demands "a *histoire croisée* to comprehend the entangled past of the victimized and victimizers."⁴³ "Victimhood nationalism" is an interesting and inspiring hypothesis with vast potentialities for opening up a new field of research.

Deok-Kyu Choi and Wonsoo Kim examine Korean foreign affairs from a global history perspective.⁴⁴ Some scholars tend to be interested in new fields of study such as diseases, environments, climates, maps, etc. In the last twenty years, studies of East Asian medical history have been accumulated progressively in Korea.⁴⁵ For example, there have been studies of King's diseas-

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² Ibid., 65. See also Haedong Yun, "Understanding 'Korean History as East Asian History' through Empire, Modern State, and Region," *Dongbuga Yeoksa Nonchong* 40 (2013); Yun, "The Modern Transformation of Transnational East Asia," *Korean Historical Review* 221 (2014).

⁴³ Jie-hyun Lim, "Victimhood Nationalism and History Reconciliation in East Asia," *History Compass* 8, no. 1 (2010). He is going to write a transnational history of the victimhood nationalism in Korea, Poland and Israel with Japan and Germany as counterparts.

⁴⁴ Wonsoo Kim, "Global History and Transcending the Horizons of the Russo-Japanese War Studies—Reconnecting with the Yalu Crisis," *Journal of Western History* 21 (2009); Kim, "A Global History of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance and the Japanese Annexation of Korea, 1905-1911—Related with Global/Transnational Relations," *Social Studies Education* 49, no. 4 (2010); Kim, "A Global History of Gando Problems and Gando Agreement, 1907-1909—Related with Global/Transnational Relations," *Social Studies Education* 49, no. 1 (2010); Kim, "Refiguring Korean History in the Context of New World History—New History Discourses on the Japanese Annexation of Korea," *Journal of Korea Elementary Education* 22, no. 2 (2011); Deok-Kyu Choi, "Korean Emperor Gojong's Memory on the Japanese Military Occupation over Korean Peninsula—Global History of the Japan-Korea Protectorate Treaty (1905)," *Journal of Western History* 27 (2012).

⁴⁵ Kyuhwan Shin, "The Trend and Prospect of Studies of East Asian Medical History in Korea," *Korean Journal of Medical History* 19, no. 1 (2010).

es during the Joseon Dynasty, medical exchanges between Korea and Japan, hygiene, and plagues.⁴⁶ From the late 1990s, studies of climates and environments have been in vogue. It seems that the spread of environmental and ecological movements might have great influence on the quantitative increase of such studies. What is really impressive is that the studies are concentrated for the period after the Imjin War of 1592. Particularly, some historians have dealt with the climate during the Little Ice Age of the 17th century,⁴⁷ using effectively the knowledge of phenology, glaciology, tree-ring analysis, and so forth.

Cho studied the Korean map of the Afro-Eurasia world, entitled “Honil Gangni Yeokdae Gukdo Jido” (Map of Integrated Lands and Regions of Historical Countries and Capitals), created in 1402. He has proposed that the oldest version, which is housed in Ryukoku University, was copied from the original sometime between early 1481 and early 1486 on the basis of a detailed re-examination of the Korean administrative place-names.⁴⁸ These are significant attempts to understand the multi-layered past.

⁴⁶ Hun Kim, “Study on King Injo’s Diseases in the Joseon Dynasty,” *Journal of Korean Medical History* 18, no. 2 (2005); Kim, “A Research on the Disease of King Sunjong in the Joseon Dynasty,” *Journal of Korean Medical History* 26, no. 2 (2013); Ho Kim, “Korea-Japan Medical Exchanges through the Joseon Delegation in the late Joseon Dynasty,” *Journal of Studies in Joseon Tongsinsa* 6 (2008); Jongchan Lee, “The Making of Hygienic Modernity in Meiji Japan, 1868-1905,” *Korean Journal of Medical History* 12, no. 1 (2003); Kyuhwan Shin, “Unexpected Success: The Spread of Manchurian Plague and the Response of Japanese Colonial Rule in Korea, 1910-1911,” *Korea Journal* 49, no. 2 (2009).

⁴⁷ Some of the articles that dealt with the issue are as follows: Tae-Jin Yi, “An Interim Report of the Study on the Little Ice Age (1500-1750) Phenomena based on the Records of the Annals of the Dynasty of Joseon,” *Korean History Review* 149 (1996); Yi, “Neo-Catastrophism and a New Global Interpretation of History,” *Asian Review of World Histories* 1, no. 1 (2013); Keun-pil Park, “Climate History of the 17th Century Little Ice Age: A Critical Review,” *Daegu Historical Review* 80 (2005); Moonki Kim, “The Climatic Change of the Little Ice Age in the Seventeenth Century, China and Joseon,” *History & the Boundaries* 77 (2010); Ji-Hyung Cho, “The Seventeenth Century, the Little Ice Age, and Anthropogenic Forcing: A Reexamination from a Big History Perspective,” *Bulletin of the Ewha Institute of History* 43 (2011); Cho, “The Little Ice Age and the Coming of the Anthropocene,” *Asian Review of World Histories* 2, no. 1 (2014); Younghun Cho, “Seventeenth-century Crisis Theory and Fall of the Ming Dynasty: A Global History Perspective,” *Yeoksabipyong* 107 (2014).

⁴⁸ Ji-Hyung Cho, “The Kangnido’s Africa: A Comparative Perspective,” *Bulletin of the Ewha Institute of History* 45 (2012); Cho, “Dating the Ryukoku Kangnido: Identifying the Oldest Extant Map of the Whole Afro-Eurasia World,” *Bulletin of the Ewha Institute of History* 42 (2011).

3. Education in World History

Now, let's take a look at the topic of education in world history. As mentioned earlier, those who first introduced world history in a new sense to Korean academia were specialists in history education. They thought that the education in world history would play an important role in shaping global citizenship for the future generations, accordingly revising the organizing principles and contents of world history textbooks.

First of all, they pointed out that there were some problems in the existing curricula and textbooks of world history. One serious problem was that of Eurocentrism, this being the dominant model and player in historiography and history education in Korea since the first national curriculum (1954). As European civilization seemed the best way to modern development for non-European nations, this main narrative in world history textbooks was European, its development process being detailed, while the history of the other regions was marginalized.⁴⁹

In the 1980s and the 1990s world history curriculum developers realized that there was a serious problem in Eurocentric discourse. But they tried to overcome that problem just by enlarging the field of study to other major civilizations. Furthermore, they still had a dichotomous way of thinking differentiating Asian history from European history. In their curriculum world history was presented as a complete form of narrative framed with the theory of European modernization.⁵⁰ Their attempt for coping with Eurocentric view of history ended in formulating a more sophisticated Eurocentrism.

However, in the early 2000s when introducing new world history, Korean scholars and teachers began to request a reconstruction of world history,⁵¹ overcoming the Eurocentric bias in the writing and teaching of history, and asserting that students

⁴⁹ Sunjoo Kang, "Conceptions of Modernity in the Middle School World History Curriculum in the Republic of Korea: Adopting Theories of European Inherited Modernity and Modernization," *Journal of Northeast Asian History* 9, no. 2 (Winter 2012), 164-65.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 168-69.

⁵¹ Some of them are as follows: Min-ho Lee, "How to Read World History - Beyond Eurocentric View of History," *Yeoksabipeong* 59 (2002); Sunjoo Kang, "World History Education in the Age of Globalization," *History Education* 82 (2002).

needed to know how civilizations and cultural traditions were interconnected. For this, they proposed the concept of “interconnectedness” as a basic theme for the reconstruction of world history.⁵² Eventually, in the 2007 amended curriculum, the Eurocentric perspective was replaced with an inter-regional approach emphasizing the influence of Asian technologies on European economic developments in modern times,⁵³ reflecting historical realities. But, the revision was ultimately partial as world history curriculum developers excluded much of “interconnectedness” on grounds of lessening the student work-load and returned to the conventional viewpoint of history in 2009.⁵⁴

Meanwhile, Korea is trying to develop the world/global history curricula in undergraduate courses as well as in graduate programs in universities. RICH launched a Master’s program in Transnational Humanities at Hanyang University, in 2011. This program has three categories of courses. Each category provides a number of subjects.⁵⁵ RICH also provides students with collaborative Foreign Exchange Programs, Transnational Humanities Lecture Series and Flying University of Transnational Humanities, marking a significant epoch in the history of universities in Korea.

In addition, new attempts are currently underway in the History Departments of Ewha Womans University and Kyungpook National University. They are carrying out the Brain Korea 21 Program, a training project for graduate students funded by the National Research Foundation of Korea from 2013. The History Department at Ewha Womans University is training professional and creative future scholars for East Asian history by studying East Asian history from a more global perspective.

The major goal of the program launched by the History Department at Kyungpook National University is to train the professional and creative manpower for “glocal” history and culture. Here, “glocal” is a compound word which is formed from the words “global” and “local.” Thus, “glocal” history pays attention to understanding of globalization based on local or regional charac-

⁵² Kang, “Conceptions of Modernity,” 171; Kang, “Cross-Regional Interaction as an Organizing Principle of World History,” *History Education* 82 (2002), 60-64.

⁵³ Kang, “Conceptions of Modernity,” 172.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 175.

⁵⁵ See the website for RICH.

teristics. In order to accomplish this goal the project team has organized a number of glocal history seminars, inviting leading world/global historians such as Ji-hyung Cho, Taejin Yi, Jie-hyun Lim, and Miyajima Hiroshi, and has introduced Glocal History Seminars in the graduate program, studying aspects of Korean history from a global perspective.⁵⁶ Three of the students who had attended the Seminar in the second semester of 2014 studied historical cases of Korean migrants from the Silla Kingdom to the Joseon Dynasty and presented their findings in the Third Congress of the Asian Association of World Historians held in Singapore on 29-31 May, 2015.

Finally, we must mention the World Class University (WCU) Project that Cho initiated at Ewha Womans University in 2008. The WCU Project intends strengthening education and research power by inviting foreign scholars of great renown, while seeking to promote research on critical fields beneficial to the country's future development.⁵⁷ One of the major initiatives of the Institute of World and Global History was to invite Christian, as mentioned earlier. Cho, as a director of the Institute, has spearheaded research, teaching, and curriculum development for world/global history and big history, and opened a big history class for the undergraduate students at Ewha Womans University.⁵⁸

III. SOME SUGGESTIONS

So far, we have examined the changing meanings of world history based on the history of concepts and have provided a general idea of its introduction and diffusion in historiography and history education in Korea. We need to organize foreign exchange programs and international conferences which will "contribute to the development of a rich global tradition of scholarship and teaching in world history,"⁵⁹ as Christian notes. In conclusion, I present some suggestions for mapping world history in Korea.

First, we need to arrange the matter of terminology. This is-

⁵⁶ The Website address is <http://webbuild.knu.ac.kr/~gchhistory>.

⁵⁷ Hur, "Writing World/Global History in Korea," 4.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Christian, "Why Global History?," 164-65.

sue was debated already in the conference which was held at Harvard University in 2008.⁶⁰ At that time the terms “global history,” “world history,” “transnational history,” “*histoire croisée*,” and “international history” were subject to review, but there was no agreement among all the participants except in the matter of “*histoire croisée*” which is a minimalist approach to “global history.”⁶¹

It has been a long time since we started using the term “world history.” And we began using the term “global history” from the 1960s. Now, we use the terms “world history” and “global history” interchangeably. But, actually, there are still some scholars who prefer world history to global history and vice versa. There are also some people who want to use “new world history” or “new global history.” Asian as well as American scholars tend to prefer the term “world history” while European scholars are inclined to use “universal history” and “global history.” All terms have their specific meanings, but they also have something like a common denominator in meaning at the same time. This can be “interdependence,” “interconnectedness” or “humanity.”⁶²

“World history” can be a term embracing these meanings. Furthermore, on the basis of what Koselleck points out, why do we not understand that the meanings which the term “world history” carried within itself have changed because the context of the concept has changed? While using the same term, we may unwittingly impart a variety of meanings to it depending on the historical circumstances. However, despite whatever sense we give it, it remains certain that the meaning of world history has changed significantly compared with its original or subsequent meaning.

Second, we need to clarify the relationship between world history and national (or regional or local) history. Until now world historians have showed a tendency to pay attention to global phenomena. Therefore, many Korean historians feel that

⁶⁰ The title was “Global history, Globally.”

⁶¹ Lim, “Mapping Global History,” 415. The terms such as “universal history,” “ecumenical history,” “macro-history,” “big history,” “world-system history” and “interregional history” belong to the same category.

⁶² Patrick Manning presents a definition of world history as “the story of past connections in the human community,” while David Christian sees world history as “an attempt to describe the history of humanity as a whole.” See Christian, “Why Global History?,” 150-51.

world history is for scholars whose major is Western or Eastern history, rather than for those scholars whose major is national history. This kind of comment implies that the national history paradigm versus the global history paradigm still works powerfully in Korean academia. In fact, while world history and national history are different in terms of the scale of the research field, they are not different in terms of the research method. The spatial domains in which historical agents work may be classified into local, nation-state, regional, and global, according to their dimensions.⁶³ Therefore, research fields in world history may go beyond the nation-state paradigm and also include it at the same time.

What matters here is the world historians' concern. As they pay attention to globality, if there is someone who investigates the globality of some historical phenomenon (or historical event) that occurred in his/her country, we may call him/her a world/global historian.⁶⁴ In other words, we probably should say that, in order to properly grasp certain historical phenomena, we have to examine them from a global perspective because it is reasonable to suppose that they were composed of a number of interconnected factors or aspects.

Third, we need to take a further step forward to get to the heart of the matter. What do we mean by interconnected factors or aspects? Such factors imply that there is both the global and the local in the phenomenon and it is both the global and the local in the phenomenon and it is a product of interaction between the two. Therefore, we have to examine it both from a global perspective and a local perspective so as to really understand this "glocal" phenomenon.⁶⁵

⁶³ Patrick Manning, "Concepts and Institutions for World History," in *World History: Global and Local Interaction*, ed. Manning (Princeton, NJ: M. Wiener, 2006), 236-39.

⁶⁴ Cho, "World History, Global History, and Postmodernism," 350, 367.

⁶⁵ Of course, we will have to pay more attention to the global because the globality was largely disregarded in traditional history so far.