Title
From Colonial to International: American Knowledge Construction of Korean History, 1880s - 1960s

Author
Oh, Sang Mee

Publication Date
2018

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

From Colonial to International:
American Knowledge Construction of Korean History,
1880s -1960s

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy

in Asian Languages and Cultures

by

Sang Mee Oh

2018

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

From Colonial to International:

American Knowledge Construction of Korean History,

1880s -1960s

by

Sang Mee Oh

Doctor of Philosophy in Asian Languages and Cultures

University of California, Los Angeles, 2018

Professor John Duncan, Chair

This dissertation, "From Colonial to International: American knowledge construction of Korean history, 1880s-1960s" studies how knowledge on Korean history was constructed in the United States while being influenced by Japanese colonial scholarship from the late nineteenth century throughout the Japanese colonization of Korea (1910-1945), and how this knowledge influenced postwar Korean Studies in the U.S., established in the 1960s. Taking a transnational approach, the dissertation looks at how the knowledge on colonized Korea was constructed by multiple national agents—namely Japanese colonial scholars, American missionaries and their children, and Korean nationalist intellectuals—and how their knowledge on Korea, despite their different

political purposes, was compatible with and influenced by each other. It also takes a fresh perspective in looking at Korean Studies in the U.S., which has been regarded as the product of Cold War politics during the postwar period, by tracing the earlier influence of prewar knowledge which reflected colonial scholarship. This dissertation argues that the history of colonized Korea was produced as a "discourse of failure" in which its contents were organized in a way to explain Korea's being colonized and losing national sovereignty. From the late nineteenth century in the U.S., this knowledge construction was developed to emphasize Korea's isolationism during the colonial period while partially integrating themes—such as stagnancy and heteronomy—from the Japanese colonial scholarship. This dissertation argues that the transnational co-authorship of Korean history confirmed it as the objective knowledge of Korea. Then, it argues that despite the discontinuity caused by changes in power dynamics, including the Pacific War and the emergence of Cold War politics, many themes from the colonial past were reconfigured to shape the basis of postwar Korean Studies in the U.S. in the 1960s. This dissertation looks at how these reshaped themes came to serve new functions, such as supporting modernization theory within Cold War politics.

The dissertation of Sang Mee Oh is approved.

Namhee Lee

Katsuya Hirano

Sung-Deuk Oak

John Duncan, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without guidance and support from many people. My deepest appreciation goes to my advisor, Professor John B. Duncan, whose steadfast support, guidance, and trust in me has been the greatest source of strength throughout my graduate school years. I will always cherish the memory of the afternoon that he suggested this project, along with his warm encouragement to a disheartened graduate student over lunch. He also inspired me as a scholar and teacher, and he taught me to take a fair but kind approach toward students as well as historical sources. I thank Professor Namhee Lee, who not only supported me as I carried out this project and grew as a scholar, but also extended her kindness into caring about my personal life. I always enjoyed working as her teaching fellow and chatting over tea at her office. I thank Professor Katsuya Hirano for his guidance and encouragement. When this project was merely a two-page research plan, he saw the potential significance of this project and advocated pursuing it. He generously shared his knowledge and time, and his support warded any doubts I had about carrying out this project. I thank Professor Sung-Deuk Oak, whose erudition, caring words, and advice I could always depend on. I also thank my teachers at UCLA, Professor Chris P. Hanscom and Professor Timothy Tangerlini. Finally, I thank Professor Do-Hyung Kim at Yonsei University, who not only inspired me to study Korean history in the first place but also encouraged me to study abroad in the United States to pursue my dream. His guidance was essential in shaping this dissertation project, and his advocacy continued throughout my doctoral research.

This dissertation project was generously supported by the UCLA Graduate Division, Mellon Foundation, Terasaki Center for Japanese Studies. and Center for Korean Studies at UCLA. Financial support for my graduate studies was also provided by the Department of Asian Languages and Cultures. I would like to thank the staff at the Center for Korean Studies and the Department of Asian Languages and Cultures, without whose financial and administrative help I could not have completed this dissertation.

During my last seven years at UCLA, I had a pleasure of meeting many wonderful colleagues, especially my fellow graduate students at UCLA. They took me into their community and provided both academic and personal sustenance. In particular, I thank Hanmee Na Kim, Hieyoon Kim, Janet Lee, Howard Kahm, Joon Hur, Mari Ishida, Sungha Yoon, May Ng, Sinwoo Lee, and Hannah Lim for their friendship as well as academic and emotional support. They have been not only wonderful colleagues but also became close friends who filled my life at UCLA with precious memories. I am also thankful to Matt Lauer, Fred Ranallo-Higgins, Tommy Tran, Jong-woo Park, Thomas Stock, Mei-mei Zhang, and Heeju Lee for sharing my journey at UCLA. I would like to extend my gratitude to Sejung Kim, who always made sure that I was taken care of; Jennifer Jung-Kim, whom I enjoyed working with as her teaching fellow; and Sang-Hun Cho for being such a helpful and resourceful librarian at the East Asian Library in UCLA. I am also grateful for my colleagues at Yonsei University, for their consistent academic and emotional assistance and friendship. In particular, I thank Misung Kim, Kyung-sun Choi, Kayoung Shin, and Yunjung Kim. While studying in different parts of the world, they always walked with me and shared their academic and personal journey with me.

During my last seven years in Los Angeles, I was fortunate to have good companions whose prayers and friendship kept me going. In particular, I thank Aiko Guevara, Dohyun Kim, Grace Hong for their heartfelt warmth and care. I also thank friends from church, including Saemi Park, Seungbin Lee, Gloria Choi, Ara Cho, Jusang Lee, Pastor Young-guk Chin, Sunghee Moon, and Yuri Jang. They kindly extended their help and prayers when I was going through difficult times. I also would like to thank my old friends in Korea, Heehyoung Cho, Gye-yeong Park, Jiwon Park, Jeewon Ahn, Ji-in Kim, and Sung-geon Chung. I could only see them during the summer when I visited Korea, but they always welcomed me with warm hugs and encouraging words from which I regained strength to continue my studies for another year.

Last but not the least, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my family, the four people whom I love the most in the world. My warmest appreciation goes to my parents, who have shown me unconditional love and constant support throughout my life. They never lost faith in me, even when I did not have faith in myself. I also thank my two sisters, who have always been and will be my very best friends. Their intimate friendship and affection have been the greatest source of my emotinoal strength, and I'm blessed to have them as my life companions.

VITA

2004-2005	Exchange Program Saint Olaf College Northfield, Minnesota
2006	B.A., Korean History Yonsei University Seoul, South Korea
2006-2008	Future Korean Humanity Fellowship National Research Foundation of Korea
2009	M.A., Korean History Yonsei University Seoul, South Korea
2010-2011	Hi Seoul Fellowship Seoul Scholarship Foundation
2011-2012	Pauline Yu Fellowship University of California, Los Angeles
2013-2014	Mellone Foundation Pre-Dissertation Fellowship University of California, Los Angeles
2015-2016	Sasakawa Fellowship University of California, Los Angeles
2016-2017	Collegium of University Teaching Fellows University of California, Los Angeles
2017-2018	Dissertation Year Fellowship University of California, Los Angeles

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

How has global knowledge of Korea been formed? Prior to 1945, Japanese knowledge of Korea produced under the Japanese colonial rule over Korea was known to be the most hegemonic knowledge of Korea in the world.[1] With the shift of international power dynamics during the postwar years, however, the United States started to assume a new leading role in the international sphere,[2] and its knowledge of different areas of the world emerged as new hegemonic knowledge. Korean Studies were established in major universities in the United States during the 1960s as part of East Asian Studies,[3] which became one of the most influential fields of knowledge about Korea among the English-reading public over the last five decades. However, not much attention has been paid to the issue of how Americans constructed knowledge about Korea during the postwar years and

[1] Takashi Hatada, "Ilbon e isŏŏ ŭi Han'guksa yŏn'gu'ŭi chŏnt'ong [Tradition of Korean Studies in Japan]," *Han'guksa Simingangjwa* 1 (Aug 1987): 70.

[2] Dean C. Tipps, "Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study of Societies: A Critical Perspective," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 15, no. 2 (Mar 1973): 209.

[3] Most often, the beginning of Korean Studies was considered to be when Edward W. Wagner became the first tenure-track Korean history professor at Harvard University in 1959. See John Duncan, "Migungae chŏn'gundaesa yŏn'gu tonghyang [Research trends of premodern Korean history in the United States]," *Yŏksawa hyŏnsil* 23 (Mar 1997): 170-188; Henry Em, "Miguk nae Han'guk kŭnhyŏndaesa yŏn'gu tonghyang [research trends of Korean modern history in the United States]" *Yŏksawa hyŏnsil* 23 (Mar 1997): 189-202; Leighanne Yuh "The Historiography of Korea in the United States," *International Journal of Korean History* 15, no. 2 (Aug 2010): 127-144; Charles Armstrong, "Development and Directions of Korean Studies in the United States," *The Journal of Contemporary Korean Studies* 1, no. 1 (Dec 2014): 35-48.

on what intellectual basis the postwar knowledge about Korea was constructed, despite the fact that academic knowledge of Korea could not have suddenly emerge out of thin air.[4]

This dissertation explores the construction of American knowledge of Korea from the 1880s, when American encountered Korea with the U.S.-Korea Treaty of 1882, to the 1960s, when the first-generation scholars in the Korean Studies finished their dissertations. In order to analyze the intellectual basis of postwar Korean Studies, this dissertation identifies three major intellectual traditions that had influenced the Korean Studies: first, American missionaries' accounts of Korea from late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, second, Japanese colonial scholarship during the early half of twentieth century, and third, the postwar modernization thoery under the Cold War regime in the United States. While exploring these intellectual traditions as separate fields in which knowledge was produced under different power relations, this study also examines how the themes and ideas traveled from one tradition to another, and how the knowledge from other traditions was incorporated into the new knowledge. Among many areas of Korean Studies, this dissertation focuses on the formation of Korean history, as national history was at the core of the national identity and gave the nation a character, explaining how it became what it is now. Furthermore, Korean national history is part of the concept of the Korean nation itself, situating Korea and its history within narratives of world history.[5]

---

[4] Leighanne Yuh and Henry Em points to Andrew Grajdanzev's *Modern Korea* (1944) as the first scholarly work on Korea, and Armstrong briefly discusses how American missionaries could be regarded as the pioneers of Korean Studies in the United States (Yuh, "The Historiography," 129; Em, "Migungnae Han'guk kŭnhyŏndaesa yŏn'gu tonghyang," 191; Armstrong, "Development and Directions of Korean Studies," 37.)

[5] Andre Schmid, *Korea between Empires, 1895-1919* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 7-8.

This dissertation emphasizes how the global knowledge construction of Korea was a transnational practice, carried out by multiple national authors who read and had influence across national boundaries. When Korea opened its port to Japan in 1876 and eventually to the United States and other western nations in 1882, Korea was integrated into the modern capitalist world as a newly emerging nation. With this change, Korea needed to be defined and located temporally and spatially within larger global framework, which required an understanding of Korea as a nation. Japan was one of the major actors active in producing knowledge of Korea, as Korea was one of Japan's others.[6] Koreans also found themselves facing the task of presenting Korea itself as a modern nation, newly interpreting the past and inventing components of a national identity, including national language, culture, and history. Among the major actors in producing knowledge of Korea often left out, of accounts, were American missionaries who were proliferate writers of Korea. Aside from travelogues providing first impressions and mere sketches and description of Korea, some missionaries who resided in Korea for more than two decades engaged themselves in more in-depth studies of Korea, especially on history, literature, and language. In other words, construction of knowledge about Korea during the early twentieth century was carried out simulatenously by multiple national authors, including Japanese and Korean intellectuals, as well as American missionaries. While not much literature exists on American knowledge about Korea during and after the colonial period, this dissertation will explore how the construction of knowledge about Korea remained transnational practice during and after the

[6] Stefan Tanaka, *Japan's Orient: Rendering Pasts into History* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993).

colonial period. In a recent study, Robert Oppenheim described this transnational practice of knowledge construction as "multi-sitedness" of knowledge construction of a nation, starting from late nineteenth century and continuing into the present.[7]

Considering this transnational aspect, this dissertation first argues that knowledge about Korea was transnationally circulated by the contemporary intellectuals over the national boundaries, and therefore, Japanese and Korean knowledge about Korea was integrated into the American knowledge about Korea. Looking at intellectual traditions across time, it traces how American missionaries during the 1900s integrated both Korean "civilization and enlightenment" discourse and Japanese imperialist knowledge of Korea; how American scholars during the 1930s and 1940s, mostly children of missionaries who wrote dissertations in American universities, integrated Japanese colonial scholarship that developed as most hegemonic academic knowledge; how U.S. postwar Korean Studies referred to Japanese colonial scholarship; and how the voice of ethnic Korean scholars was integrated into postwar American academia.

This dissertation further argues that not only was knowledge construction transnationally interconnected, but also that the themes and narrative framework of Korean history traveled from one intellectual tradition to the other. Americans' initial narrative framework of Korean history was developed as a discourse of failure, in which the narrative was organized in a way to explain the current failure – loss of sovereignty. A seamless narrative framework emerged around themes such as how Korea, which had had a

[7] Robert Oppenheim, "Introduction: The Multi-sited History of the Anthropology of Korea," *Journal of Korean Studies* 21, no. 2 (Fall 2016).

flourishing civilization in the ancient past, became stagnant with its obsession to Chinese civilization and was victimized in invasions by its stronger neighbors, resulting in its centuries-long isolation policy that in turn culminated in Korea's failure to cope with modernity. Many themes and the discourse of failure itself were often formed by projecting Korea's precarious status at the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century, not to mention by the American authors' own imperialist views, onto accounts of Korean history.[8] However, this strong initial framework and the major themes in Korean history, formed while integrating Japanese and Korean knowledge, managed to influence not only the American scholars during the colonial period but postwar scholars as well. Narratives of Korean history were newly constructed in each intellectual tradition – traditions that often appeared quite different from one another. However, some of the colonial themes as well as the basic narrative structure were influential and useful in a postwar era dominated by modernization theory, which asked why Korea failed while Japan succeeded to modernize itself. The early scholarship in Korean Studies during the 1960s revealed that while scholars created a new narrative framework of Korean history that was a product of postwar power relations and was influenced by modernization theory, they still used some themes from the prewar period, integrating Japanese colonial and postwar scholarship as well as the American scholars' books and dissertations from the prewar period.

[8] Andre Schmid, "Oriental singminjuŭi ŭi tojŏn: Anglo-American pip'an ŭi han'gye [The Challenge posed by the Oriental Colonialism; the limitation of the criticism by the Anglo-American]," *Yŏksa Munje Yŏn'gu* 12 (June 2004): 157-186.

The contribution of this dissertation is twofold: first, by broadening the scope, both temporally and spatially, of the examination of global knowledge formation about Korea, it reveals the complicated nature of knowledge construction about a colonized nation: in the case of Korean history, power relations among Japan, Korea, and the United States as well as the shared intellectual discourses of multiple national authors, intervened. Moreover, by examining how prewar knowledge intersected with layers of power relations to become postwar knowledge, it reflects on the premises of our current knowledge about Korea.

Literature Review

The scholarly literature on American writings on Korea concentrates on works written during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, from when the United States had its first encounter with Korea up to the time when Korea was colonized by Japan. Publication on Korea during this time proliferated mostly due to the American missionary interest in Korea or the prospect of Japanese colonization of Korea. The majority of the writers were American missionaries who studied and introduced Korea to the English reading public in order recruit more missionaries to Korea and to secure funding. Others included journalists, travelers, and government-hired American advisors, who recorded their exotic experiences in an unfamiliar land in the Far East.[9] A considerable quantity of literature has made use of these primary sources to examine American understandings of Korea in the late

[9] Primary sources often included but were not limited to Isabella Bird Bishop, *Korea and Her Neighbors* (London: John Murray, 1897); William E. Griffis, *Corea The Hermit Nation* (New York: Charles Scribner's sons, 1882); Homer B. Hulbert, *Passing of Korea* (New York: Double Day, Page and company, 1906); and James S. Gale, *Korea in Transition* (New York: Young People's Missionary Movement of the United States and Canada, 1909).

nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These pioneering studies were carried out by scholars on the history of Korean Christianity who studied American missionaries' understanding of Korea in relation to their activities in and influence on Korea.[10] During the 2000s, with new efforts to translate these sources, a tendency emerged among scholars to examine these primary sources in terms of how westerners viewed Korea.[11]

These studies, however, did not properly historicize American writings about Korea, often treating such accounts as objective "outsider's views," even though these views were very much prejudiced by lack of information, the Orientalized gaze, and power politics, such as Japanese mediation, influencing these writings. Even though the Americans in Korea may have seemed like "outsiders," as they were not directly involved in the process of Japanese colonization, that does not mean that their ideas and writings on Korea were unbiased. In order to properly historicize American writings about Korea, it is necessary to examine the historical context in which the specific texts were written, the purpose and function of the texts, and discourse and intellectual traditions from which the texts emerged.

Furthermore, most of this research is descriptive, often merely quoting the American authors' comments, rather than analytic in examining the materials, and it often concluded

---

[10] Kyumu Han, "Kaeil ŭi Han'guk insik kwa Han'guk kyohoe e kich'in yŏnghyang, 1898-1910 nyŏn ŭl chungsim ŭro [James S. Gale's Perception of Korea and His Influence on Korean Church from 1898-1910]," *Han'guk Kidokkyo wa Yŏksa* 4 (Dec 1995): 161-176; Manyŏl Yi, "Sŏn'gyosa Ŏndŏudŭ ŭi ch'ogi hwaldong e kwanhan yŏn'gu [A study on the early activities of Horace G. Underwood]," *Han'guk Kidokkyo wa Yŏksa* 14 (Feb 2001): 9-46.

[11] Pongnyong Sin, "Sŏsedongjŏmgi Han'gugin kwa sŏguin ŭi sangho insik [The inter-perception of Korean and the Westerners in the period of Western intrusion to the East]," *Han'guk Munhwa Yŏngu* 27 (Dec 2004): 62-93; Yon-Tae Jeong, "19segi huban 20segi cho sŏyangin ŭi Han'gukkwan [The Korean image in the eyes of the Westerners from late 19th century to the early 20th century]," *Yŏksa wa Hyŏnsil* 34 (Dec 1999): 159-206.

by judging whether the American author had so-called, favorable or unfavorable views toward Korea.

Only recently have a few studies analyzed how these writings where shaped and biased by the Western imperilalist views, regardless of their "favorable" attitude toward Korea.[12] Andre Schmid analyzed Homer B. Hulbert and Frederick A. McKenzie's books to discuss how their defense for Korean independence were supported by the logic in which Orientalism and Anglo-Saxonism were embedded. However, Schmid's study, a short article, did not further examine what else, other than Western discourse, may have influenced Hulbert, such as nationalist discourse emerging in Korea during the early twentieth century.

Another problematic aspect in previous scholarship on American writings about Korea is the virtual absence of literature on the period during the Japanese occupation of Korea (1910-1945). Since diplomatic ties had been cut between the United States and Korea, it has been assumed that the intellectual or cultural interactions were also halted during the colonial period. Even though American general interest in Korea decreased as the latter was annexed to Japan, there were still intellectual and cultural interactions between Americans and Koreans, mainly through missionaries or Korean students who studied abroad.[13] Intellectual interaction and exchange of ideas also occurred through reading across national boundaries. Academic knowledge of Korea produced by Japanese colonial scholars traveled to the United States and was read by American scholars, who incorporated such knowledge

[12] Schmid, "Oriental singminjuŭi ŭi tojŏn," 157-186.

[13] Hanmee Na Kim, "The Meanings of America in Modern Korea: A Study of Korean Diplomatic, Cultural, and Intellectual Engagement with America, 1852-1945" (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2014).

in their own dissertations. Korean students who studied abroad in the United States had written dissertations on Korea in the universities, incorporating their voices into academia. Without paying proper attention to transnational intellectual interactions and knowledge circulation, it will be difficult to achieve a broader perspective on the transnational construction of knowledge of Korean history.

Previous literature on Korean Studies in the postwar United States has not yet thoroughly explored the field's establishment and early works in the area. There is virtually no analytical research on the founding of Korean Studies as a field except a few articles briefly examining literature of Korean Studies[14] or that introduces the historiography of Korean Studies in the United States. Bibliographies on Korean Studies provide lists of the books and articles produced in Korean Studies and describe the establishment of Korean Studies, while articles on historiography provided a brief genealogy of American scholars in the Korean Studies and introduce the main concerns in the field, including to current trends. The latter briefly discuss how the Cold War politics and modernization theory shaped the early themes and focus of Korean Studies in the United States, pointing out how Korea was often regarded as merely a variation of Chinese civilization within a context where the focus was given to studying Japan and China, and how the focus on Korean history was on the reasons for Korea's failure to modernize.[15] While providing valuable information, however,

[14] Andrew C. Nahm "The Development of Korean Studies in the United States," *Journal of Korean Studies* 1, no. 2 (1971); Donald S. MacDonald, "The Study of Korea in the United States," *Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society Korea Branch* 65 (1990): 41-48; Andre Schmid, "Korean Studies at the Periphery and as a Mediator in US-Korean Relations" *Sai* 4 (2008): 9-34.

[15] Duncan, "Migungnae Han'guk chŏn'gundaesa yŏn'gu tonghyang," 172-173; Em, "Miguk nae Han'guk kŭnhyŏndaesa yŏn'gu tonghyang," 194-195; Yuh, "The Historiography," 130-131.

these studies also do not fully historicize these texts in relation to the establishment of East Asian studies. Korean Studies were never independently developed, but as part of the larger East Asian Studies, thus, were influenced by the larger framework that shaped East Asian Studies.

In this regard, an examination of Korean Studies can benefit from the literature on emergence of area studies and Japanese Studies written by scholars such as Harry Harootunian, Masao Miyoshi, and Bruce Cummings during mid-1990s and 2000s.[16] These scholars pointed out how Cold War–era area studies, especially Japanese Studies, were shaped by modernization theory that aimed to provide an alternative to the Marxist revolutionary model. Criticizing the influence of modernization theory on area studies, Harootunian argued that the modernization theory not only took the modernization as the single vocation of area studies, thereby obscuring any other possible topics in area studies, but also demanded overlooking the colonization that characterized the historical experience of many newly emerging areas. Harootunian also argued that modernization theory promoted nation-centered history as it took the nation to be the unit of the evolutionary development. In the process, the cultural particularity of the nation was emphasized over universal aspects, such as political and economic structures. Although this literature rarely examined Korean Studies, but it did point out how Korean Studies were directly related to Japanese Studies in

[16] Masao Miyoshi and Harry D. Harootunian, *Learning Places: The Afterlives of Area Studies* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002); Harry Harootunian, *The Empire's New Clothes: Paradigm Lost, and Regained* (Chicago, Prickly Paradigm Press, 2005), 36; Harry D. Harootunian, *History's Disquiet: Modernity, Cultural Practice, and the Question of Everyday Life*, The Wellek Library Lectures (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000); Naoki Sakai and Hyon Joo Yoo, *The Trans-Pacific Imagination: Rethinking Boundary, Culture and Society* (Hackensack, N.J.: World Scientific, 2012).

the United States, as emphasis on Japan as the ideal case of modernization was often contrasted with Korea as a case of failure to modernize.

Recently, a few studies emerged emphasizing the importance of looking at establishment of Korean Studies within the tradition of East Asian Studies and the historical context of Cold War politics. Sei-Jin Chang focused on Edwin Reischauer as a representative expert/scholar on East Asian Studies during the Cold War period and examined his role in establishing Korean studies. Chang argued that Reischauer shaped the initial discourse on Korean Studies in contributing the parts on Korea in *East Asia: The Great Tradition* (1960).[17] Furthermore, Chang argued that the construction of Korean Studies in the United States was influenced by the transpacific intellectual network that connected intellectuals in Japan (Hatada Takashi), Korea (Yi Pyŏngdo), and the United States (Reischauer, Wagner), and argued that Hatada's book *Chosenshi* (1951) reflected the colonial discourse embedded in the secondary sources it used despite the author's intention to overcome this discourse, , and thus influenced Reischauer's writing of Korea part in *East Asia: Great Tradition*. Chang's article is particularly illuminating for this dissertation, as it not only historicized the texts in relation to the Cold War politics and situated the Korean Studies within a broader framework of East Asian Studies, but also shed light on the transnational intellectual exchanges. While this dissertation did not explore the transpacific network per se, Chang's article provided

[17] Sei-Jin Chang, "Raishawŏ, Tongasia, kwŏllyŏk/chisik ŭi t'ek'ŭnoloji – Chŏnhu Miguk ŭi chiyŏk yŏn'gu wa Han'gukak ŭi paech'i [Edwin O. Reischuaer, East Asia, and the technology of power/knowledge]," *Sanghŏ Hakbo* 6, (Oct 2012): 90; Jong-Chol An, "Chuil Taesa Edŭwin Raishawŏ ŭi kŭndaehwaron kwa Han'guksa insik [Edwin O. Reischauer's Modernization Theory and Perception of Korea as a Japanese ambassador]," *Yŏksa Munje Yŏn'gu* 29 (April 2013): 293-322.

valuable insights in understanding how the knowledge of Korea was constructed and circulated transnationally.

Examination of previous literature on American writings about Korea and establishment of Korean Studies in the United States exhibits the following limitations: first, due to the absence of literature on colonial period, the connection between American missionaries' accounts of Korea produced during the twentieth century and the postwar scholarship of Korean Studies in the United States has been rarely examined. Virtually no studies have attended to how initial American knowledge of Korea impacted later Korean Studies, not to mention how American intellectuals studied Korea during the colonial period. While Korea was not a popular subject of study for Americans during the colonial period, however, there were American scholars who studied Korea, most of whom were children of American missionaries to Korea who inherited their parents' initial knowledge and developed it into academic knowledge by writing dissertations, which have not been analyzed in previous studies. The lack of literature on the colonial period obscures the possible route through which early accounts of Korean history were transmitted to postwar studies. Furthermore, this gap also obscures the possible influence of Japanese colonial scholarship on the U.S. academia, which occurred through the transnational ciruclation of knowledge during the colonial period. Remedying this situation requires a larger framework that can accommodate the period from late nineteenth century up to 1960s and encompass knowledge construction of Korea not only in the United States but also in Japan and Korea.

Second, most American writings on Korea are not properly historicized in earlier literature, often being regarded as objective accounts rather than subjective narratives that

were influenced by politics and the intellectual discourse to which the author consciously or unconsciously conformed. American intellectuals often positioned themselves as an unbiased third party without political implications, as they belonged to neither colonialist nor nationalist intellectual tradition in dealing with Korea. Their claims to objectivity were accepted without much criticism in the previous literature, which relegated these texts outside of its own historical context and endowed itself with false authority of objectivity. This false authority of objectivity was granted not only to American scholars but also to Japanese positivist historians. The objective exterior of "scientific knowledge" produced by them help circulate this knowledge among Koreans and Americans. To properly historicize these texts, any examination must situate them in relation to its own historical context, such as power politics among Japan, Korea, and the United States, as well as within the intellectual tradition and discourses informing the analysis. Furthermore, the resulting knowledge should be treated as subjective narrative(s) rather than objective accounts of factual information, keeping in mind what subjectivity was injected in the creation of such knowledge.

Third, the transnational aspect of knowledge construction about a colonized nation is often overlooked in early literature, which is especially clear in terms of the influence of Japanese and Korean knowledge on American writings about Korea. Knowledge about Korea was constructed in conversation among authors of different nationalities from the very early stages, when the concept of Korea as a nation was first emerging. For example, analysis of early American books on Korea, such as Hulbert's books, showed how he incorporated his contemporary Japanese scholars' works, as well as historical interpretations by newly emerging Korean "civilization and enlightenment" discourse. Even during the colonial

period, Japanese scholarship was read by American scholars and transmitted either in Japanese scholarly articles or through individual transnational scholars, such as Yoshi S. Kuno, who was born and raised in Japan and later taught East Asian history in the United States. A proper textual historicization requires an examination of such intellectual exchanges as well as historical contextualization concerning how multiple national authors transnationally contructed knowledge about a colonized nation, further reinforcing the "objectivity" of the produced knowledge.

Finally, previous literature on American and/or Japanese knowledge of Korea did not pay sufficient attention to the participation of Korean intellectuals in this process. This is due partly to the prevalent Saidian approach, in which those producing knowledge about the dominated are the dominant group in power, and partly to nationalist historiography that tends to efface the historical works of the Koreans who collaborated with Japanese in producing knowledge. A close look at primary sources shows, however, that many Korean intellectuals participated in producing knowledge about Korea not only with the Japanese intellectuals during the colonial period, which was later transmitted to the United States, but also with American intellectuals before and during the Cold War. While it is important to look at the hegemony of specific knowledge and the power relations, it is still necessary to include the voices of Korean intellectuals excluded from the previous literature in order to have more balanced picture of U.S. knowledge production about Korea.

Framework

As pointed out above, the study of formation of U.S. knowledge about Korea calls for a larger framework that encompasses the period from late nineteenth century to the postwar period and also emphasizes the discontinuities of each intellectual tradition in knowledge production. In this regard, I will follow Michel Foucault's genealogical approach in "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History,"[18] which sees history as a discontinuous process, separated by ruptures into different isolated fields where different sets of power relations operate. Foucault's periodization depended on the emergence of new set of discourses that reflected the power dynamics of each intellectual tradition. This approach is useful for this dissertation, as it divides the long process of knowledge formation into separate scenes with differing power operations, within which I can locate texts to historicize them. Also, it accommodates the constantly changing power dynamics among Japan, Korea, and the United States in the examination of knowledge production about Korea.

Using this notion, this dissertation identifies three different intellectual traditions and the changing power relations that affected the postwar knowledge production about Korea in the United States. First, I look at the American missionaries' accounts of Korea from 1882 to 1910, from when the United States concluded a treaty with Korea, to when Korea was annexed by Japan. During this time, as Korea was being produced as a modern nation, multiple national authors of Japan, Korea, and Americans produced knowledge about Korea while reading one another's works. While Japanese knowledge about Korea

[18] Michel Foucault, "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History," in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, ed. D. F. Bouchard (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977).

held the hegemony over others from 1890s, American missionaries' books were also considered important, as both the Japanese and the Koreans cared about how Korea was presented to the English-reading public, which could intervene in Korea's political situation. The initial American knowledge was produced during this time, including the initial narrative structure and themes in Korean history.

Next, I look at the production of Japanese knowledge about Korea from 1910 to 1945, the time frame during Japan colonized Korea. While the Japanese started to construct knowledge about Korea from as early as 1890s, it was during this first half of the twentieth century that knowledge production about Korea was systemized in universities in Japan and in Korea, with support of the colonial government, emerging as "scientific knowledge." Japanese colonial scholarship enjoyed unprecedented hegemony over other knowledge about Korea during this period and influenced Korean nationalist historiography as well as American scholars. Finally, I look at the postwar construction of knowledge of Korea as part of the East Asian Studies program in U.S. universities from 1945 to 1960s, that is, from the end of the Pacific War until the first generation of scholars in Korean Studies finished their dissertations. Knowledge about Korea was constructed under the strong influence of modernization theory, which supported the Cold War politics, as well as U.S. Japanese Studies, which were regarded as the ideal case of modernization. With its criticism of racist and imperialist discourses, postwar knowledge about Korea shows significant epistemological break from the prewar period.

While separating the time periods into discontinuous fields, I trace the continuing themes that cut through the different intellectual fields. Borrowing Edward Said's idea of

how colonial discourses such as Orientalism were reconfigured to become the basis of area studies in the United States, and how this was possible due to the usefulness of such discourses within the new set of power relations as well as the authority it had as accumulated knowledge,[19] this dissertation examines how themes from one intellectual tradition traveled to others and were reconfigured to serve new functions withinin the new set of power politics. For example, the discourse of failure within Korean history, a framework produced by American, Japanese, and Korean intellectuals during the early twentieth century that organized Korean history to explain Korea's failure to survive as a sovereign nation, was not only deployed by Japanese colonial scholars – as it legitimized Japanese colonial rule over Korea – but also appealed to postwar Korean Studies scholars, as it supported modernization theory by providing a case of failure that contrasted with the ideal Japanese case. This dissertation never attempts to draw a smooth line of knowledge formation from the late nineteenth century to postwar Korean Studies, but rather analyzes how the idea traveled from one separate intellectual tradition to the other and from the prewar to the postwar era.

On the other hand, this dissertation regards the various historical texts as "narrative" rather than objective accounts, using Hayden White's notion of "narrativity" in *The Content of the Form*.[20] Countering positivist historians and their claims to objectivity, White argued that any proper history with formal coherency necessitates a form of narrative, which

[19] Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), 299.

[20] Hayden White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987), 24.

reflects the author's subjective moral judgment. White's suggestion to regard all historical text as subjective "narrative" is useful for this project in various ways. First, it debunks the objective exterior of the American texts and Japanese positivist historiography and enables us to focus on the authors' subjective historical interpretations in relation to their own context of political power dynamics and intellectual traditions. Most important, however, it provides an insight into history writing not as a listing of detailed, factual information about a nation's past, but rather as a narrative framework organized by the subjective interpretation of cause-and-effect leading toward a conclusion at the end.

Written as a modern national history that draws a linear line of progress from ancient to modern, the narrative structure of Korean history was also produced as a story of how the nation (protagonist) evolved through time from ancient past to the present. The conclusion of this type of narrative framework often accompanied the assessment of the nation's present status and how it is related to its past history. In other words, Korean history was built as a narrative framework, seamlessly connected by a series of historical events that functioned as cause-and-effect, leading toward the conclusion at the end. One particular aspect of Korean history, shared by all writers regardless of nationality, was that it already had a conclusion, which was the loss of its sovereignty at the beginning of twentieth century. As a result, the organization of the narrative structure focused on explaining Korea's failure at the end; that is, it created a discourse of failure. This dissertation analyzes the narrative framework created within each intellectual tradition as well as the themes used in the narrative. Comparing and contrasting the narrative

framework of each tradition also enables us to trace the influence of one historical text on another.

I also want to emphasize that knowledge about Korea was constructed by multiple national authors who influenced one another. This multi-national and transnational aspect of the construction of knowledge about Korea has been pointed out by scholars in other academic fields. As mentioned above, Oppenheim recently suggested the term "multi-sitedness" to describe how American anthropological knowledge of Korea from 1882 to 1945 was produced by multiple national authors, including American, Japanese, and Korean scholars.[21] Oppenheim argues that registering the multi-sitedness enables greater attention to the dynamics of exchange among the different traditions[22] and allows us to trace specific instances of reading across national traditions, as well as direct encounters. Andre Schmid and Henry Em, on the other hand, used the term "co-authorship of a nation" to indicate how Japanese and Korean scholars co-produced Korean national identity despite their opposite political aims[23] and how the common conceptual basis for an evolutionary outlook was shared by Japaense imperialist discourse and "civilization and enlightment" thinkers.[24] This dissertation pays much deserved attention to the shared intellectual discourse among Japanese, Korean, and American scholars who made the transnational circulation of knowledge possible. It is important that Japanese intellectuals during the

---

[21] Oppenheim, "Introduction," 302; Robert Oppenheim, *An Asian Frontier: American Anthropology and Korea, 1882-1945* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2016)

[22] Oppenheim, "Introduction," 303.

[23] Henry Em, *The Great Enterprise: Sovereignty and Historiography in Modern Korea* (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2013), 103

[24] Schmid, *Korea between Empires*; Oppenheim, "Introduction," 304.

Meiji period used the language of Western science in constructing knowledge of its others, including Korea,[25] as it made it possible for American missionaries who shared the discourse of capitalist modernity and the logic of colonialism to adopt such knowledge without much conflict. Despite the difference in political aims, the shared intellectual basis as well as the authority it had as "objective" knowledge made it possible for such knowledge to be circulated among American, Japanese and Korean intellectuals. In analyzing each intellectual tradition, this dissertation focuses on transnational intellectual interactions that led American scholars to incorporate both contemporary Japanese and Korean knowledge about Korea. Participation of Korean intellectuals in constructing knowledge about Korea is also quite evident when this broader scope is employed.

One final note should be made on the delicate issue of agency, power politics, and the shared intellectual discourse. Power politics, as discussed above, were an important factor in the knowledge construction, as it often guided the direction and shaped the focus of contemporary knowledge. However, it would be inaccurate to simply make a direct connection between knowledge and power politics, as if the scholars produced knowledge to serve power politics. For example, it would be an oversimplification to argue that Japanese colonial scholars produced knowledge solely to support Japanese colonial policy. Boudewjin Walraven has pointed this out, arguing that Japanese colonial ethnographers' research on Korea was not a conscious, concerted, and unified attempt to denigrate Korean culture, but rather a consequence of the modern world-view of Japanese scholars, the

[25] Tanaka, *Japan's Orient.*

perspective of a modern academic discipline of Western origin and academic paradigmata shared with Korean researchers.[26] While agreeing with this view, however, this dissertation suggests that both colonial policy and colonial scholarship were based on the same intellectual discourse shaped within the power politics of colonialism. Furthermore, while individual scholars did not aim to serve the colonial policy per se with their research, they were part of a knowledge-producing system supported by funding from the colonial government, whether the individual scholar was conscious of this or not. This view can be extended to the American scholars under the Cold War regime. Postwar American scholars in Korean Studies often showed critical attitude toward American policy over Korea; nevertheless, their research was guided by modernization theory and the Cold War politics underlying American foreign policy rested.

Considering this, how then do we make sense of the issue of agency? An author's political aim in writing a text should be regarded as important; however, texts are often influenced by and conform to the intellectual discourse of which the author partakes. Andre Schmid pointed out how nationalism and colonialism in Korea, despite their opposing political goals, ended up creating very similar Korean cultural representation due to their shared impulse to appraise cultural practice in terms of compatibility with the ideals of civilized nation and capitalist modernity.[27] This can be also seen in how American missionaries such as Hulbert, who criticize Griffis's dependence on Japanese sources,

---

[26] Boudewjin Walraven, "The Natives Next Door: Ethnology in Colonial Korea," in *Anthropology and Colonialism in Asia and Oceania*, ed. J. G. van Bremen and A. Shimizu (Richmond: Curzon, 1998), 239.

[27] Schmid, *Korea between Empires*, 14.

ended up emulating his narrative framework, or how Hatada Takashi, who criticized the Japanese colonial scholarship of Korea, ended up relying on the very sources he criticized in his own narrative of Korean history. Agency matters, but it is also important to look at the larger structure of knowledge production in which individual authors produce knowledge in conversation with contemporary knowledge and the intellectual discourse on which the scholar builds his own knowledge. This is the hegemony of accumulated knowledge over the individual authors' production of knowledge.

Paying keen attention to the power politics underlying knowledge construction, while being careful not to judge or misinterpret the motivation and political aim of individual scholars, this dissertation examines the hegemonic discourses to which scholars conformed and contributed while writing about Korea.

Overview of Chapters

This dissertation, organized chronologically, identifies three intellectual traditions that influenced the establishment of Korean Studies in the United States during the postwar period, as well as connections among these traditions.

Chapter Two, "Producing Korea: Creation of American Narrative Framework of Korean History," explores early American knowledge about Korea, from 1882 to 1910, which was largely constructed by American missionaries to Korea. The chapter first situates the production of American knowledge within the historical context of production of knowledge about Korea, examining how American knowledge about Korea was interwoven with emerging Japanese and Korean discourses on Korea. American views of

Korea were often entangled with those of Japanese and Korean writers, as they shared common notions of civilization and its universality, and the knowledge of Korea was transnationally circulated. The chapter then, examines the creation of the American narrative framework for Korean history in two very influential American books: William E. Griffis' *Corea the Hermit Nation* (1882) and Homer B. Hulbert's *History of Korea* (1905) and *Passing of Korea* (1906). Most often, these two Americans were viewed as presenting conflicting narratives about Korea, a view probably coming from the fact that Hulbert, the representative "pro-Korean" American missionary, attempted to correct Griffis' book who were often regarded by later Korean historian as "pro-Japanese" American. However, analysis of each author's narrative framework for Korean history reveals more similarity than difference. Chapter Two argues that both Griffis and Hulbert contributed to creating an initial narrative framework of Korean history that relied on a discourse of failure. It also analyzes how Hulbert integrated both Korean "civilization and enlightenment" discourse, as well as Japanese colonialist discourse, as he came up with the initial narrative framework. Themes in Korean history such as Korea's stagnancy, victimization due to the strong neighbors, isolationism, and factionalism also emerged during this period and were integrated into the American narrative framework of Korean history.

Chapter Three, "Transnational Circulation of 'Scientific Knowledge': Japanese Colonial Scholarship and Its Ramification for U.S. Academia," investigates the development Japanese colonial scholarship on Korean history from 1910 to 1945, and how this knowledge was transnationally circulated among Korean as well as American scholars. Under the Japanese colonial rule, accounts of Korean history took the form of "scientific

knowledge" in major universities in Japan and Korea, which had a strong hegemony over other knowledge about Korea. With the help of previous studies, this chapter first explains how themes such as stagnancy, factionalism, and heteronomy were developed as academic themes, how the narrative framework of failure was "proven" scientifically in Japanese colonial scholarship, and how Koreans who came up with counter-narratives to Japanese colonial scholarship were also caught up in the discourse of failure. Next, the chapter examines how Japanese colonial scholarship influenced American scholars during the 1930s and 1940s in American universities. In particular, the chapter focuses on American missionaries' children, such as Harold J. Noble and George M. McCune, who were born and raised in Korea but educated in the American universities and received doctoral degrees from the University of California at Berkeley in 1931 and 1941, respectively. Analyzing their dissertations,[28] this chapter argues that Noble and McCune inherited the American missionaries' narrative framework for Korean history and transformed it into academic knowledge. Furthermore, it analyzes how McCune direct and indirect (via other transnational scholars such as Yoshi S. Kuno) integration of Japanese colonial scholarship in order to support his narrative framework and to assume its academic authority. McCune's dissertation shows how the Japanese colonial scholarship transnationally influenced the America knowledge about Korean history during the colonial period.

[28] Harold Joyce Noble, "Korea and Her Relations with the United States before 1895" (PhD diss., University of California Berkeley, 1931); George McAfee McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan, 1800-1864," (PhD diss., University of California Berkeley, 1941).

Chapter Four, "Continuity and Discontinuity: Postwar Reconfiguration of Colonial Knowledge," examines the establishment of Korean Studies during the postwar period. It first situates the construction of knowledge about Korean history within the context of emerging East Asian Studies, particularly U.S. Japanese Studies, the narrative structure of which is based on modernization theory; this shaped the narrative framework of Korean history. Building on Sejin Chang's pioneering work, this chapter analyzes the narrative frameworks in *Chosenshi* (1951) by Takashi Hatada,[29] and the chapter on Korea in the *East Asia: the Great Tradition* (1961) by John K. Fairbank, Edwin O. Reischauer, and Albert M. Craig[30] to see how the narrative framework revealed an epistemological break from the prewar narrative structure, and how some themes from the prewar period were reconfigured to serve new functions in the postwar narrative frameworks. Then, by analyzing the dissertations written by the first-generation scholars in Korean Studies during the 1950s and 1960s, such as Gregory Henderson and Key P. Yang, Edward W. Wagner, Chong Sun Kim, Hugh Kang, Chong Ik Kim and Hankyo Kim, Michael Rogers, Gari Ledyard, and John Jamieson, the chapter discusses how modernization theory and the larger narrative framework of East Asian history influenced the narrative framework employed by these authors and how new themes such as longevity of Korean dynasties and stability emerged even as the authors drew on knowledge from colonial scholarship on and missionaries' accounts of Korea.

---

[29] Takashi Hatada, *Chosenshi* (Tokyo: Iwanami zensho, 1951).

[30] Edwin O. Reischauer, John King Fairbank, and Albert Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1960). This book covers premodern East Asian history. Their modern East Asian history was published as *East Asia: The Modern Transformation* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965).

CHAPTER TWO

Producing Korea:

Creation of American Narrative Framework of Korean History, 1882-1910

In 1900, two articles were published in the first volume of the *Transactions of the Korea Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, one written by an American missionary, Homer B. Hulbert, and the other by a Canadian missionary, James S. Gale.[31] While Gale pointed to the pervasiveness of Chinese influence on Korean civilization, arguing that "nothing in Korea was uninfluenced by Chinese civilization,"[32] Hulbert criticized this position by declaring that Korean civilization was unique and could be separated from that of Chinese.[33] What can be witnessed from this discussion is that Korea as a nation was being defined and produced from around the early twentieth century by both Americans and Canadians in Korea and that they tried to carve out what they could call "Korean" separated from "Chinese."

When Korea concluded its first modern treaty with Japan in 1876, and with the United States in 1882, it was integrated into the modern capitalist world in which the "nation" was the unit of larger global ecumen and of historical process. In other words, Korea needed to be understood, imagined, and produced in a form that fit the modern concept of "nation." To

---

[31] James. S. Gale, "The Influence of China upon Korea," *Transactions of the Korea Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1 (1900): 1-24; Homer. B. Hulbert, "Korean Survivals," *Transaction of the Korea Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1 (1900): 25-50.

[32] Gale, "The influence of China upon Korea," 14.

[33] Hulbert, "Korean Survivals," 42.; For further information on this debate, refer to Yongmin Lee, "Kaeil kwa Hŏlbŏtŭ ŭi Han'guksa ihae [Understanding of Korean History by Gale and Hulbert], *Kyohoesahak* 6, no 1 (2007): 161-203.

be a nation in this way required having its own national identity, national character, and national history.

As seen from how the two missionaries looked into history in an attempt to define "Korean-ness," historical narratives were essential in defining the nation, as they gave not only the "character" but also a "life-story" to a nation. As Balibar discussed, national identity is "always already presented to us in a form of a narrative which contributes to the continuity of a subject. The formation of nation thus appears as fulfillment of a "project" stretching over centuries, in which there are different stages and moments of coming to self-awareness."[34] Imagining Korea as a nation required creating a historical narrative which explained and provided the basis of its national identity. This act also meant locating Korean civilization temporally and spatially within the world by bringing its historical narratives into the larger narrative of world history, and specifically linking it with its two neighbors, Japan and China.

Producing Korea as a "nation" became a major project pursued by Koreans who wanted to guarantee their survival in the new world, as well as by Japanese who needed an "other" in the process of constructing their own identity as a nation. While previous studies have focused on how Japanese and Koreans produced discourses on Korea,[35] scholars paid less attention to the "western" people's participation and contribution to the process of producing knowledge of Korea. Often the western people in Korea were regarded as

---

[34] Etiene Balibar, "The Nation Form: History and Ideology," in *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, ed. Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein (New York: Verso, 1991), 86.

[35] Andre Schmid, *Korea between Empires*; Tanaka, *Japan's Orient;* Hatada, "Ilbon e isŏsŏŭi Han'guksa yŏn'guŭi chŏnt'ong."

"objective observers" because they were not directly related to Japan's colonization of Korea. Despite the general belief that they merely made sketchy first impressions of Korea, however, many westerners actively engaged in producing knowledge of Korea over various disciplines. Among the publications on Korea left by western people, writings by Americans were the majority.[36] In particular, American protestant missionaries, mostly college-educated and residing in Korea for about two decades by the early 1900s, studied Korean history, folklore, literature, religion, linguistics, and anthropology. Their conclusions were published mostly through journal articles and books both in Korea and the U.S. These writings not only integrated Japanese and Korean intellectual discourses, but also formed the initial images and basic framework of American knowledge of Korea.

This chapter explores American writings of Korea and the initial knowledge of Korea they constructed from 1882, when the first American book on Korea was published, to 1910, when Korea was colonized by Japan and American publications on Korea decreased. Previous literature on American writings of Korea has failed to historicize these documents, by treating them as merely outsiders' views and focusing only on their positive or negative descriptions of Korea. This chapter locates the American writings of Korea within the historical context of knowledge production on Korea, which was fervently being produced within and outside the country. It first demonstrates how American knowledge of Korea was interwoven with the emerging Japanese and Korean discourses on Korea, by

[36] Chang Chae-yong pointed out that American authors wrote 37% of the books, British 23%, French 13%. (Chang Chae-yong, "Kŭndae Sŏyangin ŭi chŏsul e natanan Han'guksa insik [Perceptions of Korean History as Reflected in Western Sources predating 1945]" PhD diss., Kangwŏn University, 2016), 22.

examining the historical context of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Then it focuses on the creation of historical narratives on Korea in two American intellectuals' books, William E. Griffis' *Corea: the Hermit Nation* (1882),[37] and Homer B. Hulbert's *History of Korea* (1905) and *Passing of Korea* (1906).[38] It argues that American intellectuals' narrative on Korean history developed as a discourse of failure, which was organized in a way to explain how Korea failed to maintain its sovereignty, while integrating both Japanese colonialist and Korean nationalist discourse. Further, it shows how Griffis' and Hulbert's narratives, while seemingly in conflict, both contributed to develop a basic framework in writing Korean history, one which many later twentieth century American intellectuals referred to.

By doing so, this chapter weaves American writings of Korean history into the history of producing knowledge of Korea, emphasizing the transnational nature of knowledge production on a colonized nation. Finally, as part of a larger dissertation project that traces the origin of postwar Korean Studies in the U.S.—which had been only regarded as the product of the Cold War—this chapter provides evidence for another intellectual stream that influenced the postwar Korean Studies field by looking at the earlier, formative period of American knowledge of Korea.

---

[37] William E. Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation* (New York: Scribner, 1882).

[38] Homer B. Hulbert, *Passing of Korea;* Homer B. Hulbert, *History of Korea* (Seoul: Methodist Pub. House, 1905).

Discursive Formation of American Knowledge of Korea

Japanese intellectuals launched studies on Korea following Japan's conclusion of a treaty with Korea in 1876. The 1883 discovery and investigation of King Kwanggaet'o's stele from Koguryŏ, an ancient Korean kingdom, and the installment of a history department in Tokyo Imperial University in 1887 accelarated their interest in Korea, and after the Sino-Japanese War in 1894, Japanese publication on Korea dramatically increased.[39] While the studies on Korea ranged across various disciplines, their major focus was on Korean history, without which they could not explain Japanese ancient history and its origin. One of the most popular books on Korean history was Hayashi Taisuke's *Chosenshi* [*History of Chosŏn*] published in 1892.[40] This was the first Korean history written in the form of a modern national history by a Japanese scholar, and it influenced many Korean intellectuals. Hayashi periodized Korean history as four different time periods; before the Four Han Chinese Commanderies, from Three Kingdoms to the end of Silla dynasty, Koryŏ dynasty, and Chosŏn dynasty.

Hayashi's focus was on the ancient history. Hayashi described Korean history to be orignated from Kija, a Chinese scholar in tenth century B.C., and described Korea as historicallly tributory to China from ancient past to the present.[41] Furthermore, he argued

---

[39] Manyŏl Yi, "19 segi mal Ilbon ŭi Han'guksa yŏn'gu," in *Ch'ŏngil Chŏnjaeng kwa Hanil kwan'gye*, ed. Han'guksa Yŏn'guhoe (Seoul: Ilchogak, 1985), 85-87.; Cho Tonggŏl, *Hanguk kŭndae sahaksa* (Seoul: Yŏksa Konggan, 2010), 296.

[40] Taisuke Hayashi, *Chosenshi* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Hanshichi, 1892). Hayashi who studied the Chinese classics at Tokyo University. Five volumes of *Chosenshi* published in 1892 covered the ancient history to Koryŏ dynasty, and *Chosen Kinseishi* published in 1900 covered the Chosŏn dynasty. In 1912, he republished the two books together as *Chosen Tsushi* [Complete History of Korea]. Taisuke Hayashi, *Chosen Kinseishi* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa Hanshichi, 1900); Taisuke Hayashi, *Chosen Tsushi* (Tokyo: Fuzanbo, 1912).

[41] Myeon-Hoi Do, "Han'guk kŭndae yŏksahak ŭi ch'angch'ul kwa t'ongsa ch'egye ŭi hwangnip," Yŏksa wa

that Empress Jingo conquered Silla and Paekche who paid tributes to Japan afterwards, and that Mimana Nihonfu, a Japanese military post, was established in the southern peninsula.[42] This narrative depicted Korea to be historically subordinate to its two strong neighbors, Japan and China. Meanwhile, Scholars interested in Korea gathered around Tokyo Imperial University, including Shiratori Kurakichi, Naka Michiyo, Yoshida Togo, Yanai Watari. They also published a series of articles around the mid-1890s. Influenced by the Rankean methodology of evidential approach,[43] they started to study ancient kingdoms of Korea through examining names and official titles that appeared on old gravestones.[44] During the 1890s, Japanese intellectuals from the *Kokugaku* tradition—Shigeno Yasutsugu, Kume Kunitake, and Hoshino Hisashi—were using primary sources such as *Kojikki* and *Nihonshoki* from the eighth century C.E. to establish the legitimacy of the Japanese imperial family.[45]

Japanese research on Korea was closely intertwined with Japan's construction of its own national identity.[46] Stefan Tanaka discussed in *Japan's Orient* how Japan met the challenge of the Orientalized gaze from the West by creating its own "others." Japanese intellectuals such as Shiratori Kurakichi attempted to create a notion of *toyo*—an imaginary geographical concept of East Asia—in order to establish equivalence with Europe and at

---

Hyŏnsil 70 (Dec 2008): 194-195.

[42] Hye-Joo Choi, "Kŭndae Ilbonŭi Han'guksagwan kwa yŏksa waegok," *Han'guk Tongnip Undongsa Yŏn'gu* 35 (Mar 2010), 291-292.

[43] Hatada, "Ilbon e isŏsŏ ŭi Han'guksa yŏn'gu ŭi chŏnt'ong," 80.

[44] Hatada, "Ilbon e isŏsŏŭi Han'guksa yŏngu ŭi chŏnt'ong," 78.

[45] Hatada, "Ilbon e isŏsŏŭi Han'guksa yŏn'guŭi chŏnt'ong," 76.

[46] Tanaka, *Japan's Orient*.

the same time to distinguish Japan from the rest of Asia. In other words, Japan needed to research China and Korea to create knowledge of its own past, while projecting western Orientalism to discuss China and Korea's "backwardness" in order to differentiate them from Japan.[47] Korea became a useful "other" in the construction of Japanese national identity, because it was a neighbor state also influenced by Chinese civilization, but unlike Japan, "failed to separate itself" from it. Furthermore, without Korean history, it was impossible to explain Japan's ancient history, when interaction took place mostly with Koreans rather than Chinese during the ancient period. For this reason, Korean ancient history became a major focus in Japanese studies of Korea. During the 1900s, as it became only a matter of time before Japan colonized Korea, constructing knowledge of Korea gained more importance, as it was expedient to study its potential colony.

Meanwhile, Korean intellectuals started to imagine Korea as a modern nation just when the Sino-Japanese War ended its former tributary relations with China. Kabo Reform, the first modern government reform in 1895, initiated programs to construct itself as a modern nation. One of the efforts was publishing its own national history. Textbooks on Korean history were published by government orders. During the late 1890s and early 1900s, newspapers such as *Tongnip Sinmun, Hwangsŏng Sinmun,* and *Taehan Maeil Sinbo* became a new platform through which Korean intellectuals produced discourses on Korea

[47] While providing a critical framework in examining Japanese knowledge construction on its other, this book did not further discuss the function of Korea in this discourse of *toyo*, reducing *toyo* to China. Andre Schmid pointed out that research on *toyo* actually began with studies on Korea (not China), without which they could not explain Japan's ancient history. See Andre Schmid, "Colonialism and the 'Korea Problem' in the Historiography of Modern Japan: A Review Article," *The Journal of Asian Studies* 59, no. 4 (Nov 2000): 962-963.

as a nation. What Korean intellectuals strove for was to present Korean civilization as unique and original by countering the prevalent idea that Korea was only a variant of Chinese civilization.[48] To carve out what is "authentically Korean," Korean intellectuals also delved into writing Korean history, focusing on aspects that seemed to highlight Korea's uniqueness. Examples include the invention of the Korean alphabet, or an emphasis on Tan'gun as Korea's founding father, replacing a previous emphasis on Kija, who supposedly had brought civilization from China.[49]

What truly motivated Korean intellectuals was the sense of crisis spurred by the need to prove that Korea was a unique civilization and deserved to survive in the modern capitalist world into which they just were being integrated. By the 1900s, Korean intellectuals were already facing Japanese-produced knowledge which often described Korea as "backward" and "dependent." While Korean intellectuals were under the influence of a strong hegemony of Japanese knowledge of Korea, a new alternative Korean nationalist historiography also emerged. In 1908, Sin Ch'aeho's book *Toksa sillon* signaled the emergence of a Korean nationalist historiography with Tan'gun at its core, emphasizing the territorial expansion, bravery, and autonomy of the Korean ancient kingdoms, focusing on Koguryŏ.

American writers also contributed to the knowledge of Korean history. American books on Korea started to be published as early as 1882, increased in quantity around the

---

[48] Schmid, *Korea Between Empires*, 55-100.

[49] Sooja Kim, "The Modern Korean Nation, Tan'gun, and Historical Memory in Late Nineteenth to Early Twentieth Century Korea," *International Journal of Korean History* 19, vol. 2 (2014): 220.

mid-1890s and reached a peak from 1900 to 1910.[50] While many books were about the authors' travels or episodes in Korea,[51] by the mid-1890s American protestant missionaries who resided in Korea started to research Korean customs, religions, language, literature and history. Most of these studies were published as articles in missionary journals such as *Korean Repository* (1892-1898) and the *Korea Review* (1901-1906). In 1900, *Transactions of the Korea Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* became another platform through which these studies were published. American missionaries studied the Korean alphabet and grammar, performed anthropological and ethnographical studies, collected folktales, and studied history. The purpose of American missionaries' efforts was to examine Korea as a mission field, and introduce Korea to the American public, which increased the possibility of recruiting more missionaries to Korea and of raising funds for missions.

If American intellectuals' endeavor to produce knowledge of Korea seemed less desperate compared to Korean and Japanese efforts, it was because Americans lacked the same political motivations in producing knowledge of Korea, being primarily interested in mission work. Also, Americans were regarded as strangers to Korean culture, which made many later scholars discredit American writings as inaccurate and irrelevant. However, American writings of Korea did hold political significance to the contemporary Koreans

---

[50] Chang, "Kŭndae Sŏyangin ŭi chŏsul e natanan han'guksa insik," 22.

[51] See Lillias Undrwood, *Fifteen Years Among the Top-knots or Life in Korea* (New York: American Tract Society, 1904); George T. Ladd, *In Korea with Marquis Ito* (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1908); George Willaim Gilmore, *Korea From Its Capital* (Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work, 1892); Horace Newton Allen, *Things Korean* (New York: F. H. Revell Company, 1908); Daniel Gifford, *Everyday life in Korea* (New York: F. H. Revell Company, 1898); Other popular books written in English, but not by Americans, include Isabel Bird Bishop, *Korea and Her Neighbors* and James Scarth Gale, *Korea in Transition*.

and Japanese. First, Americans were regarded as people familiar with the format of the "new" knowledge, which gave them some authority in knowledge construction. For example, Griffis' book on Korea was published in 1882 in the format of a modern historical narrative. This was about a decade earlier than Hayashi's book on Korean history. Also, in the hierarchical structure of civilization in the "civilization and enlightenment discourse" that American, Korean, and Japanese scholars all shared, Americans were regarded as being in the highest tier, which gave them some intellectual authority.[52] It was in this context that Griffis' book was translated into Japanese and published in Tokyo, under the title of *Chosen Kaikano Kigen* [*The Origin of Chosŏn Enlightenment*] in 1895.[53] Furthermore, because America was regarded as a power that could intervene in the Japanese colonization of Korea, both Japanese and Koreans paid keen attention to the American books on Korea that could appeal to the American public.

Japan, Korea, and America constructed knowledge of Korea with their own political purposes. However, it would be wrong to assume that the knowledge of Korea was constructed separately, divided by national or linguistic boundaries of the subjects. Instead, it was constructed with constant interaction among them. Japanese, Koreans, and Americans read and integrated each other's works. In other words, the knowledge of Korea was formed discursively by multiple national subjects—Japanese, Korean, and American—on the shared basis of the civilization and enlightenment discourse.

---

[52] Schmid discusses how there was a practice of ranking nations into hierarchies of civilization in three-tiered typology: the civilized, semi-civilized, and the barbarian. (Schmid, *Korea Between Empires*, 37).

[53] William E. Griffis, *Chosen Kaika no Kigen* (Tokyo: Suikyosha, 1895).

It is relatively well-known how Japanese and Korean intellectuals' knowledge construction of Korea often intermingled despite their opposite political purposes. Andre Schmid pointed out that Korean self-knowledge during this period cannot be separated from the Japanese production of knowledge about Korea, since Korean nationalist discourse and Japanese colonialism shared much in their historical understanding and approaches to national culture, with their mutual endorsement of capitalist modernity.[54] Schmid stated that both Korean nationalists and Japanese colonialists shared conceptual vocabulary, themes in cultural representation, and narrative strategies, based on the shared commitment to "civilization and enlightenment" and rooted in the same range of modern discourses.[55] In this context, Korean nationalist discourse had potential to be co-opted by Japanese colonialist discourse, despite its purpose of achieving self-government. Japan described Korea as "backward" and "lacking" what Japan had in order to demonstrate the superiority of Japan (that is, being civilized enough to colonize another culture), and to portray Korea to be in such a condition that colonization was required in order to get out of its stasis. At the same time, Korean intellectuals echoed the problematic aspects of Korea in their attempts to call for reforms. In this way, Korea and Japanese knowledge not only shared cultural representations as well as historical interpretation of Korea, but also they appraised the civilization based on the same standards.

What previous scholarship on this topic has overlooked is how American authors fit into the historical context of knowledge construction of Korea. American knowledge of

[54] Schmid, *Korea Between Empires*, 13.

[55] Schmid, *Korea Between Empires*, 102.

Korea was also basically under the sway of Japanese knowledge of Korea. However, as Henry Em pointed out, Japanese intellectual studies on Korea could not achieve full hegemonic status "as it remained a dependency of Britain and the United States" and because there were "overlapping and competing hegemonies operating in Korea."[56] As a late imperial power and an Asian state, Japan's position as a "civilized nation" was somewhat unstable. Japan was lauded for its victories during both the Sino-Japanese War (1894) and Russo-Japanese War (1904), but at the same time, it risked being regarded as an "imitation of western civilization."[57] This situation made Japan strive to publish articles and books in English to advertise its superiority in East Asia, as well as to show how they were guiding Korea to modernization to prevent possible intervention.

During the 1900s, Japan started to publish records of its modernizing works on Korea, *The Annual Reports on the Progress and Reforms in Korea*, in which Japan advertised itself as a colonizer.[58] Japanese intellectuals also published articles in American periodicals during the 1890s and 1900s.[59] Some Japanese periodicals such as *Taiyo*

---

[56] Em, *The Great Enterprise*, 105-106; Em uses Cummings' approach of understanding Japan's position in the World System, where Cummings argued that Japan had been a subordinate part of either trilateral American-British-Japanese hegemony or bilateral American-Japanese hegemony. For more information refer to Bruce Cummings, "Archeology, Descent, Emergence: Japan in British/American Hegemony, 1900-1950," in Japan in the World, ed. Masao Miyoshi and Harry Harootunian (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1993), 86-87.

[57] Hulbert argued that Japan lacked the essence of western civilization, which was Christian "altruism," (Homer B. Hulbert, "Editorial Comment," *The Korea Review* 6 (Jun 1906): 350") and that Japan gave no thought to the principle on which western civilization is based. (Hulbert, *Passing of Korea,* 6). Koreans in the U.S. also shared this idea that Japan only learned the "shadow" of the original. (*Kongnip sinmun*, July 8, 1908; Schmid, *Korea Between Empires*, 110.)

[58] Government-General of Chosen, *Annual Report on Reforms and Progress in Chosen* (Korea); Schmid, *Korea between Empires*, 161-162.

[59] Jimin Kim stated that Japanese intellectuals such as Kuma Oishi wrote articles in English to *Arena*, discussing how Japan ruled Korea during ancient history. (K. Oishi, "Causes Which Led to the War in the East," *Arena* 10, (Nov 1894), 721-735; Jimin Kim, "Representing the Invisible: American Perception of

allocated pages for articles in English.[60] Schmid pointed out how Japan attempted to compete with American authors to address American audiences in discussing matters in East Asia, since Japan wanted to present itself as a legitimate power in East Asia.[61] For example, *Seoul Press*, established in 1906, was a newspaper in English published by the Japanese resident-general, in order to rival and check Hulbert's *The Korea Review*. Inviting George T. Ladd to travel Korea with Marquis Ito, the first Japanese resident-general in Korea after 1905, was also part of an attempt to show the American public that Japan was a qualified colonizer, and to spread the Japanese version of Korea's cultural representation. While Japanese publications on Korea in English rivaled American writings of Korean history, it also meant that it was easy for Americans to integrate Japanese knowledge of Korea into their own.

American accounts of Korea often overlapped with Japanese accounts, despite the fact that the Americans did not share the same political purposes of either Japanese or Korean writers. This occurred because Americans also shared the civilization and enlightenment discourse in which both Japanese and Korean intellectuals were entrapped, making them appraise civilization according to the same standards. Such standards included how adaptive a nation was in adopting western civilization, how autonomous and independent a nation was toward its neighbors, and how motivated and diligent they were in achieving civilization. This shared basis made it possible for American writers to

---

Colonial Korea," (PhD diss., Columbia University, 2011), 35.

[60] Kim, "Representing the Invisible," 34.

[61] Andre Schmid, "Colonial Japan's Promotional Activities," 316.

integrate both Japanese colonial discourse and Korean nationalist discourse. In specific, American writers shared with Japanese and Koreans a negative view toward China and an urge to look for "Korean-ness" in ancient history with Koreans.

Both Japanese colonialists and Korean nationalists viewed Chinese influence over Korea negatively. Japanese intellectuals blamed the influence of Chinese civilization over Korea for most of its problems, and their research on *toyo* depicted China as "backward." Korean intellectuals attempted to "de-center" China, and tried to look for pure "Korean-ness" from its ancient history, where it was less influenced by Chinese civilization and Confucianism. This attitude was compatible with American writers' general view of China, which was pervasively negative from the 1880s to the 1900s. American intellectuals described China as "sticking to the antiquities which no longer survive in modern life,"[62] and criticized Confucianism for causing "intellectual degeneration of the yangbans," stating that it was "largely due to the benumbing and paralyzing effects of Chinese education."[63] Hulbert also argued that it was Chinese influence over Korea after the seventh century that caused the decline in Korean civilization, reflecting the logic of Korean nationalist discourse.[64]

---

[62] W. E. Griffis, "Jack and the Giant in Korea," *Outlook* 50 (Aug 11, 1894), 213; Kim, "Representing the Invisible," 52.

[63] George Kennan, "Korean People: The Product of Decayed Civilization," *Outlook* 81 (Oct 21, 1905), 411-412.

[64] Schmid stated that Hulbert's logic and vocabulary was reminiscent of Korean nationalists in bemoaning the Chinese negative influences over Korea in his article (Andre Schmid, "Two Americans in Seoul: Evaluating Oriental Empire, 1905-1910," *Korean Histories* 2 (2010): 19.

Negative perception of Chinese influence over Korea was closely related to the focus on Korean ancient history. According to both Gale and Hulbert in the introduction, the search for authentic "Korean-ness" was only possible when the influence of "Chinese civilization" on Korean civilization is removed. Hulbert argued that authenticity could be found in ancient Korean history prior to the seventh century. Japanese and Korean intellectuals' focus on Korean ancient history was useful. As can be seen in the work of Japanese scholars such as Hayashi and Shiratori, Japanese focus on Korean studies was on Korean ancient history because it explained and established the legitimacy of Japan's origin and history. This interest traversed beyond history to other disciplines as well. For example, in 1902 Sekino Tadashi, an accomplished architect and historian from Tokyo University's Department of Architecture, visited Kyŏngju, the capital city of the ancient kingdom Silla for two months. He surveyed the temples, palaces, and shrines, making the first research report on Korean architecture and art history.[65] Korean intellectuals also emphasized ancient history; it provided extensive evidence to counter prevalent images of Korea being "subservient," "cowardly", or "dependent." Especially after 1908, Koreans emphasized Koguryŏ's bravery in fighting against Sui and Tang China, and portrayed the general Ulchi Mundŏk as representing a time when Koreans were truly Korean, unsullied by contact with debilitating Chinese culture.[66]

---

[65] Hyung Il Pai, *Constructing "Korean" Origin: A Critical Review of Archeology, Historiography, and Racial Myth in Korean State-Formation Theories* (Boston: Harvard University Press, 2000), 25.

[66] *Hwangsŏng Sinmun*, 1909. 1. 6., 1909, 2. 10, 1909. 4. 20., (Schmid, *Korea Between Empires*, 64).

American knowledge of Korea can be distinguished from that of Japanese and Korean in how it was developed and shaped within the missionary discourse. Most Americans in Korea were Protestant missionaries and engaged in studies of Korea.[67] Missionary discourse gave birth to two distinct characteristics in American writings of Korea: first, its focus on Korea's isolationism; and second, its emphasis on the potential of Korean people, accompanied by criticism toward its incompetent government. While these aspects distinctly appear in American writings of Korea, they also fit in with Japanese and Korean knowledge based on the shared discourses.

Emphasis on Korean isolationism appeared in the very first American book on Korea: *Corea: the Hermit Nation* (1882). Griffis characterized Korea as a "hermit", which had the connotation that it was willfully secluded, not wanting to be bothered by changes in the outside world.[68] This was a carefully chosen metaphor to describe how Korea remained unawakened by late nineteenth century, as the country resisted calls to open itself until its isolation was forcefully "sapped." Griffis' emphasis on Korea's isolationism was a projection of his own perception of late nineteenth century Korea, in which the Prince Regent of Korea fired on French and American ships that approached Korean shores, and then established a seclusion policy during the 1860s-1870s. This image also came from Griffis' understanding of Korean history during the early nineteenth century when Catholic

---

[67] American missionaries outnumbered residents from all other Western countries combined (Kim, "Representing the Invisible," 47).

[68] Kim Wangbae stated that the term "hermit nation" connotes that it is an isolated and inhibited land, a stationary land that lacks motivation of indigenous effort for development, a society that needs to be enlightened by the shock from the West, thus, one that should be thankful for the western Christianity. (Kim Wangbae, "Ŭndun ŭi wangguk, Han'gukhak ŭi maenga wa sŏn'guja tŭl [Hermit Kingdom: Sprouts and Pioneers of Korean Studies]," *Chŏngsin munhwa yŏn'gu* 22, vol. 3 (1999): 13.

converts were persecuted. In writing his book, Griffis depended greatly on Claude-Charles Dallet's *Historie de l'Egalise de Coree* (1874), not only in describing the nineteenth century of Korea with its Catholic persecution, but also in designating the introduction of Christianity as the beginning of Korea's "modern" period. It is not difficult to see how missionary discourse shaped the theme of Korea's isolationism. It was based on western-centered Orientalism that posited neither Japan nor Korea could achieve "modernity" without being enlightened by western ideas, especially that of Christianity. Japan, which was "awakened" by the western approach, accepted this new civilization which led to their rise to modernity, while Korea, which "rejected" the approach due to its historical isolationism, could not.

With the popularity of Griffis' book, the term "hermit" in the title caught on with many western writers when describing Korea. For example, James S. Gale, a Canadian missionary, wrote in his own book that Koreans have a "hermit tendency" which he also described as "disease that might be called *hermitoid* that manifests itself in a desire to be alone." Gale argued that Korea "avoided all foreign invitations, shunned commerce, mistrusted everybody, and wanted to be alone" until the 1800s.[69] This view also influenced other American writers in describing Korea as a "just-awakened" incompetent to face the harsh reality. An article in *Harpers Weekly* noted that Korea was "still rubbing her eyes after a sleep of centuries" and how it was not ready to fight its strong neighbors as it was "poor and defenseless."[70] This tendency to emphasize Korea's hermitage remained a

[69] Gale, *Korea in Transition*, 127-128.

[70] E. B. Rogers, "Korea," *Harper's Weekly* 38 (Aug 4, 1894): 727.

characteristic in later American writings of Korea. For example, George M. McCune, in his dissertation on Korean history finished in 1941, argued that Korea had a great "desire to keep herself isolated and secluded."[71]

As stated above, Griffis' book was translated into Japanese and read by Japanese scholars. The theme of Korea's isolationism fit well with Japan's discourse on how Korea failed to survive as a self-governing state. The theme of Korea's isolation in late nineteenth century was adopted to Japanese writings of Korea, and established as an academic theme on Korean history during the Japanese colonial period. For example, Okudaira Takehiko's book, *Chosen Kaikoku Kosho Shimatsu* [Entire diplomatic negotiations in the opening of Korea] in 1935, referred to Griffis in writing Korea's isolationism.[72] McCune later quoted Okudaira's book, stating "the introduction concerns Korea's isolationism and is extremely clear and accurate."[73]

The other tendency in American knowledge of Korea that was shaped by missionary discourse was to discuss Korea's potential to be modernized, while criticizing its incompetent government for blocking its growth. Contrary to many American travelogues and those who were associated with the Japanese, which described Korea as "lazy, apathetic, or lacking moral sense,"[74] these negative descriptions of Koreans were often contested by missionaries who lived in Korea.[75] While partly agreeing that Koreans lacked

---

[71] McCune, "Korean Relation with China and Japan, 1800-1864", 259.

[72] Okudaira Takehiko, *Chosen Kaikoku Kosho Simatsu* (Tokyo: Toko Shoin, 1935), 187.

[73] McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 281.

[74] George Kennan, "Land of Morning Calm," *Outlook* 78 (Oct, 1904).

[75] Kennan also points to this difference, by stating "American friends who have spent the peninsula more years than I tell me that the Korean, as a man is intelligent, courteous, teachable, kind-hearted, and superior

motivation, most American missionaries emphasized Korea's potential to achieve modernity if given proper guidance. Henry G. Appenzeller stated that Koreans had potential to be diligent people only if they were given proper motivation and protected from heavy tax and extortion from the corrupt officials. It was essential for the missionaries to describe Korean people as having potential, because it was closely related to evaluating Korea as a mission field.[76] Furthermore, the purpose of writing books on Korea for missionaries was to recruit more missionaries to Korea, and to secure funding for ongoing missions. Emphasizing Korean potential encouraged more Christian aid for the spreading of the gospel to give Koreans the "proper guidance."

However, they had to explain why Korean people with such potential fell into a state of "apathy", for which they blamed the Korean elites and the government. G.W. Gilmore wrote that Koreans' laziness and lack of "incentive to labor" was "not innate but results from the apathy" caused by the extortion from the "corrupt and insatiate officials."[77] Hulbert also said Korean had high intelligence but were stagnant because they were not offered opportunities for reform,[78] which was due to the heavy extraction from the corrupted government."[79] This view was echoed by other American missionaries, for

---

in many ways to the Japanese" while concluding with his disagreement by describing the unsanitary looks of Korean. (Kennan, "Land of Morning Calm," 366).

[76] Whether the mission field had potential to be great was an important consideration, as can be seen from statements such as "Korea is less attractive than Japan as a mission field. It is not a great empire with great history, but a weak people surrounded by strong and covetous neighbors." Fannie Roper Feudge, "The Country and People of Korea," *Gospel in All Lands* 13 (Aug 1888): 372.

[77] Gilmore, *Korea from its Capital*, 32.

[78] Hulbert, "What Korea Owes to Japan" *The Korea Review* 4 (Aug 1904), 355.

[79] Hulbert, "What Korea Owes to Japan," 354.

example, J. H. Wells, who considered the Korean government rotten to its core.[80] Arthur J. Brown, a missionary and General Secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Mission, also noted that Korean people were potentially intelligent but they were deprived of motivation to reform due to corrupt government.[81] It was the "weak, effeminate, and corrupt officials and government system" that caused the poverty which suppressed the potential of the Korean people.[82] This rhetoric even caught on in non-missionary journals. For example, the *New York Times* also criticized the incompetence of the Korean government and the king, who were described as heavily dependent on foreign powers.[83]

Criticism toward the incompetent elite yangban class often appeared in American writings of Korea. Yangban was an emblem of "unwillingness in the era of change." Kennan described yangban as conservative and obstinate, and "not capable of adapting himself to a changed environment."[84] Other western accounts of Korea shared this view on yangban. A British article stated that the aristocratic class was "without dignity, useless, idle, extortionate".[85] Canadian missionary Gale also wrote how Korean yangban do not labor, ignores commerce, worship useless Classical Chinese, and referred to them as "one of the last and most unique remains of a civilization that has lived its day."[86] This

---

[80] J. H. Wells, "An Appreciation" *The Korea Review* 5 (Nov 1905), 427.

[81] Arthur J. Brown, "Politics and Missions in Korea," *Missionary Review of the World* 25 (Mar 1902): 180.

[82] Arthur J. Brown, "The People" *Chantauquan* 41 (Aug 1905), 501; Kim, "Representing the Invisible," 58.

[83] "Korean Emperor Scared" *New York Times*, Oct 24, 1903; "Says New Korean Ruler Is a Fool" *New York Times*, Jul 28, 1907; Kim, "Representing the Invisible," 51.

[84] Kennan, "Korean People: The Product of Decayed Civilization," 411-412.

[85] A. M. Stoddart, "Mrs. Bishop in Korea" *Blackwood's Magazine* 163 (Feb 1898), 287.

[86] Gale, "The Korean Gentleman," *Korean Repository* 5 (Jan 1898), 6.

interpretation coincided with emerging discourse in Japanese and Korean accounts in making yangban an easy target to blame for the problems that Korea faced.[87] Yangban were described as culturally backward and primitive and as a root of Korea's internal political turmoil. In Japanese newspapers, yangban were criticized for having no particular skills and living off the labor of the commoners.[88] Korean newspapers also criticized yangban for being subservient to China.[89]

This "good people/bad government" framework aligned with the Japanese claim that Japan was guiding Korea to civilization. To many Americans' point of view, Japan was a good steward for Korea, as it "adopted western civilization" and was close to Korea geographically. This idea appears as early as Griffis' book in 1882, who thought Japan should play the role of "opener of the long-sealed peninsula" as the "helpful friend of Corea's people."[90] Many other American missionaries in Korea during the 1900s supported this idea. Arthur J. Brown noted that Korean people had potential to be fine people if good government and fair chance was given, also suggesting that Japan should be the one to nurture Korea.[91] J. H. Wells, a missionary who resided in Korea for a decade, supported a Japanese protectorate over Korea, arguing that Japan reformed and enlightened

---

[87] Schmid, *Korea between Empires*, 122.

[88] "Choseon Zatsuwa [Desultory Notes on Korea]2," *Tokyo Asahi Sinbun*, August 25, 2010.; Schmid, *Korea Between Empires*, 122-123.

[89] *Tongnip Sinmun*, April 10, 1899; Schmid, *Korea Between Empires*, 123.

[90] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, 10.

[91] Brown, "The People," 501; To read more about Brown's support of Japanese colonialism of Korea, see Kim, "Representing the Invisible," 58-59.

Korea.[92] Even Homer B. Hulbert, known for his criticism toward Japan's colonization of Korea, supported the idea of Korea being a temporary protectorate of the Japanese, stating Korea needed "wise and proper guidance" from Japan.[93] The idea that Japan should be the "strong hand" to temporarily guide Korea persisted in Hulbert's writings until late 1905.[94]

In this way, American knowledge of Korea melded with the emerging discourse on Korea in both Japan and Korea, integrating both Korean and Japanese accounts. While Japanese intellectuals wanted to prove that Korea lacked the competence to govern itself, and Korean intellectuals self-criticized in order to call for reforms through their knowledge construction, American intellectuals criticized Korea's resistance to change while emphasizing Korea's potential. However, despite the differences in motivations for producing various texts, the discourse on Korea developed into one which looked for the reasons for Korea's apparent failure. One of the fields of knowledge in which this "discourse of failure" showed most distinctly was Korean history. The rest of this chapter discusses how two renowned American writers created historical narratives on Korea that concluded with Korea's failure, which profoundly influenced later American writings of Korea during the colonial period and the postwar period.

Building Historical Narratives on Korea: Griffis' *Corea, the Hermit Nation*

---

[92] Wells, "An appreciation," 425-427.

[93] Hulbert, "What Korea Owes to Japan," 355.

[94] Homer B. Hulbert, "Northern Korea," *The Korea Review* 5 (May 1905): 141; Homer B. Hulbert, "Editorial Comment" *The Korea Review* 6 (Sep, 1906): 349.

Writing national history is an essential part in constructing a national identity. This was why Griffis and Hulbert both attempted to write about Korean history in their books introducing Korea to an English-reading public. Following the trends of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the two Americans both wrote history as a teleological narrative in which the nation was progressing toward the modern, in which culture was measured by its contribution to this advancement.[95] Griffis wrote *Corea, the Hermit Nation* in 1882, when Korea concluded a treaty with the U.S., and Hulbert wrote the *Passing of Korea* in 1906, when Japan claimed a protectorate over Korea and it was understood that colonization would soon follow. These American authors were different in their political inclinations, in their use of primary sources, as well as the timing of when their books were written. Griffis wrote his book in Japan based on Japanese primary sources, and was often regarded as the representative of Americans with a negative view toward Korea. By contrast, Hulbert championed Korean independence, and represented Americans with a positive view toward Korea. Despite this framework of rivalry, however, they both contributed in establishing the common framework for writing Korean history, which influenced later American writers. To see the ramifications in later American books on Korea, it is essential to see what historical narratives were produced during this period, and how the two historical narratives—one from Griffis, the other from Hulbert—conflicted and commingled with each other. This section examines Griffis' book and the narrative on

[95] Schmid, *Korea Between Empires*, 121.

Korean history he created, in order to analyze how the initial framework in writing Korean history was formed in American accounts of Korea.

William Elliot Griffis (1843-1928) went to Japan in 1871 to teach natural science in Fukui. Upon graduating Rutgers University, Griffis was attending the Theological Seminary of the Dutch Reformed Church when he was offered an opportunity to work in Japan. Griffis seized the opportunity and stayed until 1874, during which he collected the materials for his books on Japan and Korea.[96] This background is telling in that it demonstrates how Griffis was not a missionary but still based his book centered around Protestant Christian ideals, and how Griffis had never set foot on Korean soil, but instead collected his materials from Japan to write *Corea, the Hermit Nation* (1882). The popularity of this book was based on the fact that Griffis was already a renowned writer on East Asia; his previous book on Japan, *The Mikado's Empire* (1876) became a bestseller.[97] Also, it was published at a time when American interest on Korea had increased due to the newly concluded treaty between the countries.[98]

The influence of Griffis' book cannot be overstated. For American readers, it was the book of authority on Korea during the 1880s and 1890s. Griffis' book was especially

---

[96] For a life of Griffis, refer to Edward R. Beaucahmp, *An American Teacher in Early Meiji Japan*, Honolulu: Hawaii University Press; (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1976); R. A. Rosenstone, *Mirror in the Shrine: American Encounters with Meiji Japan* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988).

[97] William E. Griffis, *The Mikado's Empire* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1876). This book became a bestseller and was so popular its 12th edition was published in 1913 (Jong-Chol An, "William Griffis ŭi ilbongwa han'guk insik" [William Griffis' perception of Korea and Japan]" *Ilbon Yŏn'gu* 15, (2011) : 440).

[98] Cheong pointed out that the book matched the theme of his age, which was the glorification of western civilization and modernization of Japan, precisely what Americans wanted to hear. (Sung-hwa Cheong. "William Elliot Griffis and Emerging American Images on Korea." *The Review of Korean Studies* 3, vol 2 (2000), 58)

influential among the American Protestant missionaries who were planning to come to Korea, as it was one of the few books available to them to learn about Korea.[99] Major missionary magazines published in New York, such as *Missionary Review of the World* and *Gospel in All Lands,*[100] often quoted Griffis when introducing Korea, in explaining its geography, current dynasty and the king, how it was open to Christianity, as well as the status of women, religion, and customs.[101] *Missionary Review of the World* even provided a series of summaries on Griffis' book.[102] Not only the narratives, but also the illustrations, photographs, and maps were taken directly from Griffis' pages.[103] In this way, the images of Korea as well as historical narratives Griffis created circulated without much criticism during the 1880s and 1890s.

---

[99] *Corea, The Hermit Nation* was one of the required readings in the coursework curriculum of American missionaries in Korea in 1912, which shows how this book was considered essential, and was widely read among American missionaries to Korea. American missionaries' writings on Korea during the 1890s referred to Griffis' book as the one they are indebted to. This includes Gilmore, *Korea from its Capital*, Gifford, *Everyday Life in Korea*. Griffis' book was also marked as one of the eight major books written on Korea as of 1904 by one of the major missionary magazines in New York ("Books on Japan and Korea" *Missionary Review of the World* 17 (1904): 304).

[100] *Missionary Review of the World* was a missionary periodical magazine published in New York from 1878, and *Gospel in All Lands* was a missionary periodical magazine from 1880 to 1903.

[101] "The Country and People of Corea" *Gospel in All Lands* 11 (1885): 1-9. "Country and People of Korea" *Gospel in All Lands* 12 (1886): 1-9.

[102] "Corea, the Hermit Nation" *Missionary Review of the World* 6 (Sep, 1883): 409-421.

[103] Illustration of the "City of Seoul" in the front page of Griffis' book also appears on the article in 1885 (*Gospel in All Lands* 11 (1885), 3) and again in 1887 ("Korea," *Gospel in All Lands* 13 (1887), 275). Illustration of "the style of hair dressing in Korea" (Griffis, *Corea: Hermit Nation*, 161) appeared in both articles of *Gospel in All Lands* in 1885, and 1886 ("Country and People of Korea," *Gospel in All Lands* (1885), 1; *Gospel in All Lands* 12 (1886), 3) The illustration of "Korean vessel" on Griffis Book (Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, 75) appeared on the article in 1885 ("Country and People of Korea," *Gospel in All Lands* 11 (1885), 4) and the "map of Japan and Korea" (Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, 51) was also included in the article ("Country and People of Korea," *Gospel in All Lands* 11 (1885), 6)

Griffis positioned himself as a "compiler" of accounts on Korea,[104] which indicates that he depended heavily on other sources when he wrote his book. In his bibliography, Griffis listed the books that he referred to, mostly relying on Japanese sources. Yi Tae-jin pointed out that Griffis' perception of Korean ancient history was influenced by Japanese *kokugaku* tradition in the eighteenth century, which took *Nihonshoki* and *Kojikki* as the main primary sources in writing ancient history.[105] This is apparent from the bibliography where Griffis marked Japanese sources such as *Kojikki* and *Nihongi* as the ones he was especially indebted to. An Jong-Chol also noted that Griffis referred to Hayashi Shihei's book *Sangoku Ttsuran Zusetsu.*[106] Griffis' dependency on Japanese sources in writing Korean history is apparent even from the names he used for the three kingdoms of Korea: Korai, Hiaksai, and Shinra, which were romanizations of Japanese pronunciations.[107]

The resources he depended on most, however, were the books written in English or French during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The version of Hayashi Shihei's book he used was the one translated into French by Julius Von Klaproth and published in Paris in 1832.[108] One recent study by Yi Yŏngmi stated that Griffis was also much

---

[104] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, viii.

[105] Taejin Yi, "Kundae han'guk ŭn kwayŏn Ŭndŭn'guk iŏtton'ga?" 728.

[106] Hayashi Shihei, *Sangoku tsuran zusetsu* (Japan : Kaei 7, 1854). Hayashi was a scholar in Japan in mid-nineteenth century. Sangoku Tsuran Zusetsu contained the story of how the Empress Jingo conquered Silla and Paekche, and argued that the Japanese trading port in Pusan was military ports established by Japan after the Hideyoshi Invasion. Griffis adopted these interpretations in his book. For more information on Hayashi, refer to Yongwoo Nam, "Hayashi Shihei ŭi ŏpchŏk: Samguk T'ongnam tosŏl kwa pudo ŭi Tokdo rŭl chungsimŭro," *Yŏngt'o haeyang yŏn'gu* 11 (Jun 2016): 118-157.

[107] This was later criticized by Hulbert, who stated "no foreigners would recognize Paekje under the Japanese pronunciation of Hiaksai." (Homer B. Hulbert "Review" *The Korea Review* 2 (July 1902), 304)

[108] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, xii.

influenced by three books written on Korea in French and English prior to the publication his own book. These included Jean-Baptiste du Halde's *Description geographique, historique, chronologique, politique, et physique de l'Empire de la Chine et de la Tartarie chinoise* (1735), Claude-Charles Dallet's *Historie de l'Egalise de Coree* (1874), and John Ross' *History of Corea: Ancient and Modern with Description of Manners and Customs, Language and Geography* (1879).[109] Griffis' dependency on these works can be seen from the similarity in how he created the narratives on Korean history; for example, like the previous works, Griffis also started his Korean history from Kija, and treated Koryŏ as the first kingdom to unify the peninsula while neglecting the accounts of Silla's unification.[110] Just like Dallet, Griffis also stated that Korea's "modern" period started with the introduction of Christianity, and the way he described this period as series of events—starting from the introduction of Catholicism to the American expedition—also depended on Dallet's and Ross's accounts.[111] Griffis compiled all available sources written in French and English, while integrating Japanese sources he collected during his stay in Japan.

---

[109] Jean-Baptiste du Halde, *Description geographique, historique, chronologique, politique, et physique de l'Empire de la Chine et de la Tartarie chinoise,* (Paris: La Mercier, 1735); Claude-Charles Dallet, *Historie de l'Egalise de Coree,* (Paris: V Palme, 1874); John Ross, *History of Corea: Ancient and Modern with Description of Manners and Customs, Language and Geography* (Paiseley: J & R Parlane, 1879).

[110] Du Halde, Dallet, and Ross all neglected Silla's unification and regarded as Koryŏ's founder Wang Kŏn as the first to unify the peninsula. For more information, refer to Yeong-Mi Lee "Hanmi sugyo ijŏn ŭi Sŏyangin ŭi hanguk yŏksa sŏsul [Korean History Writing prior to Korea-US Treaty]," *Hanguksa Yŏn'gu* 148 (2010): 169-197.

[111] Both Ross and Griffis depended on Dallet's account when discussing the introduction of Christianity to Korea. Both Ross and Griffis framed "modern" history as series of events starting from the introduction of Catholicism to General Sherman's expedition to the French Expedition and the American expedition in 1872.

Even though Griffis depended very much on these sources, his book stands out as it shows an epistemological break from the previous three books written in western languages. Griffis stated "It is as nearly impossible to write the history of Corea and exclude Japan, as to tell the story of medieval England and leave out France."[112] Published after Korea opened its port to Japan in 1876 and concluded a treaty with the United States in 1882, Griffis' book described Korea mainly in relation to Japan, and in doing so reflected an emerging trend among Americans to perceive Korea in its relation to Japan, unlike the previous three books that described Korea mostly as a vassal state of China, and a variation of Chinese civilization, using mostly Chinese sources.[113] Korea and Japan's ancestral similarities and their relations became major points in this book. Not only did Griffis argue that Japan and Korea shared the same ancestry which resulted in the similarities in cultural, political, and social structure as well as language,[114] he also dedicated one chapter entirely to the relationship between ancient Japan and Korea. Furthermore, the Hideyoshi Invasion, in which Japan invaded Korea during the seventeenth century, became the major focus in narrating the history of the Chosŏn period—Griffis allocated nine chapters out of eleven chapters to Chosŏn.

Griffis discussed the similarities of the two nations, but also contrasted the two by temporalizing Korea to Japan's "an-awakened" past, stating "the forbidden land of today is,

[112] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation,* 51.

[113] This is also pointed out by Yi, "Hanmi sugyo ijŏn ŭi Sŏyangin ŭi Han'guk yŏksa sŏsul," 187.

[114] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation,* 51.

in many striking points of comparison, the analogue of Old Japan."[115] It was around the time when American interest increased during Japan's unusual rise to modernization,[116] and understanding Korea and its failure was closely intertwined with Japan's success. Griffis stated, "Nihon increased in wealth and civilization while Chosen remained stationary and retrograded."[117] In one chapter, Griffis pointed out how the Korean political parties suffered rivalries and excesses of power, and he concluded with a description of how Japan managed to "purge" their own "disease" with the Meiji restoration, in contrast to Korea.[118] In this way, Japan functioned as point of reference for whatever Korea lacked or whatever Korea had, and it was regarded as Japan's role to "awaken" this "hermit kingdom." The emergence of the practice to contrast Korea with Japan, and to narrate its history in relation to Japan, continued during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as Japan's influence increased to the extent of colonizing Korea.[119] The fact that many Americans shared a similar framework in discussing Korea in relation to Japan was useful to Japanese intellectuals. This can be seen from how Shinobu Chunpei, in his book *Kan Hanto* [*Korean Peninsula*], directly quoted Griffis' statement, "It is as nearly

---

[115] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation,* 10

[116] Cheong, "William Elliot Griffis and Emerging American Images on Korea," 58.

[117] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation,* 61

[118] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation,* 229.

[119] The tendency to contrast Japan and Korea, which started with Griffis' book in 1882, can be seen in various American accounts. *Harper's Weekly* contrasted the characteristics of Korean and Japanese, noting that Koreans are "lazy, slower, clumsy" while Japanese have "rapid energy." ("Korea and its people," *Harper's Weekly* 38 (Dec 1, 1894), 1134) Another article in the same magazine contrasted Korea's "filthiness" with Japan's "cleanness." (H.G. Ponting, "From Japan to Korea" *Harper's Weekly* 48 (April 16, 1904), 589-93; Kim, "Representing the Invisible,"28.) Kennan also temporalized Korea as Japan's past and and contrasted the two, arguing that Korea was "ages behind its wide-awake, energetic, and progressive neighbor" Japan (George Kennan, "Land of Morning Calm," 364).

impossible to write the history of Corea and exclude Japan, as to tell the story of medieval England and leave out France." to explain the relationship between Japan and Korea.[120]

From a glance at Griffis' book, it is apparent that his major focus was on its history. The book was divided into three parts. The first part focused on Korea's "ancient and medieval" history, and the third part covered Korea's "modern" history after the introduction of Catholicism to Korea.[121] So why the focus on Korean history? A hint is in the preface, where he asked a question: "Why should Corea be sealed and mysterious, when Japan, once a hermit, had opened her doors and come out into the world's market-place? When would Corea's awakening come?"[122] The constant theme of this book is the comparison and contrast between Japan and Korea on the premise that Korea has not "awakened" yet while Japan did.

What is more notable about this question was that Griffis asked about the reasons for Korea's "unawakened" *present*, and attempted to find them from Korea's historical past, meaning that the book was organized in a way to explain the reasons why Korea remained unawakened. Griffis narrated Korean history as if "Korea" as a nation existed from prehistoric times, whose trajectory led directly to the late nineteenth century. By writing Korean history with the assumption it already had a conclusion, which was its "unawakened" and "isolated" status, the nation was regarded as a "failure" of history,

---

[120] Shinobu also quoted Griffis in introducing Mimana Nihonfu, Empress Jingu's conquest, and the Hideyoshi Invasion, and concluded that the "peninsula was most of the time in the status of our vassal state (Junpei Shinobu, *Kanhanto* (Tokyo: Tokyobo shoten hatsubai, 1901), 382. Refer to Yi, "Kundae han'guk ŭn kwayŏn Ŭndŭn'guk iŏtton'ga?" 728).)

[121] The second part addresses more anthropological interests, including the customs, religions, and folklore.

[122] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, vi.

especially when compared to Japan. In other words, in recounting Korea's history, the author had to explain why Korean "fell" to such a status, which necessitated accounting for a series of negative causes that resulted in the current state of "failure."

The historical trajectory Griffis created started from a relatively civilized past, from Kija (1122 BC) until the seventh century. In discussing the three kingdoms' period in Korea, Griffis admitted that three kingdoms, especially Silla, were highly civilized and transmitted knowledge and arts to Japan.[123] However, this civilization was described as politically subject to both China and Japan. In addition to being tributary to Tang China, Griffis stated both Silla and Paekche were conquered by Empress Jingu of Japan during the second century, and how both states became vassals to Japan since then. While hesitant about committing to whether the date was accurate, Griffis still endorsed its substance: "evidently the core of this narrative of conquest is fact."[124] Since that conquest, both Silla and Paekche were a "tributary and dependency" to Japan, according to this narrative.[125]

From the ninth to the sixteenth century, Griffis argued that Korea went through a slow "retrogression." Griffis depicted this period as "stationary or retrograded."[126] Koryŏ was described mostly in terms of its tributary relationship to Sung China, Khitan, and Jurchen, and how it suffered from Mongol invasions. This short chapter of Koryŏ history was followed by the Chosŏn period, which the most of the accounts focused on the

---

[123] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, 48.

[124] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, 54.

[125] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, 57; Griffis referred to Hayashi Shihei's book in describing how Japan once established a colony on the southern coast of the Korean peninsula.

[126] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, 61.

"devastation" due to the Hideyoshi Invasion (1592-1597). In fact, Chosŏn was described only in terms of foreign invasions; Griffis allocated nine chapters to the Hideyoshi Invasion out of twelve chapters on Chosŏn, and other chapters that covered the Manchu Invasion and the aftermath of the two invasions.[127] Another point Griffis made, and was later criticized for, was how he described Chosŏn as a tributary state to both China and Japan after the two invasions. Even though it was not historically accurate, Griffis argued that after the Hideyoshi Invasion, Pusan, a port on the southern coast of Korea, was "possessed" by the Japanese government from this time on.[128] He stated that Japan regarded Korea as their vassal state at least from seventeenth century on, and more broadly from the time of Empress Jingu's conquest up to the late nineteenth century.[129]

As with the previous three books on Korean history in English and French, Griffis designated the influx of Catholicism during late eighteenth century as the start of "modern" period, showing his assumption that modernity could be only achieved through the introduction of western civilization. Using Dallet's account, Griffis described this "modern" period by highlighting Catholic persecution, French and American military expeditions, and argued how Korean "isolation" was sapped by Japan's actions in the nineteenth century. Until this late period, according to Griffis, Korea remained "hermit"

---

[127] The other two chapters talk about the foundation of Chosŏn, and Hamels' travel to Korea during the 16th century.

[128] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, 148-149.

[129] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, 52.

and "uninfluenced by any ideas of modern life" until forcefully penetrated by Japan and western influence.[130]

This historical narrative of Korea as a "slow retrogression" resulting in failure in part answered his own question asked at the preface: "Why did Korea remain in a dark, an-awakened state?" Griffis did not have many sources on Korean history from the ninth to the sixteenth century, as reflected in the relatively sketchy description of this period. However, Griffis decided to label this era as "stationary and retrograded" without much evidential support, in order to explain how Korea came to be in the current state of "unawakened-ness." In addition, Griffis projected two major negative images on Korean history, and gave them a timeless quality by regarding them as Korea's national character observed throughout its history: one being a victimized and subservient character attested by its tributary history, the other being Korea's insistence on isolationism, which rejects any change.

He described Korea as being ceaselessly invaded by surrounding powers throughout its history. In this account, Korea was characterized as a victimized and subservient state which had to secure peace through paying tribute to its neighbors. This became a constant theme throughout this book. It was surely a projection of Griffis' perception of Korea's circumstances in the late nineteenth century, where Korea was actually surrounded imperial powers including Japan, China, and Russia. Griffis' perception of the hostile environment that Korea was situated can be seen from his closing remarks, where he stated how Korea

[130] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, 176.

was surrounded by "jealous rivals China, ambitious Japan, and ravenous Russia."[131] Griffis projected this view to history, which was interpreted as Korea's timeless character. Griffis argued that Korea had been "threatened or devastated" by its eager enemies from "prehistoric" times.[132] This victimized character was further reinforced by his interpretation of Korea's geopolitical situation as unchanging, and being the "rich grist between upper and nether millstones of China and Japan" which was "unfortunate" for Korea. Griffis, in other articles, often characterized Korea as a "pygmy between giants", reinforcing the image of Korea as small powerless nation caught between strong neighbors.[133]

Closely intertwined with this historically victimized character was its "subservient" attitude to strong neighbors. This characterization was shown mostly by the accounts of how Korea paid tribute to both China and Japan throughout its history. Despite the fact that it was not historically correct, Griffis stated that Korea had been a tributary state to Japan during the three kingdoms period as well as after the Hideyoshi Invasion.[134] Koryŏ's history was also described only in terms of how it paid or did not pay tributes to northern tribes in Manchuria such as Khitan, Jurchen, and Mongol. Griffis characterized Korea as

---

[131] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, 441.

[132] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, 9.

[133] Griffis first used this term in the article titled "Korea and its Needs" in *Gospel in All Lands* in 1888 then again in 1902 as a title of the article "Korea, the Pigmy Empire" in the *New England Magazine* for June (William Elliot Griffis, "Korea and Its Needs" *Gospel in All Lands* 13 (Aug 1888): 370.)

[134] This interpretation was also adopted by many missionary articles in New York. For example, an article states; "In A.D. 200, the country was conquered by the Japanese" and "In 960, the authority of the Chinese emperor was acknowledged and from that time, tribute has been paid to China, and a portion of the time to Japan." (*Gospel in All Lands* 11 (1885): 1). Another article stated that Korea was "conquered by Japan but gave Japan her art, letters, science (quite rude), and ethics (Asiatic)." (*Gospel in All Lands* 14 (1889): 442.)

"The Issachar of East Asia" which was also the title of his chapter on the aftermath of the two invasions in the seventeenth century. In the Bible, Issachar is one of Jacob's twelve sons, who was described as an "ass couched down between two burdens." In his book, Griffis directly quoted the Bible: "And he saw that the rest was good, and the land that it was pleasant, and bowed his shoulder to bear, and became a servant unto tribute."[135] From this description, this characterization connoted not only a subservient attitude, but also one of wanting to avoid necessary changes as long as it could find peace in this subservient position.

Griffis' assertion that Korea had been a tributary state to Japan was later severely criticized by Hulbert for lacking any historical evidence, but the characterization and the theme remained influential, circulating among the major missionary magazines.[136] An article titled "Incessant Wars" in *Missionary Review of the World* stated: "China on the one side, and Japan on the other, have contended the mastership over Corea, each in turn making it the victim of their plundering and devastating campaigns."[137] This characterization was adopted by other Americans, along with the connotation of being "subservient and tributary" to them, as their accounts often concluded with a negative assessment of Korean civilization. For example, G. W. Knox, a missionary in Japan, wrote

---

[135] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, 159.

[136] Even though the idea that Korea paid tribute to Japan after the Hideyoshi Invasion until 1832 was criticized by Hulbert later as groundless, it persisted to influence writers such as Tyler Dennet and Arthur Brown even during the 1920s. Tyler Dennet wrote that Korea paid tribute to Japan until 1832 in his book, *Americans in Eastern Asia*, and Arthur Brown also wrote that the Japanese Korean relationship was cut in 1832. (An, "William Griffis ŭi Ilbon kwa Han'guk insik," 452).

[137] "Incessant Wars," *Missionary Review of the World* 6 (Sep, 1883): 412.

in *Gospel in All Lands* that "Corea is not a great empire with a great history but a weak people, surrounded by strong and avaricious neighbors."[138] Fannie Roper Feudge also wrote: "Korea is not a great empire with great history, but a weak people surrounded by strong and covetous neighbors."[139] George T. Ladd, who was invited to travel Korea with Ito Hirobumi (then the resident-general of Korea) and wrote his book in 1908, also quoted Griffis in describing how Korea paid tribute to both China and Japan,[140] and how Koreans "pleaded that the payment of tribute to China had so impoverished them that they could not render what was due to Japan, then Japan forgave them the obligation in 1686 A.D."[141] Richard E. Speer wrote how Korea "has for centuries known nothing but tutelage."[142]

Another major characterization of Korea that Griffis emphasized through history writing was Korea's isolationism; namely that Korea had secluded itself from the world throughout its history. Griffis used the term "hermit" to connote how Korea wanted to isolate itself from the outside world and resist necessary changes, which hindered Korea's modernization. In other words, it was regarded as one of the major reasons why Korea remained unawakened by the late nineteenth century.

Griffis gave this isolationism a timeless character, witnessed through many occasions in Korean history. Griffis argued in his preface that Korea has "for centuries" successfully carried out the "policy of isolation" and how the rulers of Korea strove to

---

[138] *Gospel in All Lands* 11 (1885): 8.

[139] Feudge, "The Country and People of Korea," 372.

[140] Ladd, *In Korea with Marquis Ito*, 189.

[141] Ladd, *In Korea with Marquis Ito*, 190.

[142] Richard E. Speer, "Korea, Japan, and Russia," *World's Work* 7 (Mar 1904), 4514.

make Korea an "accessible island" instead of a peninsula and "insulate her from the shock of change."[143] As implied in above statement, this isolationist policy was closely related to the idea that Korea had been constantly harassed by its stronger neighbors throughout history. Griffis stated that Korea was already isolated due to the "barrier" of sea and mountain, but it even desolated its own shore, and placed a neutral space of unoccupied desolated land between China in an attempt to prevent foreign invasion.[144]

Just as the victimized and subservient nature of Korea became labeled as a timeless characteristic, so did the isolationist policy. One of the characterizations of Korea related to the isolationist policy was Griffis' description of how Koreans "tend to shut themselves behind the walls" during the war. Griffis stated that isolationism was an "ancient policy" of Korea, where they "shut themselves up in their well-provisioned cities and castles" to "foil their mighty foe over and over again."[145] This characterization was applied whenever Korea had wars with the neighboring states. For example, in writing about Hideyoshi Invasion, Griffis characterized Korean soldiers as strong only behind the walls but cowardly in the field, "faithful to their character."[146] Griffis then argued that this trait can be seen from ancient history of Koguryŏ, who fought with Tang China, up to Admiral Roger's expedition in 1871, stating "we see a striking trait of Corean military character which has been noticed from the era of Tangs" and how "Chinese, Japanese, French, and

---

[143] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, 7.

[144] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, 7.

[145] Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, 43.

[146] Griffis argued that "Coreans were poor soldiers in the open field and exhibit slight proof of personal valor" but when they were "put behind walls, their whole nature seems reinforced." (Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, 47.)

Americans have experienced" this trait.[147] This characterization of Korea, often implied in phrase "kittens in the field, and tiger in the castle," was used by Griffis in his book, and was adopted by various American books on Korea. For example, Ladd also used the same phrase, directly quoting Griffis, and stated that it "characterized their behavior during the Hideyoshi Invasion, and it is characteristic of them today."[148] George M. McCune, in his dissertation in 1941, also discussed Korea's isolationist policy, saying isolation was the attitude of Korea toward "all outsiders" including Chinese, Japanese, as well as westerners.[149] McCune concluded that Korea's isolationist policy was not a consequence of western pressure, but a policy which had been enforced from the Chosŏn period onward.[150]

It would be safe to conclude that Griffis' narrative of Korean history was a linear trajectory in which it slowly retrograded from a relatively civilized past that led to the devastation and isolation of the country, which resulted in its "unawakened" status. This popular book was not an academic text. Korean history in this book was more "story-telling" and it depended very much on characterization of the nation. It is full of stories of how this weak kingdom survived many invasions from its strong neighbors, how it had to become tributary state in order to survive, and how it ended up isolating itself. However, the book was influential during the twentieth century, and it provided themes that were

---

147 Griffis, *Corea: the Hermit Nation*, 42.

148 Ladd, *In Korea with Marquis Ito*, 182-183.

149 McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 259.

150 McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 261.

eventually integrated into academic writings, as can be seen from how McCune adopted the theme of isolationism in his dissertation. Also, it established an initial framework which many American writers adopted when writing Korean history.

Emergence of Discourse of Failure: Hulbert's *Passing of Korea*

When Homer B. Hulbert (1863-1949) published *Passing of Korea* in 1906, his motivation for writing this book was quite clear, as he was engaging in political activities to support Korean independence against the Japanese protectorate. His ultimate goal was to present Korea as a nation with a distinct civilization and potential for modernity. In order to do this, he had to challenge and counter Griffis' popular narrative on Korean history through his own book.

Hulbert's strategy was to give himself authority as a Korean expert by emphasizing how he referred to Korean sources, and criticize the inaccuracies found in Griffis' book. Legitimizing his position as the one who "first attempted" to "give to the English reading public a history of Korea based on native records,"[151] Hulbert first criticized Griffis for lacking historical evidence, and for not using Korean sources in accounting for Korean history. Hulbert corrected some of Griffis' accounts; he dismissed Griffis' narrative on how Japan conquered and ruled the southern peninsula as groundless and "a fanciful tale,"[152] for it lacked confirmation from the Korean sources.[153] He also tried to change the popular

[151] Hulbert, *History of Korea,* iv.

[152] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea*, 74.

[153] Hulbert translated Chŏng Kyo's *Taedong Yŏksa* (1905) with his co-author Oh Sŏnggŭn, which was published as *Taehan Yŏksa* in 1908. It seems that Hulbert read this book when he wrote *Passing of Korea.*

view that Korea was subject to Japan in the past, by arguing and proving that they were on equal terms.[154] He refuted the claim that Korea paid tribute to Japan after the Hideyoshi Invasion, and argued that Pusan, the port which had been regarded as occupied by Japan in Griffis' accounts, was merely a trading station. Even in discussing the aftermath of the Hideyoshi Invasion, countering Griffis' accounts that it was clearly Korea's defeat, Hulbert suggested that the war was over when General Yi Sunsin "destroyed almost the whole fleet."[155]

Despite Hulbert's intention to oppose Griffis' narrative on Korean history, however, he was still influenced by Griffis' initial framework, especially in narrating how Korean history slowly declined from its relatively flourishing past to the "failure" in the late nineteenth century. It is important to note that Hulbert's book was written amidst the fervor of producing knowledge of Korea in the first decade of the 1900s; therefore, his book reflected the newly emerging discourses within Korea. Hulbert could integrate both Japanese and Korean historians' works on Korean history that were unavailable when Griffis wrote his book, so Hulbert's narrative was much more articulate and elaborate. However, the overall structure of the narrative did not change much.

(Cho Tonggŏl, Han Yŏng-u, and Park Chan-seung, *Hangukŭi Yŏksaga wa yŏnsahak* 2 (Seoul: Changbi, 1994), 161.) While Korean scholars such as Kim T'aekyŏng and Hyŏn Ch'ae adopted the Mimana Nihonfu theory, Chŏng Kyo stated that Empress Jin'gu did not "conquer" Korea; it was merely a pacification between two equal states, and he did not even discuss Mimana Nihonfu in his book *Taedong Yŏksa* (Cho, Han and Park, *Hangukŭi yŏksaga wa yŏksahak* 2, 54).

[154] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea*, 102.

[155] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea*, 101.

The similarities in historical narrative come from the fact that Hulbert's book was also framed around the same question in the preface: "why has Korea failed?" Just like Griffis, who asked in his preface the reasons for Korea's "un-awakened" status, Hulbert asked: "what has caused the present state of stagnation?"[156] This question inevitably made both authors organize their content in a way that offered reasons for Korea's decline, resulting in a depiction of Korean history as a series of negative causes culminating in a state of "failure."

Hulbert's narrative of Korean history started from Tan'gun, whose civilization influenced the advancement of three Hans in the southern part of the peninsula, which later developed as three kingdoms.[157] Hulbert praised the high civilization of the three kingdoms, especially that of Silla, which was attested by the cultural inheritances such as the observatory tower or the old bells.[158] The emphasis on the ancient kingdoms and their development until the seventh century was informed by Japanese archeological findings on Silla. Sekino Tadashi's report in 1902 on Kyŏngju, the capital city of Silla, discussed how the remains of temples, palaces, and shrines all indicated the high civilization of Silla.[159] Hulbert also integrated Korean intellectuals' emphasis on Koguryŏ's bravery,[160] stating

---

[156] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea*, 33.

[157] Henry Em argued that Hulbert differed from Sin Ch'aeho as Hulbert still regarded Tan'gun as a mythical being while Sin argued that Tan'gun was a historical figure. (Em, *The Great Enterprise*, 80) However, Oak argued that Hulbert regarded Tan'gun myth to be "founded on facts" in his series of "The History of Korea" in The *Korea Review* of January 1901. (Sung Deuk Oak, "North American Missionaries' Understanding of the Tan'gun and Kija Myths of Korea, 1884-1934," *Acta Koreana* 5 (Jan 2001): 7.)

[158] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea*, 73.

[159] Pai, *Constructing "Korean" Origin,* 25.

[160] *Hwangsŏng Sinmun*, 1909. 1. 6., 1909, 2. 10, 1909. 4. 20. Shmid pointed out how nationalist intellectuals regarded Ŭlchi Mundŏk as representing a time when Koreans were truly Korean, unsullied by contact with debilitating Chinese culture (Schmid, *Korea Between Empires*, 64). The dates for these articles were a year

that "If Kokuryŏ could beat back an army of a million Chinese, it is hardly to be believed that Empress Jingu conquered the whole peninsula."[161]

The flourishing of the three kingdoms, however, were contrasted with the subsequent decline after Silla's unification of the kingdoms. While Griffis claimed that Korean history declined from the ninth to the sixteenth century without specific evidential support, Hulbert articulated this narrative by analyzing the reason he gave, which was the influx of Chinese civilization. Hulbert argued that due to the prominence of Chinese ideas during the seventh century, Korea started to be "moulded to the Chinese type" which "deteriorated" them, as it "smothered" the genius of the Korean people.[162] Combined with his negative perception of China, as well as his idea that Korea was distinguished from China in temperament, Hulbert argued that it caused harm to Korea. He marked this as the first "intellectual stagnation" which Korea never recovered from. Three centuries ruled by a unified Silla was described as a period of "rapid decline" described as a child in front of sweetmeats [i.e. Chinese ideas] who has not learned how to moderate.[163] Hulbert's emphasis on the ancient kingdom and its development, and the decline after the seventh century was influenced by the Korean and Japanese intellectual trends of "decentering the middle kingdom" which demoted China and its influence over Korea.[164]

---

after the publication of Hulbert's book, but the discourse slowly emerging during the early years of the 1900s must have influenced Hulbert.

[161] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea*, 74.

[162] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea,* 76.

[163] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea,* 77.

[164] Schmid, *Korea Between Empires*, 60.

In describing the Koryŏ period from the tenth century, Hulbert emphasized how Korea taught Buddhism to Japan, refuting the idea of Korea as a tributary to Japan.[165] However, this was also the time of discrimination against military officials, which resulted in a "complete absence" of the martial spirit, preventing the rise of feudalism in Korea. While talking about how Koryŏ was strong enough to defend itself during the first century of its dynasty, however, Hulbert also stated that three hundred years following the first century was the period of decline, the last century of which was "one swift fall of worse and worse excess until the end," with the influence of Mongol over Korea.[166]

Praising the fifteenth century as the golden age of the Chosŏn period, when the Korean alphabet was invented, was also a reflection of the Korean studies that attempted to carve out "Korean-ness" by focusing on its native alphabet. However, Hulbert still described the Chosŏn period as a time of "general degeneration."[167] Especially from the sixteenth century, another period of "retrogression" started with the rise of "feuds among the political parties."[168] Hulbert described this as "steady and lamentable decline" in political morals, which caused Korea's inability to respond to the Japanese invasion in the late sixteenth century.[169] After spending many pages on the Hideyoshi and Manchu Invasions, Hulbert marked the eighteenth century as a time of grand reforms, which also

---

[165] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea,* 79.

[166] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea,* 86.

[167] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea*, 112

[168] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea,* 93-94.

[169] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea*, 93

showed some advances in arts and science.[170] But again, gradual decline started with persecutions of Catholics, leading to the nineteenth century, which was also described as "a time of general degeneration" in which Korea was ruled by "incapable kings surrounded by incapable ministers."[171] Hulbert contrasted the mid-nineteenth century Chosŏn with Japan, specifically how Japan was going through the "great awakening" which eventually made it a new force in East Asia, while Korea was fighting off the American and French ships on its shores, believing it to be a victory when it was actually preventing Korea from awakening.[172]

In many ways, Hulbert's version of Korean history was much more articulate than that of Griffis, as it integrated the new studies on Korea made during the intervening two decades. This articulation is demonstrated in the periodization of Korean history. Unlike Griffis, who adopted the tradition from previous French and English books in narrating Korean history from Kija and only briefly mentioned Tan'gun in the chapter discussing the myth and legend,[173] Hulbert integrated the emerging discourse on Tan'gun from mid-1890s in Korea and narrated Korean history starting from Tan'gun.[174] While Griffis did not

---

[170] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea,* 107

[171] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea,* 112

[172] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea,* 119

[173] Previous studies pointed out how this came from Hulbert's use of Tongsa Kangyo, the Korean primary source that Hulbert stated that he depended on. Tongsa Kangyo was completed in 1858 and was a summarized version of four books written during the Chosŏn period: *Tongguk Tonggam*, *Tongsa Ch'anyo*, *Tongsa Hoegang*, and *Tongsa Poyu* (Homer B. Hulbert, *History of Korea*, eds. Clarence M. Weems (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1962), ED 76.) For further discussion on how Hulbert used Tongsa Kangyo, refer to John So, "Hŏlbŏtŭ sŏnkyosaŭi han'guksa yŏn'gu [Research on primary sources of Homer B. Hulbert's Korean history]," *Taehak kwa Sŏnkyo* 30 (June 2016): 103-124.

[174] Hulbert was the first American missionary to understand the legend of Tan'gun in terms of the origin of Korean race. Kija, in Hulbert's narrative, was merely described as a cultural reformer from China who taught the art of government to Koreans but did not impose Chinese language upon the people. (Oak, "North

mention Silla's unification and stated how Koryŏ unified the peninsula, Hulbert marked Silla's unification as an important historical event that welded Korea into a single state. Unlike Griffis, who argued that "modern" Korean history started with introduction of Christianity, Hulbert's "modern" period was yet to come to Korea.[175]

However, it also meant that Hulbert also articulated the reasons for failure. In describing the causes of decline in Korean history, Hulbert first ascribed it to the Chinese influence from the seventh century, as discussed above. In addition, Hulbert cited two major factors that caused Korea's stagnation. One was factionalism among the yangban elite,[176] and the other was Korea's lack of feudalism. In articulating these two factors, Hulbert integrated both Japanese and Korean intellectual discourse emerging during the first decade of the 1900s.

Criticism toward the political feuds among the factions during the Chosŏn period existed from the eighteenth century, but the interpretation of factionalism as the major reason for Korea's "failure" emerged during the 1900s. Shidehara Taira's *Kankoku Seisoshi* (1907)[177] has been generally regarded as the first book to use the term "*tousou* [tangjaeng in Korean, meaning factionalism]".[178] Shidehara emphasized the non-rational aspect of the

---

American Missionaries' Understanding," 5, 18. See also Hulbert, "Korea Survivals," 27.)

[175] Hulbert talked about how "material advancement" could be seen in the capital, in the chapter titled "modern improvements," while the core of "modern" which was "standard of civic morals" and education are yet to be achieved (Hulbert, *Passing of Korea*, 460).

[176] Hulbert used the term "war of factions" instead of "factionalism" which is the direct translation of *tousou*, or *tangjaeng*.

[177] Taira Shidehara, *Kankoku Seisoshi* [History of Korean political strife] (Tokyo: Sanseido Shoten, 1907).

[178] Yi T'aejin, "Tangp'asŏngnon pip'an [A critique of discussions on Factionalism]" *Han'guksa Simingangjwa* 1 (Aug 1987), 57

feud, stating "it was not a public discussion or conflict based on difference of principles, but rather a personal strife, criticizing each other based on interests."[179] Hulbert's book was published prior to Sidehara's, but the idea that factionalism caused Korea's failure was already emerging among Japanese and Korean intellectuals. Hulbert's interpretation of factionalism was remarkably similar to that of Sidehara. Hulbert described these feuds as a "spoil system" where "there were no great political opinions or underlying platforms" but "simply the fight for political preferment."[180] Hulbert argued that it marked the "beginning of another retrogression, which caused steady and lamentable decline in political morals." The idea that factionalism was one of the reasons why Korea had been in stagnation up until Korea was colonized by Japan became one of the major themes in Japanese colonialist writing of Korean history.

Another major cause of decline was that Korea lacked feudalism, which was regarded as a necessary phase for a nation to adopt modernity. Contrary to Griffis' use of feudalism, which vaguely referred to a system where kings distributed lands to their officials, the use of feudalism in Hulbert's book portrays it as an essential historical stage to advance to modernity. Hulbert defined "feudalism" as a specific system, which only existed in western Europe and Japan. The importance of feudalism as a preparatory step in order to achieve "enlightenment" was clear on the first page of his preface: "the feudal system is a chrysalis state from which a people are prepared to leap into the full light of self-

[179] Shidehara, *Kankoku Seisoshi,* 31-32.

[180] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea*, 93.

government."[181] Contrasting Korea with Japan, whose feudalism gave it the ability to leap to modernity, Hulbert argued that Korea lacked such a stage. As for the reasons why Korea lacked feudalism, Hulbert argued that Korea was unified too early, stating how Korea "welded together as a single state at an early date that no opportunity was given for the rise of feudalism."[182] Secondly, he found Koryŏ society discriminated against the military officials so much that it prevented the "martial spirit" necessary for feudalism, which prevented the next stage of having an enlightened government.[183]

The idea that Japan had European-style feudalism and it led Japan to leap to modernity arose around the Russo-Japanese War in 1904 by economic and legal historians.[184] According to Miyajima Hiroshi, this reflects an intellectual shift in Japan during the first decade of the 1900s, from a tendency to imagine Japanese history as part of pan-Asian civilization to a tendency to separate Japan from Chosŏn and China.[185] In 1900, Fukuda Tokuzo was one of the first to argue that Japan had European-style feudalism in his thesis, which was later published as a book titled *Nihon Keizaishiron* in 1906. Legal historians such as Nakata Kaoru, and Miura Hiroyuki attested this to be true in their 1906 articles.[186] Uchida Ginzo also made an analogy of Japanese feudalism to that of Europe in

---

[181] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea*, 3.

[182] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea*, 80.

[183] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea*, 80.

[184] Hiroshi Miyajima, "Ilbon kuksaŭi sŏngnip kwa han'guksa e taehan insik – pongkŏnje e taehan nonŭirŭl chungsimŭro [The establishment of Japanese national history and its perception of Korean history: focusing on the discussion of feudalism]" *Hanil Kongdong Yŏn'gu Ch'ongsŏ* 2 (Mar 2000): 307-340.

[185] Miyajima, "Ilbon kuksaŭi sŏngnip kwa Han'guksa e taehan insik,"318.

[186] Kaoru Nakata, "Ocho Jidai no Shoten in Kansuru Kenkyu" *kokukagakkai zasshi* [Association of national studies journal] 20, vol. 3, (1906); Hiroyuki Miura, "bukeiseido no hattatsu" *Houseishi no Kenkyu* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1925), 585. According to Miura, this article was written during 1904-1905 (Miyajima,

his book, *Nihon Kinseishi*, in 1903.[187] Emerging ideas on how Japan's European-style feudalism led it to modernity was known to the English-reading public through a book, *The Russo-Japanese Conflict: Its Causes and Issues* (1904), written by a Japanese scholar, Asakawa Kanichi, who was a lecturer on Civilization and History of East Asia at Dartmouth College.[188] Hulbert could have referred to this book when writing in his preface how Japan rose to modernity due to its feudalism. As Miyajima pointed out, however, this idea of Japan having European-style feudalism was inseparable from the idea that Korea lacked it. Fukuda, who argued that Japan had feudalism, wrote how Korea "lacked the feudalism" in his article published in 1904.[189] Comparing the economic development of Korea in the late nineteenth century to that of tenth century Japan, Fukuda temporalized Korea to Japan's past before the arrival of feudalism. Hulbert did not use the same temporalizing strategy, but he adopted the broader idea that Korea lacked the feudalism, which prevented Korea's rise to modernity.

The overall structure of Hulbert's book shows that he not only articulated Griffis' narratives of Korean history but also adopted the tendency to configure Korean history in relation to Japan. Despite Hulbert's criticism that Korea was facing China rather than Japan

---

"Ilbon kuksaŭi sŏngnip kwa han'guksa e taehan insik," 321).

[187] Uchida Ginzo, *Nihon Kinseishi* (Tokyo: Heibonsa, 1903); Miyajima, "Ilbon kuksaŭi sŏngnip kwa han'guksa e taehan insik," 323.

[188] Kanichi Asakawa, *The Russo-Japanese Conflict: Its Causes and Issues*, (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin And Company, 1904).

[189] Fukuda Tokuzo published an article "Kankoku no keizai sosiki to keizai tani [The Economic Units and Economic Organization in Korea]" in 1904 after traveling Korea in 1902. (Kang Chinch'ŏl, "Chŏngch'esŏng iron pip'an" *Han'guksa Siminganjwa* 1 (Aug 1987): 23-39).

throughout its history,[190] Hulbert constantly contrasted Korean historical progress with that of Japan rather than with China. As discussed above, while Japan had an "almost magical rise" to modernity, Korea's lack of feudalism cause it to stagnate.[191] While Japanese samurais were adopting the "Western system," Korea was fighting off western ships on the shore.[192] This rhetoric of contrasting Korea and Japan was a reflection of intellectual trends, as many contrasts were made by Japanese intellectuals who wanted to emphasize the superiority of Japan in East Asia and present Korea as in a state to be colonized. Korean intellectuals also lamented what Korea lacked by contrasting with Japan in order to call for reforms to achieve modernity. However, for Hulbert, it also came from a writing tradition that Griffis established. That Hulbert was unconsciously adopting Griffis' framework can be seen from the allocation of chapters. Just like Griffis, whose account of Chosŏn history was mostly preoccupied with the accounts on the Hideyoshi Invasion, Hulbert's book also spent nine chapters on the invasion (among twenty-four chapters on Chosŏn period), taking up almost half of Chosŏn's history. The fact that Hulbert felt obliged to spend so many chapters on the invasion suggests that it was seen as a major historical event needing to be addressed when writing Korean history. American interest in Korea was shaped in terms of its relation to Japan from this initial period, which was eventually reinforced as Korea was colonized by Japan in 1910.

---

[190] Hulbert, *History of Korea*, vi.

[191] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea*, 33.

[192] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea*, 119.

Examination of the two American's books shows that Hulbert's narrative of Korean history was very similar to that of Griffis. Even as Hulbert's narrative contested Griffis' interpretation in certain aspects, such as claiming that Japan did not conquer Korea during the ancient period, that Korea did not pay tribute to Japan, and how the Hideyoshi Invasion did not end up as Korea's loss, the overall structure followed the same basic framework that Griffis delineated. Hulbert's intention to counter Griffis' interpretation of Korean history mattered little, as this adoption was done more unconsciously. Rather, Hulbert's narrative became much more articulated version of older American writings, since Hulbert was able to integrate Japanese and Korean intellectual trends. In this way, Griffis' narrative was confirmed rather than dismissed or countered by Hulbert's narrative of Korean history. Hulbert's book not only confirmed already existing themes such as isolationism and Korea being victimized by strong neighbors, but also presented themes such as Korea's stagnation, which was attested by the idea that Korea lacked feudalism and could not progress due to factionalism.

The emergence of this confirmed narrative suggests that a new tradition of writing Korean history was established in American writings. Both Hulbert's and Griffis' books were referred to very often when American authors during early half of the twentieth century wrote about Korea, and examination of their writings demonstrate that this frame was used to describe Korean history. So what was the tradition? This chapter argues that Korean history in American writings developed as a "discourse of failure."

The discourse of failure can be defined as a collective group of texts, seemingly unrelated to each other, which all posed reasons for Korea's failure in the late nineteenth

century, which eventually led to its extinction of sovereignty. Writing Korean history was one of the major pillars that buttressed the discourse of failure. It started with an already given conclusion, which was Korea's failure in maintaining its sovereignty, and drew a smooth historical trajectory that led to this conclusion. In this process, Korean history was described as a series of negative causes which accumulatively resulted in its state of failure in the late nineteenth century. All findings on Korean history, whether the evidence of a highly developed civilization in the past, or disputes among the elite class, were ultimately used to explain the trajectory of Korea's path to failure. If Griffis argued that it was Korea's traditional "isolationism" that caused Korea's failure, then for Hulbert it was "stagnation" caused by Chinese influence, lack of feudalism, and factionalism. By dismissing the temporal discontinuity among the historical events from which the themes were carved out, or the historical context of each event, Hulbert and Griffis both regarded these negative "causes of decline" to accumulatively create Korea's failure in the late nineteenth century.

American writing of Korean history during 1882 to 1910, then, formed the initial framework in writing Korean history. Overall, the format of the narrative was designed to answer the question in the preface, asking for Korea's reasons for failure. It started Korean history from highly civilized past, declining from Silla's reliance on Tang in the seventh century. After that, the country was declared to be in general stagnation from Koryŏ to the early Chosŏn period, with its factionalism and lack of feudalism, up until the seventeenth century when the Hideyoshi Invasion and the Manchu Invasion swept the whole peninsula. The rest of the Chosŏn period is mostly occupied with Catholic persecution, Korea's resistance to the western approach, and its seclusion policy until Japan opened its port in

1876. Korea strove to survive as a nation from 1876 to 1910, but with its incompetent elites and government corruption, it deprived its people of the motivation for reform, which eventually led to the extinction of its sovereignty by Japan. To this basic narrative, themes such as Korea's victimization and subservient attitudes toward China and other strong powers, isolationist policy, and factionalism were all specified as Korea's reasons for failure. In addition to this, the tendency to contrast Korea's failure with Japan's success became part of the tradition.

There were two major problematic aspects in the discourse of failure. One was that it had potential to be co-opted by the Japanese colonial government. Just as Korean intellectuals' self-criticism in order to overcome their crisis was co-opted by the Japanese colonial government when Korea was colonized by Japan, the discourse of failure in American writings of Korean history could also contribute in supporting the Japanese colonization of Korea. It is important to note that this contribution was made regardless of the writers' political purpose. Many American missionaries wrote their books to present Korea as a potentially successful mission field, and Hulbert's political purpose was to present Korea as a nation with the potential to govern themselves, to earn political support from the English-speaking international society. However, as Americans shared the imperialist view that was compatible with Japanese colonialism in many ways, and used the same vocabulary of the "civilization and enlightenment" discourse, it ended up describing Korean history as a failure, which suited the Japanese colonialist discourse. Furthermore, in order to earn credibility, Hulbert must have felt a need to engage in the intellectual discourse of his own time, which can be seen in how he integrated the discourse of Japan's

rise to modernity due to its European-style feudalism, which Korea lacked. The American tradition of writing Korean history as a discourse of failure, while not exactly produced with the sole purpose of legitimizing the colonial rule, was compatible with this scholarship and also useful. Themes in Korean history such as isolationism, stagnation, factionalism, and heteronomy produced in popular writings in 1900-1910 were developed as academic terms during the Japanese colonial period.

Another problem with the discourse of failure was its declared "objectivity", considering it was produced and confirmed by multiple national subjects. In other words, the co-authorship of discourse of failure strengthened the credibility of the historical narrative as apparently objective knowledge. American writings of Korea, especially, played an important role in attesting this discourse to be objective, as they were written by the "third person's perspective" not directly related to the colonial relationship between Japan and Korea. Furthermore, when later Americans referred to Hulbert's book in particular, they found the historical narratives and themes in the book to be compatible with contemporary Japanese colonial scholarship. They did not find much difficulty in adopting Japanese colonial scholarship to their work, even though they based their historical narratives on the American books published during the 1900s.

Conclusion

American writings of Korean history from 1882 to 1910 were produced and developed as a discourse of failure. Examination of two most representative books on Korean history shows how the early framework of narrating Korean history was formed

during this period. Griffis established the initial framework in narrating Korean history, and Hulbert articulated the narrative by integrating both Japanese colonial discourse and Korean nationalist discourse emerging during the first years of the 1900s. This narrative was developed and shaped as a discourse of failure. The format of asking for reasons for Korea's failure and narrating the history in order to answer the question, the tendency to contrast Korea's failure with Japan's success, and themes in Korean history—such as victimization and subservient attitude, isolationism and resistance to change, as well as stagnation due to the political feuds—all settled to shape the tradition of narrating Korean history in American writings.

The general assumption is that these American writings of Korea slowly died away following the decrease of American publications on Korea during the Japanese colonial period (1910-1945). However, the early American framework of writing Korean history remained influential during and after the colonial period. While few in number, American authors who wrote about Korea referred to the American books on Korea written from 1882 to 1910, especially to Griffis and Hulbert's books when writing Korean history. Most of the American books on Korea during the Japanese colonial period were popular, not academic, books. However, during the 1930s and 1940s, the early tradition of writing Korean history and the themes within immigrated to American academia through the doctoral dissertations written by American missionaries' children, such as Harold J. Noble and George M. McCune. As will be discussed in Chapter Three, an examination of Noble's and McCune's dissertations demonstrates that they not only inherited this initial framework in narrating Korean history as a failure but also treated the themes such as isolation, factionalism, and

stagnation as academic themes by supporting it with Japanese colonial scholarship, which was being produced by scholars grouped around Keijo Imperial University. The American intellectuals during the colonial period found the Japanese scholarship not only compatible with the early American writings of Korean history but also found it useful in securing their own academic authority.

CHAPTER THREE

Migration to Academia and Transnational Circulation:

Japanese Colonial Scholarship and Its Ramification for U.S. Academia, 1910-1945

The Japanese annexation of Korea brought several changes to the scene of knowledge construction of Korea. During the colonial period (1910-1945), knowledge on Korea was produced mostly by Japan, who not only needed to research Korea in order to rule it as a colony, but also sought to construct its own historical identity by analyzing the relationships between the archipelago, the continent, and the peninsula.[193] Knowledge production on Korea was institutionalized by the 1930s, as faculty members at Keijo Imperial University used primary sources published by *Chosenshi Henshukai* [Society for the Compilation of Korean History], a government-sponsored institution, and published their articles through the journal *Seikyu Gakuso*. Through the research of Japanese historians, the historical framework that depicted Korean history as a narrative that started from a glorious ancient past to subsequent decline that led to failure before the annexation by Japan was more academically elaborated and reinforced, as it was now supported by advanced Japanese colonial scholarship. The popular themes that emerged prior to the annexation—stagnation, heteronomy, factionalism, and *Nissen Dosoron*—were also developed as academic themes.

[193] Sang-woo Jeong, "Kŭndae yŏksahak ŭrosŏŭi Mansŏnsa [Mansenshi as a modern historiography," in *Singminjuŭi yŏksahak kwa cheguk*, ed. Yun Haedong et al. (Seoul: Chaekkwa Hamke, 2016), 195.

Some Korean intellectuals attempted to challenge this prevalent Japanese version of Korean history by coming up with alternative narrative frameworks. Most representative was the nationalist historical narrative, first suggested by Sin Ch'aeho, and the Marxist historical framework that was created by Paek Nam-un, polemicizing the themes of heteronomy and stagnation, respectively. However, their works also had to engage the Japanese colonial scholarship, and shared common epistemological ground with it. Furthermore, most of these alternative narrative frameworks were created outside of academia and therefore were easily rejected by most of the Japanese and Korean positivist historians who dominated academia, whose works were recognized as academic achievements and could be circulated outside of Korea.

American publications on Korea decreased after the Japanese annexation of Korea and remained scarce during the colonial period. By the 1930s, however, a new trend emerged where children of American missionaries to Korea studied topics related to Korea at universities in the United States, transferring previous knowledge produced by American missionaries to the academia. Harold Joyce Noble and George McAfee McCune received their Ph.D.s in Korean history from the University of California—Noble in 1931 and McCune in 1941—and taught at American universities. Their dissertations show that they inherited the narrative framework produced by American missionaries from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, while partially integrating Japanese colonial scholarship in order to academically strengthen their works. These American scholars, in other words, not only migrated the missionary narrative frameworks to academia, but also

transnationally circulated Japanese academic themes on Korean history, forming the basis on which the postwar American knowledge would be built.

This chapter examines the three main agents in producing knowledge of Korean history during the colonial period (1910-1945): Japanese colonial scholars, Korean intellectuals, and American intellectuals who were children of American missionaries to Korea. It explores the co-authorship and circulation of knowledge among the three agents and demonstrates how Japanese colonial scholarship influenced both the emergence of Korean alternative narrative frameworks of Korean history, and the American narrative framework of Korean history. American intellectuals formed their own academic narrative framework during the colonial period, which emphasized isolationism as Korea's main cause of failure, and found themes from Japanese colonial scholarship—such as stagnation, heteronomy, and factionalism—compatible with their own works. Integrating Japanese colonial scholarship conferred academic authority to their own work, as they cited the most advanced knowledge of Korea of their times. It also further strengthened the discourse of failure as it was "confirmed" by American scholars who were not the direct colonizer of Korea.

By examining the American knowledge construction on Korea during this period, which previous scholarship rarely explored, this chapter argues that the knowledge of colonized Korea was co-produced, not just by its direct colonizer Japan, but also by Koreans and Americans who circulated the knowledge as the basis of sharing common epistemological ground. This co-authorship and transnational circulation of knowledge

made it possible for the postwar scholars on Korean history to transnationally share their interpretation of Korean history.

Development of Japanese Colonial Scholarship

When Japan colonized Korea in 1910, the colonial government knew that Japanese colonialism could not be sustained with just coercive power, but that it should establish sufficient hegemony over the colonized, who would then recognize the relative superiority of the colonizer. This idea is reflected in the speech of Terauchi Masatake, the first governor-general of Korea in 1910, who stated that studying Korean history and mentality should accompany the political institution of colonial rule.[194] The Japanese colonial state not only carried out surveys and excavations through *Chosen Koseki Kenkyukai* [Commissions for Investigating Historic Relics] that investigated archeological remains, but also launched projects to write Korean history.[195]

The colonial state attempted to publish its own version of Korean history as early as the 1910s, which can be seen from the project to publish *Chosen Hantoshi* [History of the Korean Peninsula].[196] During the 1920s, the colonial state made two major efforts in regard to producing knowledge of Korean history. First, it investigated and collected

---

[194] Tsunataro Aoyagi, *Sotoku Seiji Shiron* (Keijo: Kejo Sinbunshi, 1928); Myoun-Hoi Do, "Chosŏn ch'ongdokpu ŭi munhwa chŏngch'aek kwa Han'guksa kusŏng ch'egye – Chosŏn pandosa wa Chosŏnsa ŭi kiljabi rŭl chungsim ŭro" *Yoksa hakpo* 222 (June 2014), 72.

[195] Em, *The Great Enterprise*, 106.

[196] This project was absorbed into a new project of publishing *Chosenshi* in 1924 but stopped short of publishing the results. Its unpublished manuscript shows that the purpose and nature of the project was to support the assimilation policy of the colonial government. The manuscript was collected and published by Ch'in'il Panminjok haengwi chinsang kyumyŏng Wiwŏnhoe [The Presidential Committee for the Inspection of Collaboration for Japanese Imperialism] in 2008.

primary sources on Korean history by establishing *Chosenshi Henshukai* [Society for the Compilation of Korean History] in 1925. *Chosenshi Henshukai* was an institution directly under the government-general of Korea, and it compiled primary sources into 35 volumes of *Chosenshi* in 1938. It not only invited renowned scholars on Korean studies who were mostly faculty members at Keijo Imperial University—such as Kuroita Katsumi, Oda Shogo, Suematsu Yasukazu, and Inaba Iwakichi—but also Korean scholars who graduated from Waseda University or Keijo Imperial University, such as Yi Pyŏng-do and Sin Sŏkho, to participate. *Chosenshi Henshukai* was regarded as the ultimate organization supporting the knowledge production on Korea, even by the Japanese colonial scholars such as Suematsu Yasukazu.[197]

Second, the colonial state attempted to distribute its version of Korean history through the lecture series *Chosenshi Gakkai* [Society of Korean History], established in 1923. This society published fifteen volumes of *Chosenshi Kouza* [Lectures on Korean History] from 1923 to 1924, and parts of these books were later published in five volumes of *Chosenshi Taikei* [An Outline of Korean History] in 1927, led by scholars including Oda Shogo and Seno Umakuma.[198]

By the 1930s, knowledge production on Korean history because more systemized because it operated through three powerful institutions: Keijo Imperial University,

---

[197] Takashi Hatada, *Shimpojiumu – Nihon to Chosen* (Keijo: Keisoshobo, 1969), 80-81; Sang-woo Jeong, "Chosŏnsa p'yŏnch'an saŏp chŏnhu Ilbonin yŏn'guja tŭl ŭi kaldŭng yangsang kwa saeroun yŏn'guja ŭi tŭngjang," *Sahak yŏn'gu* 116 (December 2014), 147.

[198] Chosen Shigakkai, *Chosenshi Taikei* [An Outline of Korean History] (Keijo: Chikazawa Shoten, 1927).

Chosenshi Henshukai, and *Seikyu Gakuso*.[199] Keijo Imperial University was established during the mid-1920s, and by the 1930s it had renowned Japanese scholars on Korean studies working on the faculty. Most of these scholars were members of *Chosenshi Henshukai*, and published their research through the *Seikyu Gakuso*, a journal published by *Seikyu Gakkai*.[200] As Hatada Takashi later pointed out, publication of *Sekiyu Gakuso* signified that the center of Korean history research had migrated from Japan to its colony.[201]

Themes on Korean history that emerged prior to the annexation of Korea gained new strength during the colonial period, as the themes were supported by academic research of the Japanese scholars. The most popular themes from the early twentieth century were: stagnation (chŏngch'esˇongnon), suggesting that Korea either declined or could not progress; heteronomy (t'ayulsŏngnon), implying that external forces had determined Korea's historical development; factionalism (tangp'asŏngnon); and the *Nisen Dosoron* (or Ilsŏn Dongjoron), the idea that Korea and Japan shared the same ancestry.[202] By the 1930s, these all became well-grounded academic themes that were supported by research on Korean history.

---

[199] Joon-Young Jung, "Singmin sagwan ŭi ch'ajil – Chosŏn sahakhoe wa 1920 nyŏndae singminsahak ŭi chedohwa," *Han'guk sahaksa hakpo* 35 (Dec 2016), 265-266.

[200] Sang-woo Jeong, "Chosenshi p'yŏnch'an saŏp chŏn'hu Ilbonin yŏn'guja tŭl ŭi kaldŭng yangsang kwa saeroun yŏn'guja tŭl ŭi tŭngjang [The Conflict of Japanese Researchers and Emergence of New Researchers Around *Chosenshi* Compilation" *Sahak yŏn'gu* 116 (Dec 2014), 183.

[201] Hatada Takashi, *Ilbonin ŭi Han'gukkwan*, trans. Kidong Yi. (Seoul: Ilchogak, 1983), 280.

[202] These themes were identified by South Korean scholars from the 1960s to the 1980s. For more information, refer to Kiebaek Yi, "Sŏron [Introduction]" *Kuksasillon*, (Seoul: Taesŏngsa, 1961), 1-10; Yong-sŏp Kim, "Ilbon Han'guk e isŏsŏ Han'guksa sŏsul [Korean History Writing by Japanese and Koreans]," *Yŏksa hakpo* 31 (1966).

The theme of stagnation was first raised in academia by Fukuda Tokuzo's 1904 article, which argued that Korean history lacked the stage of feudalism, hindering its progress, and that the level of development in Korea was comparable to that of tenth-century Fujiwara Japan.[203] This interpretation academically "proved" the image of Korea's historical stagnation and continued to be influential during the early colonial period. By the 1930s, this theme was again confirmed by Shitaka Hiroshi, who adopted the basic framework of Fukuda in claiming that Korea never experienced feudalism, which prevented its rise to modernity. Shikata utilized newly published primary sources on the Chosŏn period from *Chosenshi*, and argued that the stagnation of Korea also continued due to the weak kingship and relatively stronger power of ministers and inspectors in the Chosŏn period, tracing the origin of the week kingship to the tradition of aristocratic councils from the ancient period.

Not surprisingly, Shikata also utilized the theme of factionalism to support the stagnation theory, when he argued that factional strife contributed to stagnation by preventing the accumulation of capital among people.[204] This theme of factionalism was discussed in Sidehara Taira's book in 1907,[205] but gained new academic strength during the 1930s. The basic idea was that factionalism was deeply ingrained in Korean political culture, as evidenced by successive purges of literati and appearances of factional strife,

---

[203] Tokuzo Fukuda, "Kankoku no keizai sosiki to keizai tani [The Economic Units and Economic Organization in Korea]" *Keizaigaku Kenkyu* (Tokyo: Dobunkan, 1904); Kang, "Chŏngch'esŏng iron pipan," 23-39.

[204] Kang, "Chŏngch'esŏng iron pip'an," 42.

[205] Shidehara, *Kankoku Seisoshi*.

which prevented any concerted effort to make social progress.[206] It further argued that the factional strife was not based on any principle, but rather on jealousy or for the benefit of a person's own party or clan. This view remained influential during the early colonial period. Hayashi Taiksuke stated in his 1912 book: "the factions were not based on any firm principles but merely divided according to the situation,"[207] and that the "root of the accumulated factional strife could not be severed."[208] By the 1930s, the theme of factionalism became more elaborate as the scholars used factionalism to explain events in earlier and later periods of Chosŏn history. In other words, the duration of factionalism was expanded to entire Chosŏn period, marked as a major characteristic of the Chosŏn period's political history.[209] Oda Shogo attempted to show a longer duration of factionalism, by explaining Catholic persecution in the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries as an extension of the factional strife.[210] Meanwhile, Seno Umakuma argued that the factionalism in Korea started from the literati purges in the sixteenth century.[211] As can be seen from Inaba Iwakichi's statement, "factional strife was all that happened in politics of the Chosŏn

---

[206] Em, *The Great Enterprise*, 12.

[207] Taisuke Hayashi, *Chosentsushi* [Complete History of Korea], (Tokyo: Fuzanbo, 1912), 411; Yi, "Tangpasŏngnon Pipan," 60.

[208] Hayashi, *Chosentsushi*, 492.

[209] Yi, "Tangpasŏngnon Pipan," 62.

[210] Shogo Oda, "Richo no hoto rakujo shite tenshukyo ni oyobu, [A Brief Explanation on Yi Dynasty's Factions and its Ramification on Catholic Persecution]" *Seikyu Gakuso* 1 (Aug 1930):1-26. Oda already had written on the topic of factionalism, "Richo Seisho Ryakushi [A Brief History of Yi Dynasty's Political Strife]" as part of the *Chosenshi Kouza* in 1925.

[211] Umakuma Seno, "Chosen tousou no kigen wo ronsite shikatono kankeini ronkyusuru" in *Shiratori Kanreki Kinen Toyoshi Ronso*, ed. Ikeuchi Hiroshi (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1925).

period, so without understanding the factional strife, you cannot understand Korea,"[212] factionalism became an essential academic theme in discussing the history of the Chosŏn period.[213]

The theme of heteronomy—specifically, that Korean history was determined by external forces—was based on nineteenth century popular images of Korea as being victimized by strong neighboring states. The theme was influential throughout the colonial period, for example in the emphasis on the Hideyoshi Invasion, as well as the tendency to narrate Koryŏ history only in terms of foreign influence. However, it was *Mansenshi* that most effectively supported the theme of heteronomy during the 1930s. *Mansenshi,* which literally means the history of Manchuria and Korea, lumped the two geographical locations together in order to create an imaginary space called 'Mansen.' Within the framework of *Mansenshi,* Korean history was repositioned as part of the larger history of Manchuria and *toyoshi*.[214]

The most representative scholar of *Mansenshi* was Inaba Iwakichi. Based on the premise that Manchuria and the Korean peninsula were historically inseparable,[215] Inaba studied the power dynamics among Manchuria, China, and the peninsula, arguing that that major historical events in Korea were shaped by the changes of power politics in

---

[212] Iwakichi Inaba, "Chosenshi," *Sekaishi Taikai,* vol. 11 (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1935), 159.

[213] Yi, "Tangpasŏngnon Pipan," 62-63.

[214] Inaba wrote a chapter on Korean history in a book titled *Chosenshi, Manchushi* [History of Korea, History of Manchuria] in 1935, where he delineated the historical development of Korea in terms of its relation to Manchuria.

[215] Iwakichi Inaba, "Mansen fukabun no shiteki kosatsu" *Shina Shakaishi kenkyu* (Tokyo: Daitokaku, 1922).

Manchuria, denying the Korean peninsula agency in its own historical development.[216] His argument was that neither Manchuria nor Korea were capable of producing a unique civilization, and thus had to adopt civilization from others in order to establish a state, one example being the four Chinese commanderies.[217] *Mansenshi* not only emphasized the lack of autonomy in Korean history but further argued that Korean civilization was actually an imitation of Chinese civilization.[218]

Furthermore, Inaba connected his research on *Mansenshi* with the theme of stagnation, by explaining how the peninsula became static after the seventh century, when the Chinese policy changed from invasion to persuasion, leading to a decrease of war,[219] temporalizing Korean historical development as six hundred years behind that of Japan.[220]

Emergence of *Mansenshi* was closely related to the Japanese expansion into Manchuria and China, which was marked by Manchurian Incident in 1931 and the second Sino-Japanese War in 1937. Japan was emerging as a new imperialist power in East Asia, which necessitated a new historical narrative of Japan's relation to the continent. This resulted in repositioning both Japan and Korea within a new historical framework. The publication of histories of China and Manchuria during the 1930s, such as Tabohashi Kiyoshi's 1930 book, *Kindai Nisshisen Kankei no Kenkyu* [A Study of Modern Relations

---

[216] Iwakichi Inaba, "Mansenshi Taikei no Sainishiki [Reinterpretation of Manchurian-Korean History]" *Seikyu Gakuso*, 11 (1933):1-25; 12 (1933):58-76; 13 (1933):92-109; 14 (1933):56-74.

[217] Jeong, "Kŭndae yŏksahak ŭrosŏŭi Mansŏnsa," 199.

[218] Hatada, "Ilbon e isŏsŏŭi Hanguksa yon'gu ŭi chŏnt'ong," 85.

[219] Jeong "Kŭndae yŏksahak ŭrosŏŭi Mansŏnsa," 206; Inaba, "Mansenshi Taikei no Sainishiki," *Seikyu Gakuso*, 11 (1933):1-25; 12(1933):58-76.

[220] Iwakichi Inaba, *Chosen Bunkashi kenkyu* [*Cultural History of Korea*] (Tokyo: Yuzankaku, 1925); Hatada, "Ilbon e isŏsŏŭi Han'guksa yŏn'gu ŭi chŏnt'ong," 90.

between Japan, China, and Korea] reflects this trend.[221] In these accounts, Japan was repositioned as a strong state during the first century, one that was equal to China in its influence and power.[222] *Mansenshi* was also related to the colonial policy which encouraged Korean immigration to Manchuria to cultivate the wasteland with the establishment of the state of Manchukuo during the 1930s. [223] Inaba supported this policy by stating that migration to Manchuria was not a migration but rather going back to where the ancestors' old realm.[224] Nakamura's preface also stated that he felt the necessity to write his book due to the social issues such as immigration to Manchuria that emerged during the 1930s.[225]

Lastly, the theme of *Nissen Dosoron* argued that Japan and Korea shared the same ancestry. It was first raised by scholars from the nativist (*kokugaku*) tradition in Japan during the late nineteenth century. Despite being refuted by many positivist historians such as Shiratori Kurakichi, it gained momentum during the 1910s and 1920s, because it

---

[221] Jeong, "Kŭndae yŏksahak ŭrosŏŭi Mansŏnsa," 95.

[222] Nakamura's "Chosenshi" discusses how Sui China sent envoys to Japan before going to war with Koguryŏ, which was interpreted as Japan being a threatening power to China during the early periods (Nakamura, *Chosenshi*, 20). Also, in interpreting that the four Han commanderies in the Korean peninsula existed for more than 400 years, Inaba also stated that Japan directly traded with Nangnang, one of the commanderies in the P'yŏngyang area, emphasizing that Japan established itself as a strong state by the first century to the extent to that it directly and equally traded with China (Inaba, "Chosenshi," 26.) Inaba also supported the existence of *Mimana Nihonfu*, by arguing that Japan was strong enough to conquer the southern peninsula and extended the duration of Mimana from the first century to the fourth century A.D. (Inaba, "Chosenshi," 40-41); Jeong, "Kŭndae yŏksahak ŭrosŏŭi Mansŏnsa," 108-111.

[223] Do, "Chosŏn ch'ongdokpu ŭi munhwa chŏngch'aek," 92.

[224] Inaba Iwakichi, "Mansen fukabun no shiteki kosatsu" *Shina Shakaishi kenkyu*, (Tokyo: Daitokaku, 1922), 314; Do, "Chosŏn chongdokbu ŭi munhwa chŏngch'aek," 92; Yi Manyŏl stated that the scholars in *toyoshi* wanted to separate Manchuria from China prior to invading China, so that China could not claim the Manchurian territory as theirs; Manyŏl Yi, *Han'guk Kŭndae Yŏksahak ŭi Hŭrŭm* [Development of Korean Modern Historiography] (Seoul: Purŭn Yŏksa, 2007), 588.

[225] Nakamura, *Chosenshi*, 1; Jeong, "Kŭndae yŏksahak ŭirosŏŭi Mansŏnsa," 93.

supported the Japanese government's assimilation policy,[226] as can be seen from the manuscript of *Chosen Hantoshi* that stated, "Han and Yamato people originated from the same ancestry and resided in one territory but spread with migration."[227] This theory argued that both Japanese and Korean people belonged to the same ethnic group in the ancient past. Kuroita Katsumi argued that the Japanese race developed from a diverse range of ethnicities, including people who immigrated from the southern part of the peninsula, who went through the survival of the fittest and became the contemporary Japanese race.[228] This theory denied the independent ethnic identity of the Korean people while establishing enough racial differences to legitimize colonial rule by arguing that they were related in the past.[229] The theme of *Nissen Dosoron* then integrated the *Mimana Nihonfu* theory that claimed Empress Jingo conquered the three southern states in the Korean peninsula and established a colonial rule, thus presenting the twentieth century Japanese annexation of Korea as a restoration of old Japanese rule.

Supported by the academic development of these themes, the discourse of failure and the colonial narrative framework of Korean history became much more elaborate by the 1930s. The narrative framework was fully matured, as shown by the publication of

---

[226] *Nissen Dosouron* was based on primary sources such as *Nihon Shoki* and *Kojikki.* It argued that Japan's mythical God's brother, whose name is Susanohonomikoto ruled the peninsula and while Inahinomikoto became the king of Silla while his son Amanohiboko migrated to Japan. (Yi, *Han'guk kŭndae yŏksahak ŭi hŭrŭm*, 518).

[227] Ch'in'il Panminjok Haengwi Chinsang Kyumyŏng Wiwŏnhoe, p.145.; Do, "Chosŏn ch'ongdokpu ŭi munhwa chŏngch'aek," 79.

[228] Katsumi Kuroita, "Chosen no Rekishiteki Kansatsu [Historical Observation on Korea]" *Chosen* 78 (1921), 57; Jun-Young Jung, "Pi ŭi injongjuŭi wa sikminchi ŭihak: Kyŏngsŏng Chedae pŏbŭihak kyosil ŭi hyŏraekhyŏng illyuhak [Racism of "Blood" and colonial medicine: Blood Group anthropology studies at Keijo University's department of forensic medicine]." *Ŭisahak*, 21, no.3 (2012), 534.

[229] Pak, "Ilche Singminjuŭi wa," 77-78, 84.

Korean history books in the 1930s that narrated Korean history from ancient to modern.[230] These publications included Inaba Iwakichi's "Chosenshi" in the book titled *Chosenshi Manshushi* (1938), Nakamura Hidetaka's *Chosenshi – Kokushi no Kaigaishino Koukan* [Korean history – Exchange of Relations between domestic history and foreign history] (1935), and Suematsu Yasukazu's "Chosenshi" series published in 22 volumes of a journal titled *Chosen Gyosei* [Administration in Korea] from 1937 to 1939.[231]

The historical narratives written by the Japanese scholars had minor differences at the individual level, but the overarching narrative framework remained similar to the one that was formed prior to the annexation. The historical narrative started with dismissing Tan'gun as a historical fabrication from the thirteenth century, as seen in Shiratori Kurakichi's and Inaba's claims. Meanwhile, the establishment of four Han Chinese commanderies was more emphasized with new archeological excavation at Nangnang, one of the commanderies in the P'yŏngyang area.[232] The commanderies were often interpreted as if it were a "colonization" in a modern sense. It was in a similar context that *Mimana Nihonfu* was also interpreted as a colonizing institution in a modern sense. Emphasis on the Han commanderies and *Mimana Nihonfu* contributed to the ongoing theme of heteronomy.

---

[230] According to Jeong Sang-woo, the publication of "general history (t'ongsa)" of Korea reflects the historical context when the necessity to re-organize the history of the colonized arose, based on the confidence of their own academic achievement and Japanese expansion to Manchuria (Jeong, "Ilcheha Ilbonin hakcha tŭl ŭi Han'guksa e taehan t'ongsajŏk ihae [Japanese scholars' attempt at a "General History of Korea" during the Japanese occupation period: examination of their works from the mid-1930s]," *Yŏksa wa Hyŏnsil* 104 (June 2017), 94.

[231] Iwakichi Inaba, *Chosenshi Manshushi* (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1938); Hidetaka Nakamura, Chosenshi – Kokushi no *Kaigaish ino Koukan* (Tokyo: Shikai Shobo, 1935); Yasukazu Suematsu, "Chosenshi (1)-(22)" *Chosen Gyosei* (Keijo: Teikoku Chiho Gyosei Gakkaisen honbu, 1938-1939).

[232] Jung, "pi ŭi injongjuŭi," 534.

The Three Kingdoms period received praise as the apex of Korean civilization before the Japanese annexation. The three kingdoms, and especially Silla, enjoyed a highly refined civilization, a view supported by archeological evidence found by the government-sponsored excavation projects. For example, Sŏkkuram was "discovered" and restored by the Japanese colonial government in 1913, and received praise as the "culmination of the religion and the art of the Orient."[233] Sekino Tadashi, sponsored by the Japanese government, investigated Korean historical relics including the murals, sculptures, tombs and architecture from the Silla period, which he praised as refined arts. His findings strengthened the already popular historical narrative that Korea flourished during the ancient period. This high regard for Korean's ancient civilization, however, was closely related to the Japan's imagining of *toyo* as its past. According to Stefan Tanaka, *toyo* functioned in two ways. First, it gave give Japan a past that belonged to a larger civilization that was equal to European civilization. Second, it imposed everything negative about "Asian-ness" onto *toyo* and allow contrast Japan to separate itself from Asia's long troubled past.[234] Korea's brilliant ancient past became part of the *toyo* which was shared by Japanese civilization; in this way, the brilliancy was defined as "Asian" rather than "Korean."[235] So in narrating Korean history, this refined culture of the ancient past was used in order to be contrasted with its subsequent decline, as shown in Sekino's comment

[233] Em, *The Great Enterprise*, 87.

[234] Tanaka, *Japan's Orient.*

[235] Em, *The Great Enterprise*, 93.

that the arts lost their fine quality and became decadent as Korea experienced three hundred years of misrule by elites who only sought their own benefits through factional strife.[236]

The Koryŏ period was often narrated only in terms of foreign aggression against the Korean dynasty, the focus being on Koryŏ's foreign relations with Khitan, Jurchen, and Mongol. For example, Suematsu's "Chosenshi" allocated half of the narrative to the Koryŏ period in explaining these relations.[237] With emergence of Mansenshi during the 1930s, the Koryŏ period was further defined as a time period where Korea's historical development was decided only by external forces, further reinforcing the theme of heteronomy.

As discussed above, the Chosŏn period received new attention from Japanese scholars during the 1930s. With the publication of *Chosenshi,* most of the primary sources were from the Chosŏn period.[238] The Chosŏn period was researched by scholars such as Nakamura Hidetaka, Inaba Iwakichi, Tagawa Kojo and Sin Sŏkho, who were all members of *Chosenshi Henshukai* and who had access to these primary sources.[239] While new attention was paid to topics such as Chu-Hsi's family rituals in Chosŏn, genealogical rosters (chokpo), and secondary status group, these new studies still ended up concluding how the topics explained the exclusivity of Korean culture and how the Korean nation fell behind.[240] For example, Suematsu concluded that the family rituals limited Korea's

---

[236] Takashi Hiroshi, "Ilbon misulsa wa Chosŏn misulsa ŭi sŏngnip [Establishment of Japanese Art History and Korean Art History" in *Kuks aŭi Sinhwarŭl nŏmŏsŏ*, eds. Lim Jihyun and Yi Sŏng si, Seoul: Humanist, 2004, p.189; Do, "Chosŏn ch'ongdokpu ŭi munhwa chŏngch'aek," 75.

[237] Suematsu, "Chosenshi (7)," *Chosen Gyosei* vol. 2, no. 4 (1937), 191-192; Jeong, "Ilcheha," 98.

[238] Out of 35 volumes of *Chosenshi*, 24 volumes were dedicated to the Chosŏn period (Jeong Sang-woo, "Chosenshi p'yŏnch'an kwa sŏnbyŏl kijune taehayŏ" *Sahak Yŏn'gu* 107 (2012), 282-295).

[239] Jeong, "Ilcheha," 104.

[240] Jeong, "Ilcheha," 105.

philosophy to focus only on its kinship, which "already prevented a normal growth from the establishment of Yi dynasty".[241] Inaba also stated that family rituals further reinforced nepotism, which worsened the factional strife.[242] Studies on the secondary status group also focused on their failure to emerge as a new social elites due to their obsession with yangban status.[243]

Along with emphasis on the Hideyoshi Invasion as a major event in the Chosŏn period,[244] *Mansenshi* further emphasized how Chosŏn history was shaped by outside power dynamics rather than Koreans themselves. As discussed above, the theme of factionalism, academically refined during the 1930s, emphasized the internal strife ingrained in Chosŏn political life, which continued even during the national crisis at the end of the nineteenth century. This failure was again regarded as the conclusion of the Korean historical narrative, and used to uphold the "necessity" of Japan's annexation of Korea, as declared in Suematsu's preface: "Korean history is a concluded history, as its conclusion was Korea's annexation to Japan."[245]

Therefore, the basic narrative framework of Korean history did not change much from before, but rather was strengthened by new academic findings. Scholars still narrated Korean history as continually being "colonized" by China and Japan, applying the modern concept to ancient events. Its flourishing civilization in the ancient period was contrasted

---

[241] Suematsu, "Chosenshi (15)," *Chosŏn Gyousei* vol. 2, no. 12 (1937), 115-116.

[242] Inaba, "Chosenshi," 151-152, 161.

[243] Inaba, "Chosenshi," 177-178.

[244] Jeong, "Ilcheha," 99.

[245] Suematsu, "Chosenshi (1)" *Chosen Gyousei*, vol. 1, no. 6 (1937), 206.; Jeong, "Ilcheha," 96.

with stagnation through the Koryŏ and Chosŏn periods, when it was pressured by strong neighboring states and suffered internal factional strife. Eventually, Korea became so decadent it needed to be "saved" by Japanese colonialism. This narrative framework influenced research on Korea in other disciplines as well, which, in turn, supported and confirmed the narrative framework. For example, during the mid-1920s, physical anthropologists Kirihara Sinichi and Paek Inje "scientifically confirmed" *Nissen Dosouron* through research on the distribution of blood-types of Korean people, concluding that Korean people were constituted of two racially different people in the northern and southern regions.[246] This conclusion supported Kuroita's theory of how southern Korean people migrated to Japan during the ancient period, which confirmed the shared ancestry of the two people. During the 1930s, physical anthropologist Sato Takeo again confirmed Kirihara and Paek's research through nationwide investigation of blood types, showing the same results. Sato's research also confirmed *Mansenshi* to be a "scientific fact" by indicating the racial affinity between the Korean people in the northern part of the peninsula and Manchuria, as well as China.[247]

The narrative framework of Korean history was transnationally shared and circulated among Koreans themselves. Paek Inje was an ethnic Korean physician who

---

[246] Kirihara Sinich and Paek Inje used the Biochemical Race Index to investigate the portion of blood types A and B in Korean people. They obtained samples from Koreans in Southern Chŏlla Province and Northern P'yŏngan Province and argued that southern Koreans showed a higher number (1.41) than the northern Koreans (0.83), whose overall average was still lower than the Japanese in Korea (1.78); Jung, "pi ŭi injongjuŭi," 534. Kirihara Shinich and Paek Inje, "Nissenningen ni okeru ketsuekizokubetshu hyakubunritsu no sai to ketsuekizokubetshu tokuyusei no idenni tsuite [On the difference of blood type percentage and the heredity of its peculiarity among Japanese and Koreans]," *Chosen Igakkai Zasshi*, 40 (1922).

[247] Jung, "pi ŭi injongjuŭi," 534.

participated in this type of research, and renowned Korean intellectual Yi Kwangsu lamented the "decline" of the Korean nation and pin-pointed "factionalism" as the major cause of the decline in his famous article, "Minjok Kaejoron [Reformation of the Nation]".[248] Positivist historians who worked with Japanese colonial scholars at Keijo Imperial University also engaged with institutions such as *Chosenshi Henshukai* and wrote articles in *Seikyu Gakuso* or *Chindan Hakbo*, a Korean version of *Seikyu Gakuso* published by *Chindan Society,* established by Korean critical-textual historians. Japanese scholarship was often accepted by Korean intellectuals as "objective" academic work, and thus "not political." Cha Sangch'ŏl, an editor of a magazine in Korea, *Kaebyŏk*, adopted Oda's view in his 1925 article "Sahwa wa Tangjaeng [Literati Purges and Factionalism]" stating that the factionalism was at the core of nation's failure.[249] This narrative framework became what most intellectuals in both Japan and Korea conformed to, and what influenced American scholars who studied Korean history during the 1930s.

Nationalist, Marxist, and Positivist narrative framework by Korean intellectuals

Up until the early 1900s, Korean intellectuals adopted and were influenced by the Japanese colonial narrative framework, for example when Hyŏn Ch'ae and Kim T'aek-yŏng adopted the basic narrative framework of Hayashi Taisuke's *Chosenshi*. However, after Japan made Korea its protectorate in 1905, a new generation of political activists and

[248] Kwangsu Yi, "Minjok Kaejoron [On National Reconstruction]" *Kaebyŏk* 23 (May 1922); 18-72.

[249] Sangch'ŏl Cha, "Sahwa wa tangjaeng [Literati purges and factionalism]" *Kaebyŏk* 71, 1925; Yi, "Tangp'asŏngnon Pip'an," 63-64.

intellectuals redefined Korea in terms of internal homogeneity and external autonomy.[250] A new alternative narrative framework of Korean history emerged that challenged the prevalent Japanese version of Korean history.

Sin Ch'ae-ho is often regarded as the first Korean who narrated the history of Korea as a homogenous ethnic nation, and who also produced a strong counternarrative to the prevalent Japanese narrative framework. Sin wrote the serialized essays "Toksa Sillon [A New Way of Reading History]" which were published in *Taehan Maeil Sinbo*, from August to December 1908. The purpose of his writing was to arouse the national consciousness of the Korean people and to mobilize them to achieve political independence and reclaim authentic identity.[251]

Sin's narrative started with presenting Tan'gun as a historical figure, not a mythical being. Tan'gun has been mentioned by many Korean enlightenment thinkers as a founding father, but more often as a deity. However, Sin removed the mythical elements from the stories to trace Korea's ethnic-national origin back to Tan'gun as a historical figure who established ancient Chosŏn.[252] After asserting a distinct, separate ethnicity for Korean people, he expanded the geographical space of Korean history to nearly all of Manchuria and created a genealogical history that continued through Ancient Chosŏn, Puyŏ, Koguryŏ, Parhae, Koryŏ, and Chosŏn. He argued that the Puyŏ tribe was the major ethnic people (*chujok*) that led Korean historical development, emphasizing Koguryŏ as representing

[250] Em, *The Great Enterprise*, 79.

[251] Em, *The Great Enterprise,* 82.

[252] Em, *The Great Enterprise,* 120.

Korean ethnicity. This was targeted to oppose the prevalent Japanese interpretation that traced Koryŏ's legitimacy through "Unified" Silla, which limited its historical space to the southern part of the peninsula, and which also depended on Tang China to unify the peninsula. By creating a narrative framework that emphasized Koguryŏ, Sin could assert that Korea was historically autonomous and strong, evidenced by how Koguryŏ successfully resisted Sui China, as well as King Kwangaet'o's territorial expansion to Manchuria. Sin subverted the weak and limited conception of Korea's national space.[253]

Sin's major target of criticism was the theme of heteronomy. Sin denied the existence of the Han Chinese commanderies on the peninsula by arguing that they were actually located on the Liaotung peninsula, asserting that Korea was never "colonized" by China in the past.[254] Sin's polemic against Kim Pu-sik and his *sadaejuŭi* [Serving the Great], a mentality of subservience, and in erasing the history of Parhae (thus Manchuria) from the narrative of Korean history also opposed the theme of heteronomy. His emphasis on ancient Korean history—especially Tan'gun, Koguryŏ, and Parhae—was therefore a new way to argue that Korea was historically autonomous, resistant to foreign powers, and capable of deciding their own fate.

However, Sin also narrated Korean history as a decline since the mid-Koryŏ period. Again, the glorious past which was represented by Koguryŏ's bravery and territorial expansion, in contrast to the subsequent decline, especially during the Chosŏn period marked by sadaejuŭi and factionalism. In "Chosŏn Sanggosa," serialized in *Tonga Ilbo*

---

[253] Em, *The Great Enterprise,* 98.

[254] Cho, Han and Pak, *Han'guk ŭi yŏksaga wa yŏksahak*, 90.

from October 1924 through March 1925, argued that the defeat of Myoch'ŏng by Kim Pu-sik in 1135 was the disastrous turning point in Korean history and ushered in a thousand-year legacy of *sadaejuŭi*.[255] Despite the fact that Sin developed this counternarrative to challenge the powerful Japanese version of Korean history, in many ways Sin's narrative was still under the influence of the Japanese narrative framework.[256] Sin focused on what Japanese scholars focused on: ancient Korean history. By emphasizing the ancient period that both Japanese and American intellectuals praised, Sin could easily argue that the Korean "national spirit" was at its peak during this period. However, it was not easy for him to explain why Korea was then colonized by Japan at the end of the nineteenth century despite its refined ancient civilization. As long as he was building his argument on the social evolution theory, and the expansionist historical imaginary shared by the Japanese colonial scholarship, he could not escape from the discourse of failure.

Furthermore, Sin's adoption of categories such as *tongyangsa* and *Jina,* based on *toyoshi* and *Shina* produced by Japanese scholars from the late nineteenth century, also shows how Sin's narrative had to engage the Japanese narrative framework to even attempt to counter it.[257] Em pointed out the paradox inherent in nationalist discourse in the colonial world: subjugated people, in resisting colonial rule, still speak the language of their oppressors, which is the language of empire.[258] By adopting the same logic derived from

---

[255] Em, *The Great Enterprise,* 83

[256] Schmid, *Korea between Empires*.

[257] Em, *The Great Enterprise*, 100.

[258] Partha Chatterjee, *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986); Em, *The Great Enterprise*, 100.

the imperialist discourse, Sin's narrative framework had to face the dilemma that Korea, despite its territorial expansion and bravery in the ancient past, still shrunk down to the peninsula under subjugation of Japan in the present.

Still, Sin's version of nationalist historiography was powerful in imagining Korea as a homogenous ethnic nation and was influential for later Korean nationalist historians and activists, who put the "national spirit" at the center of their narrative framework even during the 1930s. Chŏng In-bo and An Chae-hong are good examples. Chŏng, just like Sin, narrated Korean history centered around *ŏl*, which was another expression of "national spirit." Chŏng's focus in narrating Korean history was two-fold. First, as Sin did, Chŏng focused on ancient Korean history, publishing serialized articles in *Tonga Ilbo* from 1935 to 1936, under the title "Chosŏn's ŏl during five thousand years," in which he narrated Korea's ancient history from Tan'gun to the Three Kingdoms period. His narrative was very similar to that of Sin. He considered Tan'gun as a historical figure instead of a mythical being. He claimed that the four Chinese commanderies were located outside of the peninsula. He denied the *Mimana Nihonfu* theory, and he emphasized the three kingdoms' active resistance against China and Japan. Second, Chŏng focused on the emergence of the *sirhak* [Practical Learning] scholars during the late Chosŏn period. Chŏng pointed out how the scholars such as Yu Hyŏng-wŏn, Yi Ik, and Chŏng Yag-yong, as well as Yangming doctrine scholars, embodied a new intellectual trend that focused on practical studies and departed from Confucian scholars who were bound by the empty formalities of Neo Confucianism. Chŏng engaged in the *Chosŏnhak Undong* [Movement to Revitalize Korean Studies] during the 1930s, which defended Korean culture, language and history. He

thought that *sirhak* could be the basis on which "the unique identity of Chosŏn" could be established.[259] An Chae-hong also focused on Korea' ancient past, arguing that Kija was a common noun which indicated that it was a feudal vassal of Tan'gun, narrating how Tan'gun's lineage was inherited to Koguryŏ. An attempted to find the origin of the democratic tradition particular to Korea in ancient history, especially from Koguryŏ's Chega Hoeŭi, and Silla's Hwabaek Hoeŭi, which he referred to as "aristocratic democracy." However, this glorious past was again contrasted with the subsequent decline during the Koryŏ and Chosŏn periods.[260]

As later criticized by Paek Nam-Un, the nationalist historical narrative framework depicted Korean history as particular, as the whole narrative was grounded on the idealist and abstract concept of "national spirit." The tendency to narrate Korean history as a particular history further reinforced colonialist historiography by emphasizing Korean uniqueness.[261] The essentialist view of the Korean nationalists historians, according to Paek, dove-tailed with the Japanese colonialist discourse on Korea's "unique condition (*Chosen tokushu jijo*)", which served as the ideological justification for coercive and autocratic methods.[262]

Another attempt to counter the narrative framework of Japanese colonialist historiography was made by Marxist historians such as Paek Nam-un during the 1930s.

---

[259] Cho, Han and Pak, *Han'guk ŭi yŏksaga wa yŏksahak*, 176.

[260] Cho, Han and Pak, *Han'guk ŭi yŏksaga wa yŏksahak*, 201; Em, *The Great Enterprise* 201.

[261] Em, *The Great Enterprise*, 119.

[262] Em, *The Great Enterprise*, 124.

Paek challenged "stagnation theory" by building his narrative framework on Marxist historiography that presumed all societies develop unilaterally from primitive communism to slave, feudal, capitalist, and socialist societies.[263] In his books, *Chosen Shakai Keizaishi* (1933) and *Chosen hoken shakai keizaishi* (1937), Paek established his own historical narrative in which he identified all five stages in Korean history. Paek's narrative started from Tan'gun, whose myth demonstrated the beginning of class differentiation and privileging of the male over the female descent line, which represented the primitive communal tribes.[264] The Three Kingdoms period until Silla's unification in the seventh century represented the slave society, which was followed by Asiatic feudal society from the seventh century to the eighteenth century. In characterizing feudalism in Korea as a particular manifestation of universal feudalism, Paek rejected the notion of the Asiatic mode of production, which also supported the idea that Korea had stagnated. Paek argued that Asiatic feudal society disintegrated during the eighteenth century and the incipient capitalism that emerged—referred to as "the sprouts of capitalism"—was replaced by transplanted capitalism via Japan during the early twentieth century.

Paek's narrative located Korean history within a linear evolutionary narrative, demonstrating how each stage of Korean history emerged as a result of social forces internal to Korea, thus countering the stagnation theory. Furthermore, by arguing how

---

[263] This view was regarded as orthodoxy, since the Soviet scholars rejected the Asiatic mode of production at the Leningrad Conference of 1931 (Em, *The Great Enterprise*, 132).

[264] Paek regarded Tan'gun's story as a myth, but argued that he could find evidence of social relations from this myth. Paek also found the evidence of matrilinealty and promiscuity in Korea's primitive communal society from the Tan'gun myth. He used Lewis H. Morgan's philological research of kinship, and argued that the same family structure could be found in Korean history as well. He argued that Korean history followed the universal development, just like other societies throughout the world. (Em, *The Great Enterprise*, 123)

Korean history also developed according to the universal "historical law" in line with other societies, Paek rejected the notions of Korea's historical particularity and its "Asiatic" nature claimed by Japanese colonial scholarship, presenting Korean history as universal history.[265] However, Paek's attempt to apply the universal developmental stage to Korean history was criticized for over-stretching his argument without proper historical evidence, and harboring logical flaws in explaining the transition from one historical stage to another. For example, he could not explain how the slave society of the Three Kingdoms period that he described as the classical slave society could transform into the Asiatic feudalistic society.[266] Paek's view, therefore, was criticized even by Marxist historians. For example, Yi Chŏng-wŏn argued that it was a mechanical application of Japanese Marxist historiography onto Korean history.[267]

Marxist intellectuals such as Paek were marginalized by the colonial state and Korean nativist (kuksujuŭija) intellectuals during the 1930s. However, it is important to note that Paek's two books were written in Japanese and published in Japan, and still regarded as academic works, unlike the most of the nationalist historians such as Sin Ch'ae-ho who were outside of academia. It is not a coincidence that his name appeared in the bibliographies of postwar Japanese books such as Hatada's *Chosenshi* in 1951, and American dissertations on Korean history during the 1950s and 1960s, along with the names of positivist historians from the colonial period.[268]

---

[265] Em, *The Great Enterprise*, 132.

[266] Cho, Han and Pak, *Han'guk ŭi yŏksaga wa yŏksahak*, 220.

[267] Em, *The Great Enterprise*, 134.

[268] Paek's two books were often cited by Korean scholars who wrote doctoral dissertations in U.S. institutions

Both Sin Ch'ae-ho's and Paek Nam-un's narrative frameworks were influential among Korean readership during the 1930s. Sin Ch'aeho's articles were compiled as a book and also published serially in *Chosŏn Ilbo* during the early 1930s.[269] Paek became a foremost scholar after writing the two books in 1933 and 1937.[270] Despite the popularity of these narratives, however, they did not make much impact on university-trained historians, who built their research on or in collaboration with Japanese colonial scholarship. Scholars such as Yi Pyŏngdo, Sin Sŏkho, and Kim Sanggi were mostly graduates of Waseda University and Keijo Imperial University, and trained in positivist historiography. They were also affiliated with *Chindan Society,* which was an academic society organized in 1934 to compete with the Japanese in empirical research in Korean history and culture, which became a venue for Korean positivist historians to publish their works in Korea until it was dissolved in 1942.[271] Despite the declaration that it was established in order to "compete" with the Japanese research on Korea, these positivist historians' work did not challenge Japanese colonial scholarship—rather, it was built on the Japanese narrative framework of Korean history. Most of the *Chindan Society* members were taught by Japanese scholars on Korean history and worked in collaboration with Japanese colonial

---

during the 1950s and the 1960s. For example, both Hesung Chun Koh and Kim Chong Sun cited Paek in their bibliographies (Hesung Chun Koh, "Religion, Social Structure and Economic Development in Yi Dynasty Korea," (Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1959); Chong Sun Kim, "The Emergence of Multi-Centered Despotism in the Silla Kingdom: A Study of the Origins of Factional Struggles in Korea" (Ph.D. diss., University of Washington, 1965).

[269] An Chae-hong published Sin Ch'ae-ho's *Chosŏn Sanggosa* written during the 1920s as a series in *Chosŏn Ilbo* from June to October in 1931. Sin's other articles on Chosŏn history were published in *Tonga Ilbo* during 1924 and 1925, and were compiled as a book titled *Chosŏnsa yŏn'guch'o* by Hong Myŏng-hee in 1930 (Cho, Han and Pak, *Han'guk ŭi yŏksaga wa Yŏksahak*, 83).

[270] Em, *The Great Enterprise*, 130.

[271] Em, *The Great Enterprise*, 127.

scholars. For example, Yi Pyŏngdo studied in Waseda from 1916 to 1919, studied with Tsuda Sokichi and Ikeuchi Hiroshi, and worked in *Chosenshi henshukai* from 1927 while maintaining membership at the *Seikyu Gakkai*. Sin Sŏkho graduated from Keijo Imperial University and also joined *Chosenshi Henshukai* in 1929, and worked as an editorial committee member at *Seikyu Gakkai* from 1930.[272]

It was not that these university-trained positivist Korean historians did not struggle with the gap between their own ethnic identity and what they wrote. Remco Breuker argued that although Kim Sang-gi declared himself a positivist, his view departed from Ikeuchi Hiroshi, who studied the same topic of sambyŏlch'o in the Koryŏ period, in emphasizing Korean agency and subjectivity.[273] Still, in a larger sense, Kim was still building on the narrative framework of Korea's decline and how foreign powers and their invasions shaped Korean history, even as he emphasized resistance rather than the invasion per se. Though they attempted to "rival" Japanese academic research on Korea through *Chindan Society*,[274] they still conformed to the same narrative framework.

While these Korean positivist historians received relatively less attention from the postwar South Korean scholars who studied the national historiography—and thus are rarely covered in the previous literature as their works were often viewed as that of "collaborators"—it was still their works that dominated academia during the colonial

---

[272] Taegu Sahakhoe Ch'iam Sin Sŏkho Paksa Kohŭi Kinyŏm Nonch'ong Kanhaeng Wiwŏnhoe, "Ch'iam Sin Sŏkho paksa yaknyŏk," *Taegu Sahak* vol. 8 (1973), 13.

[273] Remco E. Breuker, "Contested objectivities: Ikeuchi Hiroshi, Kim Sanggi and the tradition of Oriental history (Tōyōshigaku) in Japan and Korea," *East Asian History* 29 (2005): 69-106.

[274] Em, *The Great Enterprise*, 128.

period, and that were circulated outside of Korea during and after the colonial period. They were "recognized" by the colonial scholarship because they had degrees from Waseda and Keijo Imperial University, and were recommended by the renowned Japanese historians on Korean history such as Ikeuchi Hiroshi and Tsuda Sokichi. They were, therefore, the ones who were academically trained and qualified to teach in universities when Japan withdrew from the peninsula after 1945. The social atmosphere became more and more hostile for Marxist historians: Kim Tae-jun was executed in 1949; Paek Nam-un and Pak Mun-kyu went to North Korea in 1948;[275] and most of the nationalist historians were in self-imposed exile and outside of academia. Therefore, the positivist historians dominated the postwar academia, and remained in power until the 1970s. [276]

Hatada stated that there were almost none of Korean scholars on Korean history during the colonial period except for a few.[277] This reflects his view that did not regard nationalist historiography as academic work, and only recognized a few books and articles written by the positivist historians, as well as Paek Nam-un.[278] This demonstrates how important it was for authority to conferred on the knowledge produced by academic institutions such as universities and academic societies, along with such knowledge being declared objective as positivist historical methodology and having a "non-political" position. These qualities made it easier for that knowledge to be utilized, appropriated, and

[275] Em, *The Great Enterprise*, 128.

[276] Cho, Han and Pak, *Han'guk ŭi yŏksaga wa yŏksahak*, p.76.

[277] Hatada, "ilbon e isŏsŏŭi hanguksa yongu ŭi chŏntong," 71.

[278] This is also apparent from the bibliography of his book *Chosenshi* published in 1951. Korean scholars that he cited included Yi Pyŏng-do, Sin Sŏk-ho, Yi Sang-baek, Yun Yong-gyun, and Paek Nam-un.

circulated by others, such as American intellectuals who studied Korean history, as well as the postwar Japanese and American scholars who referred to the colonial knowledge in building their research.

Integration of Japanese Colonial Scholarship into United States Academia

During the colonial period both popular and academic writings on Korea remained scarce, except for a brief American interest on the March First movement during the early 1920s.

However, a noticeable trend emerged during the 1930s, where American scholars started to study topics related to Korea in the United States academia. Most of these scholars were children of American missionaries to Korea. Harold Joyce Noble[279] and George McAfee McCune[280] received doctoral degrees from the University of California at Berkeley (in 1931 and 1941, respectively) by writing dissertations on Korean history. They

[279] Harold Joyce Noble (1903-1953) was born in Korea to American missionaries William A. Noble and Mattie W. Noble. He graduated from Ohio Wesleyan University and received a doctoral degree from the University of California at Berkeley in 1931. Noble became an assistant professor of Far Eastern History at the University of Oregon from 1931 to 1934. During the Pacific War, he worked as a combat intelligence and Japanese language officer with the U.S. Marine corps, a correspondent for *The Saturday Evening Post* (1946-47), chief of the Publication Branch of the Civil Intelligence section of the General Headquarters of the Far East in 1947-48. He served as First Secretary of the American Embassy at Seoul until 1951 (David Shavit, *The United States in Asia* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1990), 365).

[280] George M. McCune (1908-1948) was born in P'yŏngyang, son of George S. McCune. McCune went to Occidental College where he received both a B.A. and M.A. In 1935 he started his Ph.D. program at the University of California at Berkeley, finishing in 1941. From 1937 to 1938, McCune stayed in Korea for fieldwork, where he and Edwin O. Reischauer invented an English Romanization system of the Korean language (the McCune-Reischauer system), and collected primary sources from Keijo Imperial University and Chosen Christian College to write his dissertation, *Korean Relations with China and Japan, 1800-1864* (1941). In 1942, McCune served in the Office of Strategic Services, the Board of Economic Warfare, and the State Department. He joined the faculty of University of California at Berkeley in 1946 as a lecturer in the Department of History and worked on the advisory editorial board of the *Far Eastern Quarterly*. (For more, see Jong-Chol An, "Making Korea Distinct: George M. McCune and his Korean studies." *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 17 (2004): 162-169).

both taught Korean history in American universities. While previous research didn't pay much attention to the American missionaries' children's contribution to the early Korean Studies in the United States, these scholars were well-versed in American missionaries' early writings on Korea, had personal networks in Korea, and were trained in the higher education institutions in the United States. They not only transformed the American popular writings on Korea to academia by writing them into doctoral dissertations, but they also partially integrated Japanese colonial scholarship in order to borrow their academic authority. This transnational circulation of knowledge on Korea formed the basis on which postwar American and Japanese scholars could share their knowledge. This section discusses how these American scholars created a narrative framework of Korean history that emphasized isolationism as a main cause of Korea's failure, and how it was compatible with Japanese narrative frameworks and themes of heteronomy, stagnation, and factionalism.

Noble's doctoral dissertation, *Korea and her relations with the United States before 1895* (1931), was an examination of the Korean-American relationship. Noble's main focus was on analyzing the nature of the American-Korean treaty in 1882. Analyzing the diplomatic documents written by George C. Foulk, the *charge d'affairs* at the American legation in Seoul during the late nineteenth century,[281] he concluded that when America encountered Korea, Americans "misunderstood" Korea as an independent state, which resulted in confusion in concluding the treaty. He also concluded that the good office clause

[281] *Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States*. Transmitted to Congress with the Annual Message of the President; Noble, "Korea and her relations with the United States before 1895," 571.

included in the treaty, often "misinterpreted" as meaning America would save Korea from being colonized by Japan, did not signify an American legal obligation to intervene on behalf of Korea.[282] Noble argued that America consistently kept a neutral position in the Far East as its policy, which also applied to Korea.

Noble's dissertation, finished in 1931, reflects the Americans' major concerns about Korea during the 1920s, namely the American-Korean relationship, and whether America was legally obliged to intervene based on the 1882 treaty. This issue has been raised by Korean independent movement activists in the United States, such as Syngman Rhee during the 1920s. Syngman Rhee made speeches stressing that the U.S. should fulfill the good office clause in the U.S-Korea Treaty in 1882. He argued that it should intervene in Japanese colonial rule in order to support Korean independence. Rhee stated "we beseech the government of the U.S. to exert its good office to bring about a cessation of this injustice and oppression."[283] and "Korea has always kept her treaty obligations with the U.S., and should not the U.S. now in our extremity do the same?" Noble's dissertation topic reflects the American topic of interest or concern during the 1920s.

McCune's dissertation, *Korean Relations with China and Japan, 1800-1864* (1941), on the other hand, delved into Korea's relations with its neighboring states prior to its encounter with the Americans. McCune's topic also reflected American concerns about East Asia, with Japan expanding to Manchuria and going to war with China during the

---

[282] Noble, "Korea and her relations with the United States before 1895," 566-567.

[283] Official Communication of President Rhee," 8; "Doctor Rhee's Speaking Tour" Korea Review 1, no.9 [Nov 1919] 9-10 in the speaking tour in Trenton, 1919.; Kim, "Representing the Invisible," 198.

1930s. It also reflected Japanese scholarship's trends on Korean history, which focused on Korean relationship to China, Manchuria, and Japan emerging during the 1930s. McCune analyzed Korea's relationship with both China and Japan, and argued that the Korean-Chinese relationship constituted an entirely different basis and manner from that of the Korean-Japanese relationship. McCune's major question for the Korean-Chinese relationship was whether Korea was independent or not by the time it opened its port to the West. While ambiguously defining the relationship as "closely bound to it[China] but at the same time was free and independent,"[284] McCune argued that the tributary status was rather "symbolic" [285] and that Korea had authority to engage in foreign relations at will. That is, Korea's authority to engage in foreign relation was "theoretically unimpaired" by its tributary status. However, McCune further argued that Korea was "in reality" not independent because Korea needed China due to its "own inclination" to depend upon a larger power,[286] suggesting *sadaejuŭi* was Korea's consistent foreign policy from traditional times onward. Pointing out how Korea was dependent on China until the Sino-Japanese War in 1894 and on Russia until the Russo-Japanese War in 1904, [287] McCune characterized Korean traditional foreign policy as "depending on other powers," despite the fact that it was a projection of Korea's specific circumstances in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

---

[284] The main purpose of his dissertation, according to his preface, was to define the nature of the Korean relationship with China and Japan during the Chosŏn period. McCune's concern was how independent Korea was from China (McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 11).

[285] McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 236.

[286] McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 248-249.

[287] McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 242.

Meanwhile, he contrasted the Korea-Japan relationship to the Korea-China relationship, arguing that it was of an entirely different nature, as the latter was more of a "spiritual and cultural union rather than a political one,"[288] in which ceremonial etiquette was utmost importance,[289] while the former was mainly for "economic benefits based on trade."[290] This description of Japan's interest in Korea resembled the "Western" interests in Korea, represented as "trade and commerce."[291] Within this framework, Japan was regarded as an exception from the other "Asiatic" nations in the East Asia. This reflected the tendency to contrast Japan and Korea in the early American accounts of Korea, as well as the intellectual trend of *toyoshi* that marked Japan as an exception from the rest of the Asia. Within this framework, Korea's dependency on China was contrasted with Japan, which refused Chinese suzerainty.[292] Furthermore, McCune described how Japan's attempts to alter the ceremonial patterns annoyed the Korean court, who depended upon the continuance of traditional relations.[293] In this way, both Korea's *sadaejuŭi* as well as its resistance to new changes characterized Korea's relationship to China and Japan.

It is not surprising, therefore, that McCune found Japanese colonial scholarship useful for his studies, as most of the themes found in that scholarship—such as stagnation

---

[288] McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 10.

[289] McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 257.

[290] McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 12.

[291] McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 261.

[292] "Why, then, did Korea choose the policy of Sadae [Serving the Great] at all? Why did not Korea, like Japan, refuse to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Chinese empire?" (McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 240.)

[293] McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 257.

and heteronomy—were compatible with his own works. McCune had received assistance from the faculty at Keijo Imperial University, as stated in the preface of his dissertation, and praised most of their works as trustworthy.[294] McCune's extensive annotated bibliography also shows his respect for the advanced Japanese colonial scholarship, praising Tabohashi Kiyoshi's book as "an accurate and excellent study" and a "keen analysis" done by "the foremost Japanese historian of relations among countries in Northeast Asia."[295] As for Kuroita Katsumi's book, *Kokushi no Kenkyu* [Research on the History of Japan] (1918), he called it "one of the most important research studies in Japanese history," which had considerable information for his own work.[296] McCune also described *Seikyu Gakuso* (1929-1038) as the "foremost journal devoted to research in Korean history." It was not that McCune blindly praised the Japanese scholarship, because he recognized that Japan could present Korean history in a way that benefited Japan, as can be seen from how he commented on *Chosenshi Taikei* (1927) as being favorable to Japan.[297] Also, McCune distanced himself from the idea that *Nissen Dosoron* signified the restoration of Japanese rule over Korea presented by Higasa Mamoru, arguing that "it is difficult to sustain."[298] However, he did dismiss *Nisen Dosoron* per se, as can be seen from how he accepted Kuroita's book.

---

[294] McCune stated in his preface that he is indebted to the members of the Keijo Imperial University (McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," iii-iv).

[295] McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 282.

[296] McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 279.

[297] McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 278.

[298] Mamoru Higasa, *Nissen Kankei no Shiteki Kosatsu to Sono Kenkyu* (Tokyo: Shikai Shobo, 1930); McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 281.

Perhaps what influenced McCune most were the books written by Yoshi S. Kuno, who was an assistant professor in the Department of Oriental Languages at the University of California at Berkeley from 1920 to 1935,[299] when McCune was a graduate student in the same university. McCune not only put his name in the preface, but also often quoted from Kuno's book, *Japanese Expansion on the Asiatic Continent* (1937),[300] praising the book as "an accurate and penetrating study."[301]

Kuno narrated the origin of Japanese expansion from the ancient period, making the Japanese urge to expand to the continent during the 1930s seem to be a natural result and a culmination of centuries-old aspiration.[302] Kuno described the establishment of *Mimana Nihonfu* in 70 A.D. on the Korean peninsula as the first Japanese attempt to expand on the continent,[303] which he described as a "protectorate of Japan" using terms such as the establishment of "Japanese government-general," interpreting it as a protectorate in a modern sense. Kuno recognized that Empress Jingo's invasion into the southern peninsula in 200 A.D. could be fictional. However, he argued that it is probable that Japan crossed the water and successfully conquered Korea around this time, and made the conquered regions

---

[299] Yoshi S. Kuno (1865-1941) was born in Nagoya, Japan, and graduated with the degree of Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering in 1897, and the Master of Science degree in 1900 in Japan. By a request from the University of California, Department of Oriental Languages, he was transferred to an assistantship in Japanese in 1911 and served as a chair of the department from 1924-1925.

[300] Yoshi S. Kuno, *Japanese Expansion on the Asiatic continent*, vol. 1 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1937).

[301] McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 284.

[302] Gustave Voss, S. J., "Review," review of *Japanese Expansion on the Asiatic Continent*, by Yoshi S. Kuno," *The Far Eastern Quarterly*, vol. 1, no. 1 (Nov 1941), 85.

[303] Kuno, *Japanese Expansion on the Asiatic Continent*, 2.

into Japan's tributary states, citing inscriptions from King Kwanggaet'o's stele.[304] He argued that at least by the latter part of the fourth century or the early part of the fifth century, Japan established a suzerainty over Silla and Paekche, extended her military power over Koguryŏ, and established a government-general in *Mimana* for the purpose of supervising affairs on the Korean peninsula.[305] In narrating Japanese expansion he used primary sources such as *Kojikki* and *Nihonshoki*, as well as books written by Japanese colonial scholars such as Kume Kunitake and Yoshida Togo,[306] successfully mediating the Japanese colonial scholarship to the U.S. academia.[307] The overall narrative framework also reflected the narrative framework of Japanese colonial scholarship in claiming Japan's early establishment as a state during the first century A.D. and its role in shaping East Asian history, as well as in emphasizing Japanese exceptionalism, by narrating how Japan naturally rose as an imperial power during the modern period due to its historical process.

While Noble and McCune's dissertations both focused on nineteenth century Korea and did not narrate Korean history from ancient to modern times, they still adopted the basic narrative framework used by the American missionaries such as Hulbert, as can be

---

[304] Kuno translated the inscription of King Kwangaet'o's stele in the appendix at the end of his book (Kuno, *Japanese Expansion on the Asiatic Continent*, 221-222).

[305] Kuno, *Japanese Expansion on the Asiatic Continent*, 5.

[306] Kunitake Kume, *Dai Nippon Kodai Jadai Shi* [Periodic History of Ancient Japan] (Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1915); Togo Yoshida, *Tojo Nipponshi* [History of Japan in Reverse Order] (Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1917).

[307] The biggest contribution of this book was recognized as making Japanese scholarly works accessible to U.S. academia by translating them into English by his contemporary reviewers (Voss, "Review," 87). McCune also reviewed Kuno's book and appreciated the appendix that contained the firsthand documents on Japanese relations with Korea and China (G. M. McCune, "Review" Review of *Japanese Expansion on the Asiatic Continent*, by Yoshi S. Kuno, *Pacific Historical Review*, vol. 9, no. 4 (Dec 1940), 476.)

seen from frequent references made to Hulbert's 1905 book *History of Korea*.[308] McCune cited Hulbert in explaining the ancient Japan-Korea relationship, and stated that there was no record in Korean sources about Empress Jingu's conquest, as Hulbert had asserted in his book.[309] McCune even corrected Kuno's claim that the first recorded raiding by Japanese pirates in Korea occurred in 14 B.C, using Hulbert's record of 14 A.D. However, McCune still depended on Kuno for most of the account in ancient history, stating "Professor Kuno examined the evidences in question and concludes that there was a successful invasion by Japan at that time and that southern Korea was held by Japan until the sixth century."[310] He followed Kuno's interpretation in describing three kingdoms as having been conquered by Japan from the fourth to sixth centuries.

McCune's description of the Chosŏn period also was centered around the question of identifying the major cause of Korea's decline. Describing the late nineteenth century as "void of any significant development," by citing Hulbert,[311] McCune thought that it was the resistance to change—represented by an isolationist policy, as well as internal factionalism—that ultimately caused Korea's failure.[312] Emphasis on Korea's isolationist

---

[308] Noble often quoted both Griffis and Hulbert in describing Korean history. For example, he referred to Griffis in explaining the Korean-Japanese relationship (Noble, "Korea and her relations with the United States before 1895," 16-17), the Korean political system, (Noble, "Korea and her relations with the United States before 1895," 7), and Catholic persecution (Noble, "Korea and her relations with the United States before 1895," 19). Noble used the 9th edition of Griffis' book (1911) in his dissertation. Noble also used American missionary magazines such as *Korean Repository* (1892-1899), and *Korea Review* (1901-1906) for which Hulbert worked as an editor.

[309] The *Mimana Nihonfu* theory was criticized by Hulbert for lacking evidence in Korean sources. (Hulbert, *History of Korea*, 47; McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 5.)

[310] Kuno, *Japanese Expansion on the Asiatic Continent*, 219-220; McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 5.

[311] McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan", 13; Hulbert, *History of Korea*, 2, 192-193.

[312] Contrary to An Jong-Chol's previous assessment that McCune wanted to point out in his dissertation how

policy was first raised by Griffis in *Corea: the Hermit Nation* (1882) and became a popular theme in American books on Korea: the term "hermit kingdom" was included in almost every book written in English. Noble and McCune built their research on this tradition, and pointed to Korea's isolationist policy as the major cause of Korea's failure to survive. Noble stated that Korea was "too well satisfied with its own isolation" and that it rejected all western attempts to conclude treaties, which resulted in Korea's "weakness" that "endangered the security of more powerful neighbors, and therefore was she destroyed."[313] McCune further extended this idea, by describing isolationism as Korea's "traditional" attitude toward all outsiders, arguing that it was not a consequence of western pressure but a policy which had been enforced from the Chosŏn period onward.[314] In the same way McCune conflated Korea's *sadaejuŭi* as a consistent foreign policy from traditional times onward,[315] McCune also described the policy of isolation and a resistant attitude to change as Korea's national trait, disregarding the historical context or changes in power dynamics since the Chosŏn period.

The theme of isolation was supported by an image of Korea that had been invaded by strong neighboring states throughout its history, which also emerged in both Griffis and Hulbert's narrative framework. McCune basically adopted this image in explaining how Korean history was dominated by "repeated invasion or threat from the north" due to its

---

Korea was not as much hermit as it was called, I argue that McCune actually emphasized the hermitage of Korea (An, "Making Korea Distinct," 172.)

313 Noble, "Korea and her relations with the United States before 1895," 2.

314 McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 261.

315 McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 242.

proximity to Manchuria.[316] In supporting this idea, McCune brought in the theme of heteronomy from Japanese colonial scholarship. Citing Inaba Iwakichi's articles from *Seikyu Gakuso*, McCune stated that "Korea was also much harassed by Tartar tribes. A Japanese historian has presented the Korean aspect brilliantly." [317] While McCune did not use the framework of *Mansenshi* per se, McCune adopted Inaba's interpretation of how Korea was constantly invaded by the northern tribes, in order to academically support his position that Korea decided to isolate itself due to its historical experience of being invaded or dominated. McCune stated that Korea attempted to reduce outside contact to minimum, choosing an isolationist policy "for centuries." [318] In explaining Korea's isolationist policy, McCune also cited Okudaira Takehiko's book, *Chosen Kaikoku Kosho Shimatsu,*[319] stating that Okudaira's remarks on Korean isolationism were "extremely clear and accurate." It is an interesting turn that Okudaira himself referred to Griffis' book in narrating Korea's isolationist policy.[320] The theme of isolation and Korea's hermitage not only became an emblem of Korea's passivity and failure to respond to western challenges, but also an academic trope during the colonial period.

---

[316] McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 3.

[317] Inaba Iwakichi, "Mansenshi Taikei no Sainishiki," *Seikyu Gakuso*, 11 (1933):1-25; 12 (1933):58-76; 13 (1933):92-109; 14 (1933):56-74; McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 3.

[318] McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 260.

[319] Okudaira Takehiko's book also imagined Korean space within the cultural space that formed around Manchuria. (see You-Jung Ki, "Kyŏngsŏng Chedae Chŏngch'ihak kangjwa wa singminji Chosŏn esŏŭi ŭimi [Lectures on Political Studies in Keijo Imperial University and its Significance in Colonized Chosŏn]," *Tongbanhakchi* 163, (2013).

[320] Okudaira Takehiko, *Chosen kaikoku kosho shimatsu*, (Tokyo: Toko Shoin, 1935), 23.

McCune's and Noble's dissertations also show how the theme of factionalism was elaborated after partially integrating Japanese colonial scholarship. Factionalism was regarded as one of the major causes of Korea's failure in Hulbert's book,[321] which was adopted by Noble, who described it as based on "internal jealousies rather than on that of convictions of principles," citing George H. Jones and Hulbert.[322] McCune also stated it as "the most vicious weakening factor of the later years of the Yi dynasty."[323] McCune again brought in the Japanese colonial scholarship that was ever more focused on the theme of factionalism during the 1930s, by citing Sin Sŏkho's article in *Seikyu Gakuso*.[324] That this article was written by a Korean scholar further gave McCune authority to argue that the factionalism was the most serious cause of Korea's failure, declaring it to be confirmed by "Korean, Japanese, and western historians,"[325] This remark provides a glimpse into why McCune cited Japanese colonial scholarship, and also how the transnational circulation of knowledge further confirmed the knowledge of the colonized to be an "objective" knowledge.

Overall, the theme of Korean hermitage emphasized in the American narrative framework was compatible with themes from Japanese colonial scholarship in general, especially the themes of heteronomy, stagnation, and factionalism. The theme of isolation

---

[321] Hulbert, *History of Korea* vol. 2, 146.

[322] Noble referred to George H. Jones's article "History, Notes on the reigning dynasty" from *Korean Repository* 3, 423-439, and Hulbert's book, *History of Korea*, vol. 2, in describing factionalism in the late nineteenth century (Noble, "Korea and her relations with the United States before 1895," 11-14)

[323] McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 14.

[324] Sŏkho Sin, "Heiko Shihini Tsuite [Concerning Party Strife in the Yi Dynasty]" *Seikyu Gakuso* 1, (1930): 85-104, (1931): 79-97. McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 14.

[325] McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan," 14.

was supported by the theme of heteronomy and *Mansenshi* by emphasizing how Korea had been constantly threatened by external forces, as well as by the theme of stagnation which emphasized Korea's resistance to change. The tendency in the American narrative framework to extend the Korea's foreign policy of *sadaejuŭi* and isolationism as consistent throughout the history further supported the theme of stagnation. The theme of factionalism in the American narrative framework was further strengthened by Japanese colonial scholars' research on factionalism during the 1930s.

This transnational circulation and integration of Japanese colonial scholarship into the U.S. academia was made possible due to several factors. First, they both built their research on a larger narrative framework that was formed prior to the Japanese annexation of Korea, one that focused on Korea's failure to survive. This narrative framework was shared by Americans and Japanese from as early as the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, which made it easier for Americans to integrate Japanese works. Second, both American and Japanese research on Korean Studies shared the same epistemological ground as imperialism and the Orientalist view of East Asia. As Japan imposed western Orientalism onto China and Korea—and marked itself as an exception—American scholars also viewed China and Korea to be typical "Orient" nations, which had an obsession with formalities and were resistant to change. Furthermore, Japan was rising as an imperialist power by expanding into Manchuria and China during the 1930s. Since that is when most of these dissertations were written, Japanese exceptionalism might have been more persuasive to these American writers. In the process of this transnational circulation, the discourse of failure in the narrative framework of Korean history was further strengthened

as it was confirmed by contribution of American, Japanese, and Korean scholars in the academia.

Wartime publication of scholarly research on Korea in the United States

The outbreak of Pacific War in 1941 also brought changes to the scene of knowledge construction in the U.S. Korea, which was only regarded as a colony of Japan became one of the issues that the U.S. government had to take care of. As the Cairo Declaration of 1943 promised Korea's independence in "due course" by the Allied nations, also called for an investigation of the Korean situation.[326] Korean language centers were established in the military. What promoted research on Korea during the 1940s was, however, the Institute of Pacific Relations (IPR). Founded in 1925 in order to facilitate scholarly research on the people of the "Pacific area," Institute of Pacific Relation published scholarly researches on Korea increasingly from 1943.[327]

One of the important books published during this period was Andrew J. Grajdanzev's *Modern Korea* (1944),[328] and M. Frederick Nelson's *Korea and the Old Orders in Eastern Asia* (1946).[329] Published during the turmoil of changing power

---

[326] Nahm, "The Developmnet of Korean Studies in the United States," 12.

[327] Jung-hyoo Ko, "Singminji Sidae miguk chisikin ŭi han'guk munje insik – Taep'yŏngyang munje yŏn'guhoe rŭl chungsimŭro [The U.S. Intellectuals' Perception of Korean Matters during the Japanese Occupation – An approach to the Institute of Pacific Relations]," *Yŏksa wa hyŏnsil* 58 (Dec 2005) :121. One of the important publication from the earlier period includes Hoon K. Lee's *Land Utilization and Rural Economy in Korea* (1936).

[328] Andrew J. Grajdanzev, *Modern Korea* (New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, distributed by John Day Company, 1944)

[329] Melvin Frederick Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders in Eastern Asia* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana state university press, 1946).

dynamics in East Asia, in which America's role was increasingly becoming important, these two books, were often regarded as the earliest postwar scholarly research of Korean studies in English that influenced the postwar scholars.[330] Grajdanzev, a Russian economist who were educated in Manchuria and the United States,[331] attempted to critically assess Korea's potential to be an independent state, by examining its social economic situation in this book. Reflecting the wartime power dynamics, Grajdanzev showed strong criticism against the Japanese rule of Korea, pointing out how the material achievement made during the colonial period was not related to the welfare of Korean people,[332] through the analysis of how Korean agriculture and industry were organized in a way to support the Japanese wartime preparation,[333] and argued that Korea should be independent "at once" and that it should be built on complete destruction of Japanese rule.[334] Grajdanzev's criticism against not only the Japanese colonial rule but also the colonialism per se shows a significant break from the other scholars of early half of twentieth century.

---

[330] Em, "Migungnae Han'guk kŭnhyŏndaesa yŏn'gu tonghyang," 191.

[331] Grajdanzev studied in Irkutsk Polytechnical Institute, and Harbin School of Law and Economics to receive M.A. in 1928 and moved to the U.S. in 1937. He received M.A. in Economics from University of California, Berkeley in 1943, and Ph.D. from Columbia University in Political Science in 1943. He worked as a researcher in IPR from 1938 to 1946, specializing in East Asia, and also worked as an assistant professor in University of Oregon in 1944. He also studied Japan while working with the U.S. government headequarter in Japan, but after coming back from Japan, could not find a job as he was regarded as too progressive. See Jung-hyoo Ko, "A. J. Kŭrajedanjebŭ wa Hyŏndae Han'guk [Andrew J. Grajdanze and Modern Korea]," *Han'guksa Yŏn'gu* 126 (Sep 2004): 244-260.

[332] Grajdanzev, *Modern Korea*, 37-38, 50-52.

[333] Grajdanzev, *Modern Korea*, 105-110, 148-184; Ko, "A. J. Kŭrajedanjebŭ," 264.

[334] Grajdanzev, *Modern Korea*, 276-290.

In discussing Korea's potential to be an independent state, Grajdanzev assigned a chapter on Korean history. While most of his accounts of Korean history was about the modern history – Japanese encroachment and Korea's independence movement - relying on Henry Chung's article and Frederick McKenzie's book,[335] the brief discussion of premodern history was based on Hulbert's *Passing of Korea*,[336] especially in emphasizing the creativity and innovative aspect of Korean people, listing the Korean inventions such as phonetic alphabet, moving metal type, iron-clad warships. The narrative framework itself did not depart much from the Hulbert's version either as he discussed how the Hideyoshi Invasion ended the flourishing period using Hulbert's expression of "never recovered from this blow,"[337] and how since then it closed its frontiers to all nations but China for three hundred years. The idea that Korea isolated itself for three hundred years, as well as the description of Korean relationship to Japan and China during late Chosŏn period, also resonate with George McCune's view. While Grajdanzev did not list McCune's dissertation or articles in the bibliography,[338] McCune's name appears in the preface, as one of ten people who gave advice and help.[339] The "final decades before the annexation," was again contrasted with the "brilliant history" of ancient Korea, where its emperor was described as

---

[335] Henry Chung, *Treaties and Conventions between Corea and Other Powers* (New York: 1919); Frederick A. McKenzie, *The Tragedy of Korea* (London: 1908). Grajdanzev discussed the history after the conclusion of Kanghwa Treaty in 1876, using these documents, mostly in emphasizing the unfair aspect of Japanese encroachment.

[336] Hulbert, *Passing of Korea*; Grajdanzev, *Modern Korea*, 24.

[337] Grajdanzev, *Modern Korea*, 25.

[338] Grajdanzev put Shannon McCune's Climate of Korea and other article on Korea's climate in the bibliography. Shannon McCune, *Climate of Korea: Climatic Elements*, 1941; Shannon McCune, "Climatic Regions of Korea and Their Economy," Geographical Review, (Jan 1941): 45-99.

[339] Grajdanzev, *Modern Korea*, v; Shannon McCune was also one of the ten people.

"the worst examples of an Oriental despot."[340] Grajdanzev's view departs a little from Hulbert and McCune's narrative in not discussing factionalism as the main factor of its failure, and emphasizing Japan's encroachment – both Hideyoshi Invasion during the premodern period, as well as the forced Kanghwa Treaty of 1876 – as the major factor, emphasizing how Korea fell under Japan as its victim. However, the overall narrative does not depart too much from the Hulbert's version of Korean history.

Grajdanzev consciously put effort to depict Korean people as "creators not imitators" while criticizing previous western view that only described Korean people in a negative light. He pointed out the Webster's dictionary defined Korean people as "adept imitative rather than profound intelligence,"[341] and how American writers such as George Kennan and G. Trumball Ladd's influential articles depicted Korea only in a negative light, in praising Japan's achievements in Korea.[342] Grajdanzev argued that Japan's achievement in material progress did not bring Korean people's welfare, which also resonated with Hoon K. Lee's book, *Land Utilization and Rural Economy* in Korea (1938)[343] that he cited and referred in analyzing the agricultural situation in Korea.[344]

---

[340] Grajdanzev, *Modern Korea*, 6.

[341] Grajdanzev, *Modern Korea*, 24

[342] George Kennan, "Korea: A Degenerate State," *Outlook*, (Oct 1905); Ladd, *In Korea with Marquis Ito*; Grajdanzev, *Modern Korea*, 34-37, 48-49.

[343] Hoon K. Lee, *Land Utilization and Rural Economy in Korea*, (Shanghai: Kelly and Walsh Ltd., 1936); Grajdanzev, *Modern Korea*, 320.

[344] Grajdanzev's bibliography does not include the prominent Japanese colonial scholarship, while listing the primary sources published by the Japanese government-general. This seems to be a reflection of wartime with Japan, but also because the book's main focus was not history but an evaluation of Korea's current situation.

M. Frederick Nelson, on the other hand, shows less critical view compared to Grajdanzev, despite his criticism against Japanese imperialist expansion. Reflecting the wartime interests on the relationship among East Asian states, Nelson delved into the issue of traditional East Asian tributary relations and the Confucian world order centered on China. Japan, according to Nelson, attempted to re-establish the "old order" with its expansion, but as it lacked the ethical basis that former China possessed, it ended up being the mere façade for the exploitation of the neighboring people.[345] Nelson's book has three parts; he narrated Korean premodern history while focusing Korea's position within the traditional Confucian world order in the first part, and for the latter two parts, he discussed Korea's reaction to the western expeditions and changing Chinese-Korean relations, and how Korea came be part of the western state system.

Nelson listed about dozen authors who he is indebted to in writing his book, the ones that worked on Korean history among them included Griffis, George T. Ladd, Kuno, and Frederick A. McKenzie.[346] Closer analysis of his citations shows, however, that he referred very much to Hulbert's *History of Korea* and *Passing of Korea*, as well as Hulbert's articles from the *Korean Repository* and the *Korean Review* as well.[347] He also used other articles written by missionaries such as James S. Gale, George H. Jones, as well

---

[345] Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders*, 297.

[346] Griffis, *Corea the Hermit Nation*; Ladd, *In Korea with Marquis Ito*; Frederick A. McKenzie, *The Tragedy of Korea*; Frederick A. McKenzie, *Korea's Fight for Freedom* (New York: Flemming H. Revell Co., 1928); Yoshi S. Kuno, *Japanese Expansion on the Asiatic Continent*.

[347] Homer B. Hulbert, "The Mongols in Korea," *Korean Repository* 5 (April 1898): 133-143; Homer B. Hulbert, "The Korean Alphabet," *Korean Repository*, 2 (Jan 1892): 1-9; Homer B. Hulbert, "National Examination in Korea," *Transaction of Korea Branch of Royal Asiatic Society* 14 (1923): 9-32; Homer B. Hulbert, "Korean Survivals."

as Hulbert in *Korean Repository* and the *Transactions of Korea Branch of Royal Asiatic Society*.[348]

His narrative framework, therefore, shows a mixture of historical interpretations that he got from Kuno, Gale, Griffis as well as Hulbert. For example, when discussing Korea's relationship to Japan during the ancient period, he depended greatly to Kuno, accepting his argument on the existence of Mimana Nihonfu, which was described as "Japanese-administered area,"[349] and how Silla was conquered by Japan and paid tribute to Japan.[350] Nelson also cited Kuno in describing Japan as strong as Koguryŏ during the fifth century, depicting Japan's attempt to expand in the southern peninsula in order to forestall the advance of Koguryŏ.[351] He also directly quoted from Kuno in discussing the early process of Hideyoshi Invasion, and its aspiration to rule the far East.[352] In discussing how Korean civilization was so much influenced by Chinese civilization that it was almost an imitation of Chinese civilization, Nelson referred to Gale's article,[353] and Griffis' book.[354] Hulbert's influence over the book was also apparent, as he referred to Hulbert's articles and

---

[348] George H. Jones, "Historical Notes on the Reigning Dynasty," *Korean Repository* 3 (Sep 1896): 343-349; George H. Jones, "The Japanese Invasion," *Korean Repository* 2 (Jan 1892) 1-16; James S. Gale, "Hanyang," *Transaction of Royal Asiatic Society Korea Branch* 2 (1902): 1-43.

[349] Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders*, 32 ; Kuno; Herman, *Atlas of China*, 32.

[350] Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders*, 43-44;

[351] Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders*, 36.

[352] Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders*, 75-76 ; Kuno, 314-317, 303-304.; Nelson, however, also discussed how Kuno's argument that Chosŏn paid tributes to Japan after the Hideyoshi Invasion was not accurate, and how they were actually on equal terms. Nelson argued that Kuno must have confused it with Mimana Nihonfu (Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders*, 77)

[353] Gale, "The Influence of China Upon Korea."; Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders*, 46, 51, 53-54, 85.

[354] Griffis, *Corea the Hermit Nation*; Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders*, 46, 85.

books for most of the factual information, as well as the interpretation that Korea was relatively independent from Chinese influence until seventh century, stating how Chinese civilization was overwhelmed by the native civilization before the seventh century.[355] Influence of Hulbert can also be seen from his short explanation on Idu,[356] Palhae,[357] and Korean alphabet, in which he cited Hulbert. However, his narrative framework was closer to Griffis, especially in looking at how Korea paid tribute to both Japan and China during the ancient period, how it Korea was Sinicized and recognized their country's status as inferior to that of Middle Kingdom,[358] and how the tributary system was settled from fourteenth to nineteenth century, and in describing how Korea ended up isolating itself against the world and became the hermit kingdom, rejecting Christianity and western civilization.[359]

Nelson's view of the East Asian traditional world order was one that was imbued with Orientalism of the colonial period. Nelson depicted the Confucian world order as operating on the notion of hierarchy and harmony, rather than on the western notion of "reason, example, and conversion."[360] Furthermore, Nelson described this order as an extension of Confucian idea of family. It was "familial, not legal,"[361] and as "conducted on the basis of the rules of proper conduct between the superior and inferior according to the

---

[355] Hulbert, "Korean Survivals," 27-30.

[356] Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders*, 51.

[357] Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders*, 52.

[358] Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders*, 56.

[359] Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders*, 110-115, 123, 130-134.

[360] Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders*, 289.

[361] Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders*, 291.

classic theory of li,"[362] He compared Chinese-Korean relationship to that of a father and a son, which changed to the elder brother and the younger brother during the seventeenth century.[363] This remark shows resemblance to Noble and McCune's description of traditional Korea's relations with China.[364] Nelson's discussion of Korea' sadaejuŭi also resembled Noble and McCune's interpretation in describing it as "a habit of subservience to a stronger power extending over centuries."[365] This attitude was also applied to the U.S. when the individual American aided Korea, which led Korea to regard the U.S. as an "elder brother" and as their protector in the western world.[366]

Conclusion

Japanese colonialist writings of Korean history emerged during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and then were developed as academic topics during the colonial period. By the 1930s, Japanese colonial scholarship on Korean history was a well-established academic field, which could exercise hegemony not only over the colonized Koreans but also over the Americans outside of the peninsula. Japan became the most advanced center of knowledge production on Korea, to which everyone referred. Korean intellectuals attempted to form counternarratives to the strong Japanese narrative

---

[362] Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders*, 72-73.

[363] Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders*, 289.

[364] Nelson cited Noble's article in the bibliography. (Harold J. Noble, "The United States and Sino-Korean Relations, 1885-1887," *Pacific Historical Review* 2 (1933): 292-304); Noble also reviewed Nelson's book when it came out. (Harold J. Noble, "Review" Review of *Korea and the Old Orders*, by M. Frederick Nelson, *Pacific Historical Review*, vol. 14, no. 4 (1945): 462-465.

[365] Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders*, 294.

[366] Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders*, vi.

framework of Korean history. However, their works were still mired in the Japanese narrative framework because they were built on the same epistemological ground. American scholars who wrote about Korean history as their dissertations also partially integrated Japanese historians' research in order to strengthen the academic authority of their own works.

It is important to note that these actors all had different political aims in producing knowledge of Korean history. The Japanese colonial government tried to depict Korean history as a failure in order to legitimize colonial rule. Other Japanese scholars who were sponsored by the government-general followed suit. Korean intellectuals wanted to establish a Korean ethnic identity from a historical narrative that depicted Korea as autonomous, or as have developed according to the universal laws of history. American scholars manifested their affection toward Korea in their prefaces, which showed that they were writing about Korean history in order to let the English-speaking world know more about Korea. However, regardless of their political aim or intention, they wrote histories that consciously or unconsciously conformed to the larger intellectual trends led by Japanese colonial scholarship. Japanese colonial scholarship had a hegemonic authority over the transnational audiences, which made anyone who discussed Korean history to engage Japanese narrative framework of Korean history on some level.

American scholars' integration of Japanese colonial scholarship during the 1930s further demonstrates how the adoption of postwar Japanese scholarship to the U.S. academia was made possible. American knowledge of Korean history was compatible with Japanese colonial scholarship, which made it easier for the postwar American scholars to

adopt much of the advanced Japanese postwar scholarship, which was built on the Japanese colonial scholarship. In other words, the co-authorship and transnational circulation of the narrative frameworks of Korean history were all built upon a discourse of failure, and then formed the intellectual basis on which postwar American and Japanese scholars could share their knowledge of Korean history.

CHAPTER FOUR

Continuity and Discontinuity: Postwar Reconfiguration of Colonial Knowledge

With the end of the Pacific War, area studies started to be established in major universities in the United States. As many scholars have pointed out, the establishment of area studies reflected the Cold War dynamics. As the United States and the Soviet Union engaged in a contest to win the allegiance of the Third World nation states that emerged from decolonization, American interest toward the non-Western nations shifted from anthropological concerns to that of national security—in specific, to preventing them from "fall in to the hands of the communists."[367] The U.S. government's need for foreign policy during the Cold War, along with its encouragement of private foundations such as Ford, Carnegie and Rockefeller to provide funding for the research, made the rapid expansion of area studies possible.[368]

East Asian Studies in the United States was also established within this context. Beginning in the military information agencies during the war, East Asian Studies moved to universities during the late 1940s and 1950s with funding from American private foundations. Centers for East Asian Studies were established in universities such as

---

[367] Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Unintended Consequences of Cold War Area Studies," in *The Cold War and the University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Post War Years*, ed. Noam Chomsky (New York: The New Press, 1997), 201. As for the relationship between the establishment of area studies in the U.S. with Cold War politics, see Harry D. Harootunian, *History's Disquiet*, as well as Masao Miyoshi and Harry D. Harootunian, eds., *Learning Places.*

[368] See Bruce Cummings, "Boundary displacement," in *Learning Places: the Afterlives of Area Studies*, ed. Masao Miyoshi and Harry D. Harootunian (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002).

Harvard, University of Washington, and Columbia University.[369] East Asian programs in universities received lavish funding as Japan rose as an important ally that contained communized China at the East Asian front,[370] and as it assumed a significant role in supporting modernization theory.[371] Modernization theory—formulated by social scientists during the 1950s in the United States and reaching its peak in the 1960s—provided a program that offered a peaceful model of modernization to Third World nations, as an alternative to the Marxist revolutionary model. Soon it became the dominant framework in constructing knowledge of these nations, and especially in interpreting East Asian history, because Japan was regarded as a successful case model of peaceful modernization, whose traditional flexibility and adaptability functioned well when it met the Western challenge during the late nineteenth century.

Korean Studies, meanwhile, was established during the 1960s, much later than Japanese and Chinese Studies due to its "less important" function in supporting modernization theory. Nonetheless, it was very much inspired and shaped by modernization theory, by the larger narrative framework of East Asian history that was already influential during the postwar period, and by the accumulated knowledge of Korean history from the prewar period. By the time American scholars started to research Korea, they were already

---

[369] At the University of Washington, the Far Eastern Institute was installed in 1945, at Columbia University, the East Asian Institute was installed in 1949, and at Harvard, the Center for East Asian Studies was established in 1957.

[370] To read more about this alliance, see Sakai and Yoo, *The Trans-Pacific Imagination: Rethinking Boundary, Culture and Society*.

[371] Between 1953 and 1966, the Ford Foundation alone poured the sum of 270 million dollars into 34 universities in the United States in order to build up the area and language studies program (Cummings, "Boundary Displacement," 272; Sebastian Conrad, "The colonial ties are liquidated: Modernization theory, postwar Japan and the global cold war," *Past and Present,* no. 216 (Aug 2012): 270).

under the heavy influence of the established narrative structure on East Asian history which contrasted Japan's success at modernization with China's failure to modernize due to its adherence to tradition. Korea, within this narrative framework, was also positioned as a case of failure due to its inability to adapt, again contrasted with Japan.

Despite the discontinuities from the prewar period, which came from different power dynamics, postwar scholars still made use of prewar knowledge in constructing their own narratives. This made it possible for some themes and interpretations from Japanese colonial scholarship as well as the American missionaries accounts to be reflected in the new postwar knowledge of Korean history. Furthermore, modernization theory shaped the early themes and areas of focus in Korean history.

This chapter explores how knowledge construction of Korean history during the postwar period, focusing on the influence of modernization theory, the narrative framework of East Asian history, and the accumulated knowledge from the prewar period. It first examines the larger narrative structure of East Asian history during the 1950s in order to examine the location of Korean history within this context, by using *East Asia: Great Tradition* (1960) written by John K. Fairbank, Edwin O. Reischauer, and Albert M. Craig,[372] and focusing on the influence of Japanese postwar scholar Takashi Hatada's *Chosenshi* (1951).[373] This section analyzes the discontinuities in the narrative framework between Hatada and Edwin O. Reischauer's accounts of Korean history, while arguing how

[372] Reischauer, Fairbank, and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*. This book covers premodern East Asian history. Their modern East Asian history was published as *East Asia: the Modern Transformation* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965).

[373] Hatada, *Chosenshi*.

some themes from Japanese colonial scholarship were incorporated into the new narrative frameworks, and reinforced even while serving different functions in each narrative framework.

Then, by analyzing the dissertations in Korean Studies written in the United States during the 1960s, the chapter discusses how the first-generation scholars of Korean Studies in the United States were inspired by modernization theory and the larger narrative framework, while reflecting the colonial knowledge of Korean history. By examining scholars such as Gregory Henderson and Key P. Yang, Edward W. Wagner, Chong Sun Kim, Hugh Kang, Chong Ik Kim and Hankyo Kim, this chapter analyzes the characteristics of the early Korean Studies in the U.S. which continued to be influential even after the 1970s, as well as the historical and intellectual context that shaped the knowledge produced.

Location of Korean Studies within East Asian Studies during the 1950s

East Asia: the Great Tradition was published in 1960, as a compilation of lectures taught at Harvard University during the 1950s by three professors, John K. Fairbank, Edwin O. Reischauer, and Albert Craig. Published during a time when the United States was in dire need of understanding East Asia, and coming from the most prominent center of East Asian Studies, this book not only received well by contemporaries and soon used as a textbook at major universities, it also was influential for decades, inspiring the first generation of scholars of East Asian Studies in the postwar period.[374] It would not be an

[374] This book, along with Hatada's *History of Korea* (translated into English in 1969), was used as major

exaggeration to say that this book represented and reflected the framework of how scholars viewed East Asia during the 1950s and 1960s.[375]

For that reason, this book is important to our discussion of how Korea was positioned within a larger narrative framework of East Asian history during this period. The "less important" function of Korean history in this overall narrative is shown by the fact that only one chapter was allocated to discuss Korean history in this book. That single chapter, however, reveals how postwar American scholars structured the narrative framework of Korean history, and how it related to the overall narrative of East Asian history.

Edwin O. Reischauer, a scholar of Japanese history, wrote the chapter in question. Reischauer noted in the preface that he was "unusually dependent" on Takashi Hatada's *Chosenshi* (1951) when writing the chapter on Korea.[376] Recently, a few studies have pointed out how Hatada functioned as a mediator between the Japanese prewar colonialist view and the postwar Korean Studies in the United States.[377] Sejin Chang, building on Sakai Naoki's notion of the transpacific alliance between Japan and the United States, argued that the transpacific intellectual networks which connected Hatada in Japan, Yi Pyŏngdo in Korea, and Reischauer and Wagner in the United States produced the postwar

---

influential textbook until the 1990s, when American scholars started to write new textbooks, such as *Korea Old and New* and *Korea's Place in the Sun.* (Chang, "Raishawŏ, Tongasia, kwŏllyŏk/chisik ŭi t'ek'ŭnoloji," 102.)

375 Chang, "Raishawŏ, Tongasia, kwŏllyŏk/chisik ŭi t'ek'ŭnoloji," 93.

376 Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: the Great Tradition*, vii.

377 Chang, "Raishawŏ, Tongasia, kwŏllyŏk/chisik ŭi t'ek'ŭnoloji."; An, "Chuil Taesa Edŭwin Raishawŏ ŭi kŭndaehwaron kwa han'guksa."

American knowledge of Korean history. Analyzing the Korea part in *East Asia: the Great Tradition,* Chang argued that Hatada, despite being a representative postwar scholar who was critical of the prewar Japanese studies on Korea, still built his own work on previous literature, making references to major colonial scholars when writing his book, *Chosenshi*. Through the transpacific intellectual network, Chang argued, the prewar colonialist knowledge of Korea was transmitted to the U.S. academia.[378]

Building on and supplementing the previous studies on this topic, the next section explores the discontinuity and continuity of knowledge production of Korean history in Japan and United States after the war. It first compares Hatada's *Chosenshi* and examines its epistemological break from the prewar colonial scholarship, while tracing how some themes from the prewar studies were reconfigured into new narrative. Then it analyzes Reischauer's chapter on Korea in *East Asia: the Great Tradition* to discuss how it created a different narrative framework from that of Hatada, while making use of Hatada's content as well as the narrative frameworks and themes that were developed by American missionaries and their children. In other words, this section will show how the new postwar narrative framework of Korean history in the United States was created, how it served a new function of supporting modernization theory during the Cold War, and how it made use of both Japanese colonial scholarship and American missionaries' discourse of failure.

When Hatada wrote *Chosenshi* in 1951, the dominant mode of writing a national history was the Marxist historical framework. In postwar Japan, historical materialism had

[378] Chang, "Raishawŏ, Tongasia, kwŏllyŏk/chisik ŭi t'ek'ŭnoloji," 101.

emerged as a major influence on the interpretation of Japanese history, as it was the only intellectual currency that was not implicated in the nationalist propaganda of the war years. The Marxist approach remained hegemonic in academia from 1945 to the late 1950s, when Marxist interpretations came gradually under attack.[379] This trend in Japanese history was also reflected in writing Korean history, as many Marxist historians criticized Japanese expansionism in Korea, as well as prewar notions of Korean "backwardness." Christine Dennehy pointed out that even if the specialists in Korean history did not necessarily identify themselves as Marxists, their narrative was still dominated by the themes of class struggle, capitalist exploitation, and episodes of resistance by oppressed people within a framework of historical materialism.[380] Progressive scholars in Japan after 1945 criticized the prewar notion that Korea was inherently "stagnant and backward," and asserted that prewar Japanese colonial scholarship on Korean history was used by the state to maintain control over Korea. They called for a construction of new narratives that focused on Korea's development and legacies of resistance against imperialist aggression.[381]

Hatada himself was not a Marxist, but his narrative of Korean history in *Chosenshi* still echoed this intellectual trend of postwar Japan. Takashi Mitsui further pointed out that Hatada was influenced by the Movement for National History (kokuminteki rekishigaku undou) represented by Ishimoda Sho, who claimed that history should be focused on the history of people and should be written by the people themselves. This idea emphasized a

---

[379] Conrad, "The Colonial Ties are Liquidated," 187-188.

[380] Kristine Dennehy, "Memories of Colonial Korea in Postwar Japan." (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2002), 19.

[381] Dennehy, "Memories of Colonial Korea," 2.

narrative framework that regards the subject of history as the people who fought against the elites and external forces.[382] Hatada's narrative framework of Korean history in *Chosenshi* also reflected this view. The structure of his narrative shows that he designated Korean people (minshu) who resisted the foreign aggression or the ruling class as the subject of Korean history. Hatada also attempted to trace the historical progress of Korean history, which he periodized according to dynastic change, from the formative period through the Three Kingdoms period, Silla (unified), Koryŏ, Yi Dynasty, modern times, Japanese rule, and to liberation. He focused on economic and social conditions of each period, mainly about how the land was controlled, and discussed the status of the peasants and their uprisings during each period. Hatada argued that each period was more advanced than the previous, and worked to find signs of progress from each period. For example, Hatada stated that Chosŏn was more advanced than Koryŏ because the private agricultural estate expanded. In this way, Hatada's new narrative framework showed a noticeable epistemological break from the prewar Japanese colonialist version of Korean history. For this reason, this book was often regarded as the beginning of postwar Japanese knowledge of Korean studies.[383]

Furthermore, despite his own career—graduating from Tokyo Imperial University under Ikeuchi Hiroshi, and working for the Research Bureau of the Southern Manchurian Railway Company until 1944—Hatada distinguished himself from the prewar Japanese

---

[382] Takashi Mitsui, "Chŏnhu Ilbonesŏ ŭi Chosŏnsahak ŭi kaesi wa sahaksasang [Japan's Historiography of Korea and its images in 1950-60s]" *Han'guksa yŏn'gu* 153 (June 2011): 364.

[383] Mitsui, "Chŏnhu Ilbonesŏ ŭi Chosŏnsahak," 345.

colonial scholars by reevaluating major themes in Japanese colonial scholarship. Hatada led the discussion in a symposium titled "How to inherit the accumulation of Korean studies in Japan (nihonhi okeru chosenkenkyu no sakuseki wo ikani keishou suruka)" sponsored by Nihon Chosen Kenkyusho from 1962 to 1964, where Hatada criticized the prewar Japanese studies of Korea and *toyo* as distorted and dehumanized because it lacked a Korean voice. In his 1969 article on the tradition of Korean studies in Japan, he criticized the prewar themes of stagnation, heteronomy, Nissen Dosouron, and Mansenshi as serving the colonial aim of ruling Korea.[384] For this reason, he has been known as the conscience of Japanese postwar intellectuals. However, it should be noted that his deeper criticism started during the 1960s,[385] and his criticism against the prewar colonial scholarship was not as explicit during the early 1950s when he published *Chosenshi*.

The preface of *Chosenshi* reveals what he thought as most problematic about prewar colonial scholarship. Hatada criticized colonial scholarship for placing too much emphasis on an ancient history that "specialized in textual exegesis, chronological tables, and verification of geographical place names." According to Hatada, this was a "dehumanized" scholarship in which the "history of Korean people as they lived it through the ages" was absent.[386] However, Takashi Mitsui pointed out that Hatada's major concern

---

[384] Takashi Hatada, "Nihonni okeru chosensi kenkyu no dentou [The tradition of Korean studies in Japan]," *Shinpojimu Nihon to Chosen* (Tokyo: Keishou Shobou, 1969).

[385] Mitsui argued that the discussion about what to inherit and what not to inherit from the prewar period started with the symposium during the early 1960s. (Mitsui, "Chŏnhu Ilbonesŏ ŭi Chosŏnsahak," 346.)

[386] The most problematic aspect of this "dehumanized" scholarship, according to the preface, was that it took away incentive from Koreans to research their own history as it invoked feelings painful to Koreans (Hatada, *Chosenshi*, v; Takashi Hatada. *A History of Korea,* trans. Warren W. Smith and Benjamin H. Hazard (Santa Barbara, California: American Bibliographical Center, 1969), xii.)

was that colonial scholarship lacked interest in the social economic condition of Korean history and its agent, the Korean people (minshu), in its narrative. But Hatada still trusted prewar academic scholarship, appreciating scholars' role in breaking the old dogmas, and in establishing a rational positivist scholarship whose scrutiny of ascertaining historical facts is worthy of compliment. In other words, Hatada did not necessarily question the system of knowledge production that was sponsored by the Japanese colonial state per se, at least during the 1960s.[387]

This ambiguous attitude toward prewar scholarship made it possible for him to rely on secondary sources created by major Japanese colonial scholars when he was writing *Chosenshi*. As previous studies pointed out, Hatada's *Chosenshi* made reference to colonial scholars such as Shiratori Kurakichi, Ikeuchi Hiroshi, Imanishi Ryu, and Suematsu Yasukazu.[388] Hatada's work even criticized by his contemporary Marxist historian, Yamabe Kentaro, for the lack of primary source citation, and for using the works of "cowardly intellectuals in an age of extremely limited freedom of expression."[389]

As a result of relying mostly on prewar colonial scholarship, he ended up incorporating some of the old historical interpretations and themes of Korean history in his book. For example, he dismissed Tan'gun as a myth and started his account of Korean history from Kija Chosŏn, which he understood to be a conqueror of the native Korean people living on the peninsula. This resembled Shiratori Kurakichi's view in the article that

---

[387] Hatada, "Nihonni okeru chosenshi kenkyu no dentou," 7-9.; Mitsui, "Chŏnhu Ilbonesŏ ŭi Chosŏnsahak," 356-357.

[388] Chang, "Raishawŏ, Tongasia, kwŏllyŏk/chisik ŭi t'ek'ŭnoloji," 101.

[389] Dennehy, "Memories of Colonial Korea," 56.

Hatada cited,[390] where Shiratori interpreted Kija and Wiman Chosŏn as Han's colonies.[391] In describing the four Han Chinese commanderies, Hatada referred to articles written by Shiratori Kurakichi, Ikeuchi Hiroshi, Imanishi Ryu, as well as Yi Pyŏngdo, in interpreting the Chinese commanderies as colonies in a modern sense, stating that each was governed by the Chinese homeland, and was under the direct jurisdiction of Chinese dynasties for 280 years.[392] In this way, Hatada interpreted that Korea was under direct administrative rule of China until the fourth century, when the relationship changed to tributary.

Another notable Japanese colonialist interpretation can be seen from his description of the ancient Korea-Japan relationship. Hatada stated that Japan developed earlier than Korea and established a unified state centered on Yamato by the fourth century, then conquered and subjugated Pyŏnhan state, which became the "Japanese colony of Mimana."[393] Hatada not only interpreted Mimana as the territory governed by the Japanese from the fourth to the sixth century, but also described Koguryŏ's expansion to the southern part of the peninsula as a counter attack against the Japanese colony.

The theme of stagnation was most challenging for Hatada, who attempted to describe Korean history as one of progress. Japanese colonial research was done within the narrative framework that depicted Korean history as being in general decline after the seventh century, and Hatada struggled to find signs of development in order to form a

---

[390] Kurakichi Shiratori, "Kandai no Chosen [Chosŏn during Han dynasty period]" *Manshu Rekishi Chiri*, vol. 2.; Hatada, *Chosenshi*, 9.

[391] Chan-Heung Park, "Mansŏnsa esŏŭi kodae Manchu yŏksa e taehan insik," *Han'guk kodaesa yŏn'gu* 76 (Dec 2014): 145.

[392] Hatada, *A History of Korea*, 5.

[393] Hatada, *A History of Korea*, 22-23.

narrative framework of progress, while still relying on the colonial scholarship for content. This discord between his narrative framework and the available content was resolved by his interpretation that "it was a progress not in the basic structure of the society, but only within the bounds of social relationship already in existence since ancient times."[394] This view is shown in Hatada's discussion of factional strife in Korea. Hatada argued that the literati purges and factional in-fighting was progress compared to the political strife from the Koryŏ period, because the more recent political struggle had no connection with the royal house and was no longer restricted to the capital, unlike that of Koryŏ. Also, the method of political struggle was public discussion, a more advanced form compared to that of Koryŏ.[395] However, at the same time, Hatada brought in the typical colonialist interpretation that the disputes were not over government policy but stemmed from personal retribution,[396] and that factionalism weakened the government to the point that it was unable to recover from the two invasions,[397] or later when it was threatened by the West.[398] In this way, Hatada adopted the colonial scholarship's theme by extending factional strife to the entire Chosŏn period, and marked it as "characteristic of Yi dynasty political history."[399] Thus, factional strife was viewed as a form of progress in Hatada's narrative, but one with significant limits.

---

394 Hatada, *A History of Korea*, 81.

395 Hatada, *A History of Korea*, 69-70.

396 Hatada, *A History of Korea*, 71.

397 Hatada, *A History of Korea*, 81.

398 Hatada, *A History of Korea*, 91.

399 Hatada, *A History of Korea*, 72.

Any progress made by Koreans was further halted, according to Hatada, by foreign invasion and external forces. For example, under the Han Chinese commanderies, Korea could not progress until the domination of Chinese officials was broken.[400] In Hatada's narrative framework, major decline started with the Hideyoshi Invasion (1592) and the Manchu Invasion (1636), as evidenced by the decrease in the land area controlled by the state.[401] Describing Korean history as a history of suffering and destruction caused by foreign oppression and invasion, Hatada argued that it retarded the historical progress, at times even to the point of retrogression to earlier, less-advanced life.[402] In this way, Hatada's narrative framework, despite his declared aim to find signs of progress and his attempt to place Korean history "along the same line of other peoples of the world," ended up depicting Korean history as one that "evolved unevenly,"[403] and which eventually declined due to the external foreign oppression of the Korean people.

Hatada's narrative framework also structured Korean history as a struggle between the ruling class (or foreign domination) and the people, shown by their suffering and resistance. He viewed foreign domination as a negative influence on Korea's own progress, which was very different from the prewar colonial scholarship's stance that Korean history developed specifically due to outside forces. Within this narrative, the theme of Korean people's suffering due to external forces, as well as the incompetence of Korea's yangban

---

[400] Hatada, *A History of Korea*, 7-8.

[401] Hatada, *A History of Korea*, 81.

[402] Hatada, *A History of Korea*, 142.

[403] Hatada, *A History of Korea*, 142.

elites as represented by the factional strife, started to serve a new function in the narrative of emphasizing class struggle. Despite Hatada's intentions, however, it also resulted in emphasizing the theme of heteronomy; namely, that Korea's fate was decided by external forces as well as factionalism throughout Korean history. In other words, his recognition of the authority of prewar works as academic achievements, coupled with his reliance on the content from the prewar period, including the historical interpretations and themes to a certain extent, meant his own work harbored the colonial interpretation of Korean history in spite of the fact that Hatada presented a new narrative to fit into the context of postwar Japan, which showed strong discontinuity from the previous colonial narratives.[404] This characteristic made Hatada criticize his own book in the 1970s and decide to stop printing *Chosenshi*; he stated that his book "failed to overcome the theme of stagnation, recognized Japan's rule of Korea during the ancient period, and failed to discuss the cultural creativity of Korean people."[405]

As stated above, Hatada's work influenced Reischauer's account of Korean history, but to what extent? Despite Reischauer's remark that he was "unusually dependent" on Hatada's *Chosenshi*, Reischauer came up with an essentially different narrative framework from that of Hatada. Hatada's position in the postwar Japanese intellectual stream—a conscientious postwar scholar who criticized Japanese colonial expansion and sympathized with the Korean people—was welcomed by American postwar scholars such as

---

[404] Chang referred to Hatada's book as a bricolage text in which the legacy of imperialism and postcolonial zeitgeist were heterogeneously mixed. (Chang, "Raishawŏ, Tongasia, Kwŏllyŏk/Chisik ŭi Tekŭnoloji," 98).

[405] Takashi Hatada, "Chosenshi kenkyu wo kaerimite [Looking back at studies on Korean history]," *Chosenshi kenkyukai ronbunshu*, 15 (1978).

Reischauer.[406] However, Reischauer's narrative framework was built to fit the postwar United States where East Asian Studies was getting established as a field, which made Reischauer develop a very different narrative framework from that of Hatada.

Reischauer's account of Korean history was closely related to how he interpreted Japanese history based on modernization theory.[407] Modernization theory, formulated by social scientists during the 1950s, was a theory of transformation of nation states from traditional to modern. It was designed to provide a program of peaceful modernization for the newly emerging Third World nations as an alternative to the Marxist revolutionary model. Unlike civilizing missions in the prewar times, the modernization theory was non-racist, and at least in theory, was universally applicable to any race or nation.[408]

Modernization theory argued that the survival of particular traditional values and institutions whose endurance qualified them to play a new role as mediators, can transform nations from traditional to modern.[409] The particular aspect was often regarded as the capacity of institutions to adapt to or control rapid and continuous change. As can be seen from how Eisenstadt argued that modernization is characterized by two features—a structural differentiation, and the response to change—the capacity of institutions to absorb

---

[406] Chang, "Raishawŏ, Tongasia, kwŏllyŏk/chisik ŭi t'e'kŭnoloji," 120.

[407] Chang pointed out that Reischauer, although he did not like to be called a modernization theory scholar, was still regarded as one of the initial scholars on modernization theory at the Hakone conference held in Tokyo in 1960. Edwin O. Reischauer, *My Life Between Japan and America* (New York: Harper and Row, 1986), 155.; Chang, "Raishawŏ, Tongasia, kwŏllyŏk/chisik ŭi t'ek'ŭnoloji," 110.

[408] On the modernization theory in the U.S., see Nils Gilman, *Mandarins of the Future: Modernization Theory in Cold War America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2003); Michael H. Hunt, *The American Ascendancy: How the United States Gained and Viewed Global Dominance* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010).

[409] Harootunian, *History's Disquiet*, 33.

"continually changing problems and demand"[410] for those nations which were going through the modernization process as a response to the Western challenge, adaptability and flexibility in adopting Western civilization was often considered an important element.

Japan arose as an ideal model of modernization theory, making a case that could be applied among the American scholars. Modernization theorists argued that the particular mental structure of Japan, such as adaptiveness to foreign culture, enabled Japan to achieve modernization. Harootunian pointed out how modernization theorists such as Bella and Reischauer interpreted Japan's feudal order as one of the values that survived from earlier history to mediate the social change.[411] Reischauer was also part of this discourse, arguing how Japan's westernized intellectuals and political leaders during the Meiji period played an important role in the modernizing process, especially in bureaucratic management of the capitalist economy, which was regarded as a sign of mature, rational political democracy. Japan's adaptive power, according to Reischauer, helped it avoid revolutionary upheavals.[412] Japan became a "textbook case" for developing nations, one that showed an ideal model of transition from a feudal order to liberal democracy and capitalism.

Reischauer's account of Japanese history depicted Japan as a variation of Chinese civilization that departed from China during the medieval period, and that established its own feudal system during the Tokugawa period, creating a system that was more like

---

[410] Shmuel N. Eisenstadt, *Modernization: Protest and Change* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.; Prentice-Hall, 1966) 43; Dean C. Tipps, "Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study of Societies," 203.

[411] Harootunian, *The Empire's New Clothes,* 77-89.

[412] Harootunian, *The Empire's New Clothes*, 88-89.

Europe than China.[413] When faced with the Western challenge, Japanese leaders could adopt Western civilization due to its traditional cultural trait of adaptability, and could rise as an empire. Therefore, it is not surprising that *East Asia: the Great Tradition's* overall narrative structure was organized in a way to show how Japan, unlike China and Korea, could become a modernized state. The book asked rhetorically "why relatively small Japan became a world power, while China sank to the status of an international problem, and Korea disappeared into Japanese empire?"[414]

Traversing all three nations' history,[415] Reischauer, along with Fairbank and Craig, developed an overall narrative structure that put Chinese civilization at the center and discussed to what extent Japan and Korea, as variations of Chinese civilization, deviated from the Chinese cultural pattern.[416] As Chang pointed out, however, the focus of the narrative structure was not on China, but rather on Japan. In the last chapter of the book, which functioned as the conclusion of this book, Reischauer wrapped up the historical narratives of three nations by discussing why China failed to react to the Western challenge while Japan succeeded. Contrasting Japan's reaction, which was "entirely different" from that of China and Korea, Reischauer answered his own question by pointing out that Japanese society had social and political mobility that China and Korea lacked due to

---

[413] Chang, "Raishawŏ, Tongasia, kwŏllyŏk/chisik ŭi t'ek'ŭnoloji," 108.

[414] Reischauer, Fairbank, and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 670.

[415] Reischauer's expertise was on Japanese ancient history, so it is notable that he not only wrote the chapters on premodern Japanese and Korean history in *East Asia: the Great Tradition*, but also premodern Chinese history, except for the chapters on Mongol, Ming and Qing dynasty written by Fairbank (Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, vii.); Chang, "Raishawŏ, Tongasia, kwŏllyŏk/chisik ŭi t'ek'ŭnoloji," 104-105.

[416] Chang, "Raishawŏ, Tongasia, kwŏllyŏk/chisik ŭi t'ek'ŭnoloji," 105-106.

"inertia", and that Japan felt a strong national distinctiveness from the Chinese, which made it easier for them to grasp the Western concept of a nation. Most importantly, however, it had feudal political institution in its history which showed that Japan was "already evolving along the course not far different from the one Europe had taken" toward "modern society."[417]

Within this context, Korean history was viewed as a failed case that could be contrasted with Japan's successful case. Both civilizations were variation of Chinese civilization but one managed to achieve successful modernization while the other failed and became a colony. In the narrative structure where Japan was contrasted with China and Korea, therefore, the narrative framework of Korean history already had a conclusion decided for it: a failure to react to the Western challenge. Reischauer looked for historical evidence which led Korea to this assumed failure—things that Japan had and Korea lacked, and things that Korea had that Japan lacked.[418] The factor that contributed to Japan's achievement was its strong national distinctiveness, so in contrast, Korea's dependency and similarity to Chinese civilization was emphasized. Japan was depicted as having exceptional social mobility and flexibility, so Korea's rigidity and immobility were highlighted. In other words, if Japan was a showcase model of modernization theory, Korean history functioned as a control group that belonged to the same ancient East Asian civilization, but one that could not deviate from older Chinese civilization as Japan did.

---

[417] Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 673-674.

[418] Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 671.

Unlike Japan, the exception that achieved modernization, Korea was compared with China, on the premise that Chinese civilization was the standard and Korean civilization was just a variation of Chinese civilization. Reischauer looked at how "Sinicized" Korea was throughout history, and in what aspects it deviated from China, which was regarded as Korea's particularistic historical character. His position on Korean history as essentially dependent on China is apparent from the title of his chapter on Korea: "A Variant of the Chinese Cultural Pattern."[419] The narrative was organized in a way to explain to what extent Korea went through "Sinification" and how similar and different it was from Chinese cultural patterns.

The narrative framework of Korean history, therefore, shows how each Korean dynasty gradually became more Sinicized. While Silla was not under strong Chinese influence due to its geographic distance from China, Later Silla [or Unified Silla] showed "wholesale borrowing of Chinese culture and institutions."[420] Koryŏ marked "a significant step forward the Sinification," and a "much closer imitation" of China than Silla had ever been,[421] and by the Chosŏn period, it not only became a "perfect replica" of Ming China, but also it became "more traditionally Chinese than China itself."[422] This gradual "Sinification" was of course regarded as a negative influence on Korea. First, this "borrowing" of Chinese civilization made Korea much more rigid, due to how it adhered to

---

[419] Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 394.

[420] Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 409-411.

[421] Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 416.

[422] Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 426.; Chang, "Raishawŏ, Tongasia, kwŏllyŏk/chisik ŭi t'e'kŭnoloji," 109

and blindly accepted Chinese ideas, which proved to be stultifying to Korea's own intellectual and artistic development. It also drew Koreans' minds away from their immediate realities as they instead studied Chinese history in Chinese language, inhibiting other developments.[423]

Most importantly, however, while the imposed Chinese culture formed the "intellectual and political surface" or "imposing superstructure" of Korean history, it conflicted with Korea's "inherited primitive cultural substructure," resulting in a distinctive variation of Chinese civilization, which manifested as rigidity and stability in Korean political life. What Reischauer regarded as the most salient feature of this "inherited substructure" was the strong aristocracy and rigid hereditary social system, often described as the "sharpness of class line."[424] This aristocratic structure originated in the Silla period and was maintained through a tradition of determining status and function by birth, even when adopting the Chinese system of civil service examinations during Koryŏ and Chosŏn periods, a practice which restricted the commoners' access to the official posts, further drawing a sharp class line between the elites and the rest.[425]

According to Reischauer, this substructure, defined as strong aristocracy and rigid hereditary social system, made Korea a particularistic variation of Chinese civilization, which negatively affected Korean history in several aspects. First, it aggravated

[423] Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 448-449.

[424] Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 419.

[425] Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 417, 427-428.

factionalism in Korea to the extent that it was far worse than Chinese factionalism,[426] primarily because of the strong aristocracy that made the Korean kingship relatively weak. Reischauer saw evidence of this power struggle in how censoring institutions in government flourished during the Yi dynasty which could, unlike those in China, reprimand the king himself. These censoring institutions were also used as tools to attack and remove political rivals. Furthermore, lacking a mechanism of reconciliation other than the king's mediation, a weak kingship contributed to worsening factionalism.[427] Also, Korean "native social institutions" tended to express everything in family terms, and so hardened factional divisions along hereditary lines. Unlike in China where factionalism was linked to discussion over major economic and foreign policies, the Korea's factional strife was centered around "less fundamental problems" which resulted in "repeated purges." These "disruptive factional conflicts" started after the fifteenth century, according to Reischauer, signaling a long decline in the Yi dynasty.[428]

Due to the rigidity coming from both the Korean primitive substructure of sharp social cleavages, and the "borrowed" Chinese civilization which Korea so staunchly adhered to, resulted in Yi dynasty lasting for five hundred years. For Reischauer, this curious longevity was a particularly distinctive feature of Korean civilization, whereas Chinese dynasties usually lasted for two or three hundred years. However, this longevity was never a good sign. Reischauer pointed out that the Yi dynasty, which started declining

---

[426] Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 437.

[427] Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 437.

[428] Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 437.

more severely after the sixteenth century, was in a "sorry state" and in need of periodical rejuvenation through a new dynastic cycle. It "dragged on for another three centuries" in a condition of "near collapse," as "unfortunately" no other dynasty came to power.[429] Instead of improving, Korean history "deteriorated" for the next three centuries. To Reischauer's eyes, Korea was "strangely unmoved and unchanging" despite the inefficient government and the social disruptions, which resulted in the "bitter stage" of Korean history at the end of the nineteenth century. People followed the "timeworn paths established by their ancestors" for two hundred years. This curious feature made Reischuaer name the last section of the chapter "Korean resistance to change."[430]

Two features of Korean civilization made Reischuaer curious. First, as asked in the last section which functioned as a conclusion of the chapter: "Why the extraordinary stability of early-modern Chinese civilization should have been carried to these less desirable extremes in Korea?" Unlike the stability and slowness of change in China that were associated with political strength and social harmony, Reischuaer thought Korean stability was more associated with "economic stagnation, political corruption, and cultural sterility." The answer to this was two-fold. For one, Korea was smaller in size, which produced a "deadening degree of uniformity," unlike China whose size and diversity spared it from that fate. But more importantly, it was because Koreans were "borrowers" of the ready-made system from China, and adhered to it more rigidly, which stultified their intellectual development. Unlike Japan, which deviated from Chinese civilization and

[429] Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 444.

[430] Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 448.

developed independently, Korea was trapped by Chinese civilization and went through gradual but severe Sinification to the extent of deterioration, which was made worse by its own native institutions that emphasized sharp class lines, strong aristocracy, and weak kingship.

The narrative framework of Korean history, therefore, was described as one of general decline. Contrasted with the Three Kingdoms period, when Korean states were "brilliantly creative in adapting Chinese civilization," and with the Koryŏ period where Korea became more Sinicized, ultimately the late Yi dynasty endured the time when the "dead weight of the Chinese language and heavy hand of Chinese classical tradition seems to have inhibited all creative endeavor in Korea."[431] The fifteenth century, when the Yi dynasty was first established, marked a time of great strength, prosperity, and cultural brilliance, represented by the invention of han'gŭl and movable type.[432] However, decline started with the factionalism in the sixteenth century, with two wars so devastating that the Yi dynasty "never fully recovered from the blow,"[433] Korea reached a the "sorry state" in the seventeenth century, in a condition of near collapse dragged on for three centuries.

The actual narrative framework developed by Reischauer was neither borrowed nor influenced by Hatada's *Chosenshi*, but was newly created to fit the needs of the postwar American scholars who utilized the knowledge of East Asian history in order to explain a peaceful modernization historical process, in which Japan became a showcase of

[431] Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 449.

[432] Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 432.

[433] Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 443.

modernization theory. Unlike Hatada's narrative framework, which described Korean history as one of general progress albeit within certain limits, Reischauer described Korean history as a gradual Sinification which proved to be the major negative cause of Korean rigidity and immobility in the face of Western challenge.

What Reischauer depended on was Hatada's content, mostly factual information. However, he also incorporated some historical interpretations as well as the themes into his own narrative of Korean history. For example, Reischauer adopted Hatada's description of four Chinese commanderies as a colonial institution (in a modern sense) that ruled Korea for four hundred years, as well as accepting its positive influence in stimulating Korean states to be well-organized political units while suppressing and exploiting the native people.[434] Hatada's discussion on factionalism, described in both books as a negative influence in Korea, was also useful to Reischauer's narrative. Reischauer also adopted Hatada's interpretation that it was conflict arising from personal animosities rather than a discussion over government policies which weakened the Yi dynasty and made it unable to react to the challenges of Hideyoshi Invasion, which the dynasty never fully recovered from.[435] Reischauer's book also included the tendency to extend the duration of factionalism from the late fifteenth century to the end of Chosŏn dynasty, which Hatada had adopted from the colonial scholarship.[436] Hatada pointed it out as the prime characteristic of Yi dynasty's political history, and Reischauer also allocated one third of

[434] Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 404.

[435] Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 400-442.

[436] Hatada, *A History of Korea*, 71; Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 437-440.

his description on the Yi dynasty on factionalism. Furthermore, the idea that Korea was a more rigid society than China was also taken from Hatada, though it was much more heavily emphasized in Reischauer's narrative framework. Reischauer adopted Hatada's interpretation that Silla was more rigid than Tang,[437] and that Koryŏ political structure was not so different from Silla due to the strong aristocratic tradition,[438] as well as the idea that Chosŏn political structure was comparatively immature and backward because it was borrowed from China.[439] All these elements strengthened Reischauer's narrative framework, which depicted Korea as more rigid than China as a result of its own aristocratic tradition ossifying the borrowed structure.

Some themes from Hatada's book were used very differently in Reischauer's book, due to the different narrative frameworks. For example, Hatada described the sufferings of the lower class in order to explain how the people (minshu) developed historically, but Reischauer, while using Hatada's content, used it mainly to present it as a sign of dynastic decline. When discussing the foreign aggression against Korea, Reischauer did not necessarily adopt Hatada's view that it prevented Korea's growth. In this way, Hatada's contents were re-organized in a way to strengthen Reischauer's narrative framework.

Interestingly, the narrative framework of Reischuaer was closer to that of American missionaries from the early twentieth century and scholarly works written by the missionaries' children during the 1930s and 1940s. Despite the fact that Reischauer's

---

[437] Hatada, *A History of Korea*, 30.

[438] Hatada, *A History of Korea*, 37.

[439] Hatada, *A History of Korea*, 64.

framework was created to fit the postwar American need to study East Asian history in terms of the applicability of modernization theory, his narrative framework still ended in Korea's failure. The emphasis on Korea's Sinification, contrasted with Japan's separation from Chinese civilization, made it possible to make use of the discourse of failure developed by American missionaries of the early twentieth century, this time to reflect discourses of decentering the middle kingdom, as well as Japan's rise to modernity and specially as a modern empire.

Though Reischauer did not list Hulbert's book in his references, the general narrative framework is very similar to that of American missionaries' narratives from early twentieth century, as represented by Hulbert. They both viewed Korea's decline as starting in the late seventh century due to heavy Chinese influence. Both mark the fifteenth century as a time of temporary prosperity in which the Korean alphabet was invented. Both interpret Korea to have deteriorated during the sixteenth century due to disruptive factionalism. Both use the idea that Korea's resistance to change and its incompetent elite class prevented Korea from reacting to the Western challenge, which ultimately resulted in Korea's failure. Discussion on *idu* or Parhae, which Hatada left out of his book, does appear in Reischauer's book—points which were also discussed by American missionaries in the early twentieth century.[440]

[440] Hulbert discussed the invention of *idu* as well as the emergence of Parhae in his accounts. (Homer B. Hulbert, *History of Korea*, ed. Clarence Norwood Weems (London: Routeledge and K. Paul, 1962), 119-121; Hulbert, "The Itu" *Korean Repository* 5 (Feb 1898): 47-54.

The reason for the similarity of these narrative frameworks comes from the similarity of the major question asked by each scholar, as Hulbert and Griffis also asked "Why did Korea fail to survive as an independent nation while Japan succeeded?" The tradition of contrasting Japan with Korea, or showing Japan as an exception that broke away from other "Asiatic ways" was compatible with the narrative frameworks developed by postwar scholars of Korean history, which needed to emphasize Japan's successful modernization as contrasted with the other two nations. Furthermore, the discourse of failure developed during the early twentieth century, which organized Korean history in a way to explain Korea's "current failure", was also useful for postwar scholars who wanted to look at why Korea failed to achieve modernization. Another reason for this compatibility actually comes from modernization theory itself. Dean C. Tipps pointed out how modernization theory still continued to be motivated by "the self-confidence of ethnocentric achievement", though it discarded the racism of the biological school of evolutionary theory. Its terminology also changed: for example, blatantly ethnocentric terms such as "civilized" and "barbarism" were regarded as unacceptable and were replaced by more neutral terms such as "modernity" and "tradition" even while it evaluated the progress of nations by their proximity to the institutions and values of Anglo-American societies.[441] Tipps further noted that it was still deeply rooted in the perspective of developmentalism that was firmly established in Western social science by the end of the nineteenth century.[442]

---

[441] Tipps, "Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study of Societies," 206.

[442] Tipps, "Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study of Societies," 209.

A possible route through which the American missionaries' view was transmitted to Reischauer can be traced through Shannon McCune's book, *Korea's Heritage: A Regional and Social Geography,* one of the three books Reischauer listed in the bibliography of the chapter on Korea.[443] Shannon McCune's book has two chapters which are essentially a brief sketch of Korean history based on Homer B. Hulbert's *History of Korea*, as well as his own brother George M. McCune's *Korea Today*—he made frequent reference and directly and indirectly quoted from the latter book.[444] Shannon McCune's narrative framework is similar to the American missionaries' narrative framework that he referred to. He described seventh century Korea as the golden period of early Korean civilization before it became decadent,[445] and the fifteenth century as one of momentous cultural advances, with the inventions of the Korean alphabet and metal movable type (which was not emphasized in Hatada's book).[446] He found that factionalism was a dominant factor in Korean court life, and was based on less substantial causes among the homogenous people, while directly quoting George M. McCune[447] that factionalism along with Korea's resistance to outside change were the major causes of Korea's failure to react

---

[443] Reischauer listed three books for the chapter on Korea: Shannon McCune, *Korea's Heritage: A Regional and Social Geography* (Rutland, Vermont and Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Co., 1956); Cornelius Osgood, *The Koreans and their Culture* (New York: Ronald Press, 1951); and In-sob Zong, *Folktales from Korea* (London: Routeledge and Kegan Paul, 1952).

[444] Hulbert, *History of Korea*; George M. McCune, *Korea Today* (Boston, Harvard University Press, 1950); McCune, *Korea's Heritage*, 200.

[445] McCune, *Korea's Heritage*, 29.

[446] McCune, *Korea's Heritage*, 31.

[447] McCune, *Korea's Heritage*, 25.

to the Western challenge in the late nineteenth century.[448] This also resembled the conclusion of McCune's dissertation that Korean isolationism and the Korean people' tendency to resist change meant it was incapable of surviving as an independent nation during the late nineteenth century.[449]

Reischauer distanced himself from the precolonial writings on Korean history: references in his bibliography were all from the postcolonial period, and he referred to Hatada's book as his main source in the preface despite the difference in their narrative frameworks. Reischauer embodied a postwar tone in declaring that it was useless to look for reasons for Korea's extreme stability as a result of racial or national characteristics,[450] and in not using the term "hermit kingdom."[451] Also, despite the similarities in the narrative framework, it was reconfigured in a way to fit the specific postwar political needs which emphasized Korea as a distinct variation of Chinese civilization in order to contrast both countries with Japan. However, the various themes which were academically developed during the 1930s and the 1940s by the missionaries' children, such as the Korean resistance to change, started to be used more in the postwar narrative framework's

---

[448] McCune, *Korea's Heritage*, 33-35.

[449] Reischauer's personal relationship with McCune also might have influenced his knowledge of Korean history. They came up with the McCune-Reischauer system in 1939. (Edwin O. Reischuaer, George M. McCune, "Romanization of Korean Language Based upon its Phonetic Structure," *Transactions of Korea Branch of Royal Asiatic Society* 29 (1939):1-55.

[450] Reischauer, Fairbank and Craig, *East Asia: The Great Tradition*, 448.

[451] The term "hermit" was included in almost every book on Korea written in English during the colonial period, whereas McCune during the 1940s described it as "desire to be isolated" or as "satisfaction of the Korean mind with the status quo," (George M. McCune, "Korean Relations with China and Japan, 1800-1864," 259.)

emphasis on the Yi dynasty's longevity and stability, revealing a continuity despite the epistemological break in the postwar academia.

Establishment of Korean Studies in the U.S. and its focus and themes in the 1960s

Most scholars referred to Edward W. Wagner's appointment to the Harvard University as a tenure-track professor of Korean Studies in 1959 as the beginning of the Korean Studies field in the United States.[452] Reischauer received funding from the Rockefeller Foundation to establish Korean Studies at Harvard University and invited Wagner to teach Korean history.[453] The period following the mid-1950s witnessed the growing role of Korean-born scholars who were involved in research on Korean-related topics in the United States academia, whose dissertations were finished during the 1960s.[454] Korean language programs were established at Harvard and University of Washington by Doo-Soo Suh. Yale and Columbia University also had Korean language programs. However, until the 1960s, Korean Studies remained an appendage to either Chinese or Japanese Studies, as it was difficult to get funding from either the U.S. government or foundations such as Ford, Rockefeller and Carnegie who were willing to provide grants to support Chinese or Japanese, but not Korean Studies.[455]

---

[452] Duncan, "Migungnae Han'guk chŏn'gŭndaesa yŏn'gu tonghyang," 171; Em, "Migungnae han'guk kŭndaesa yŏn'gu tonghyang," 192; Yuh, "The Historiography of Korea in the United States," 130.

[453] Chang, "Raishawŏ, Tongasia, Kwŏllyŏk/Chisik ŭi Tekŭnoloji," 89.

[454] Nahm, "The Development of Korean Studies in the United States," 14-15.

[455] Nahm, "The Development of Korean Studies in the United States," 16.

Andrew Nahm pointed out that it was during the mid-1960s that Korean Studies started to exist as an independent field, and that the Vietnam War and the Peace Corps program increased the general interest in Asia, which affected the growth of both Asian Studies and Korean Studies at universities. The growth of Korean Studies during the mid 1960s can be seen from how the Committee on Korean Studies was created within the Association of Asian Studies in 1966,[456] and how Ford Foundation grants totaling $565,000 were made in 1967 to promote Korean Studies programs at major universities.[457]

The dissertations in Korean Studies that were completed during the 1960s reflected the historical context in which East Asian Studies were under the influence of the ongoing Cold War as well as modernization theory. Their focus was mostly on premodern history and political science.[458] Political scientists, reflecting the power dynamics of the 1960s between the United States and the Soviet Union, focused on communist movements or nationalist movements in Korea, which were directly related to the interests of the Cold War regimes.[459] Focus on premodern history was also closely related to Cold War dynamics and modernization theory. As discussed in the previous section, modernization theory looked for particular adaptive cultural traits or institutions that could have worked as

---

[456] The Korean section in the Association of Asian Studies Conference was scheduled in 1960, and in 1961, there was a Korean section meeting, but until 1966, no Korean section was scheduled. (Nahm, "The Development of Korean Studies in the United States," 17, 25.)

[457] The recipient institutions were Harvard, Columbia, University of Hawaii, Princeton, and University of Washington which received $100,000 each; $65,000 was given to SSRC to promote Korean Studies in the United States (Nahm, "The Development of Korean Studies in the United States," 19-20).

[458] Among the 68 dissertations published in 1968 and 1969, 17 were history, 13 were political science, 10 were on sociology, and less than five dissertations were in the fields of international relations, language and literature, economics and education (Nahm, "The Development of Korean Studies in the United States," 24).

[459] Duncan, "Migungnae Han'guk chŏn'gŭndaesa yŏn'gu tonghyang," 171-172.

the mediator of social change, such as Japan's feudalism discussed by Reischauer. It was essential to study the premodern social and political institutions in order to create a narrative of modernization. It is also important to note that Korean Studies in the United States was following in the footsteps of Japanese Studies and Chinese Studies in terms of framework and focus. As Nahm pointed out in 1970, "studies in the problems of Korea's modernization process cannot be adequately made without proper understanding and appreciation of her historical and cultural traditions," and he further pointed out that Japanese and Chinese Studies in the United States were also built on such foundations of historical research laid by Fairbank and Reischauer.[460]

Modernization theory further guided and inspired the topics that these early historians focused on. As Harootunian discussed, as modernization theory drove scholars to focus only on what caused or hindered the modernization of each nation, it precluded scholars from researching any other possible topics.[461] Furthermore, it drove scholars to look for a particularity, rather than any universal aspect of human society from its history, in order to explain the modernization process, or what hindered the process. Scholars of Korean history, therefore, looked for the reason of Korea's failures from its particular political and social institutions.

Em discussed how the first-generation scholars of Korean Studies were influenced by Fairbank's framework of "Western challenge and East Asia's reaction," and Reischauer's use of modernization theory, in asking why Korea failed to reach

---

[460] Nahm, "The Development of Korean Studies in the United States," 33.

[461] Harootunian, *The Empire's New Clothes*, 83.

modernization compared to Japan, who succeeded in modernizing through the Meiji Restoration.[462] According to Em, first-generation scholars of Korean Studies, working on the premise that the Meiji Restoration functioned as a smooth transition from premodern to modern society, also looked for such attempts in Korean history.[463] However, they could not find anything like the Meiji Restoration in Korean history, and the accumulated historical research from the prewar period pointed to how Korea failed to make any "important" social changes in its history that could contribute to modernization. Therefore, their research often ended up explaining why Korea, unlike Japan, could not achieve peaceful transition to modern society, and looked for the reasons within its particular political/social institutions.

Analysis of dissertations on Korean premodern history completed during the 1960s reflect this trend of looking at the problems of political institutions that hindered the cultivation of adaptability in Korean history. Naturally, factionalism among the elites of the Chosŏn dynasty became an important issue as it not only hindered progress toward modernity but also reflected the rigidity of Korea's political institutions. Key P. Yang and Gregory Henderson, in their influential article "An Outline History of Korean Confucianism Part 1: The early period and Yi factionalism," discussed the nature of Confucianism in the Yi dynasty and how it related to factionalism. Contrasting Korea's geographical condition to that of China, Yang and Henderson argued that it made Confucianism in the Yi dynasty a "more rigorous, less qualified, less escapable political

[462] Em, "Migungnae han'guk kŭndaesa yŏn'gu tonghyang," 193-194.

[463] Em, "Migungnae han'guk kŭndaesa yŏn'gu tonghyang," 194.

experience" in Korea than in its Chinese homeland.[464] Factionalism was exacerbated by the Confucian notion of legitimacy but more by the "native Korean stress on the purity of the bloodline,"[465] which had been emphasized since the Silla and Koryŏ periods.[466] They concluded that the factional struggle had "much to do with the nature of Korea's response to the West," as the factionalism that not only prevented foreign ideas and Christianity from influencing society, but also created "weakness and disunity" that were exploited by the West in the late nineteenth century.[467] This article reflected the framework that was seen in Reischauer's writings, such as viewing Korea as more rigid due to its native substructure that emphasized bloodline and status, as well as emphasizing factionalism as the symbol of Korean rigidity that prevented Korea from reacting successfully when faced with the Western challenge.

A more influential and representative work on the Chosŏn period and its elites was Edward W. Wagner's dissertation, finished in 1959. Wagner's research questions in the dissertation were "Why did factional lines of conflict come to be drawn as they were? Why did Yi dynasty factional divisions so rigidify? Why did factionalism become institutionalized in the later half of the Yi dynasty and prove so stubbornly resistant to efforts to eradicate it?"[468] In other words, on the premise that the factional divisions

---

[464] Key P. Yang, and Gregory Henderson, "An Outline History of Korean Confucianism Part 1: The Early Period and Yi Factionalism," *The Journal of Asian Studies*, vol 18. No. 1 (November 1958): 94.

[465] Yang and Henderson, "An Outline History of Korean Confucianism," 98.

[466] Yang and Henderson, "An Outline History of Korean Confucianism," 92.

[467] Yang and Henderson, "An Outline History of Korean Confucianism," 97-98.

[468] Edward W. Wagner, "The Literati Purges: Case Studies in the Factionalism of the Early Yi dynasty" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1959), iii.

rigidified and were resistant to changes during the later Chosŏn period, and that the state grew "increasingly rigid and reached a state of near solidity" by the time of Taewŏn'gun,[469] Wagner looked at the earlier period's four literati purges that formed the basis of the factionalism during the Yi dynasty, and placed the purges in the larger framework of the general problems of factionalism.[470] While he could not find a direct connection, he still pointed out that through the four literati purges, the censoring organs steadily gained power as they conflicted with the more highly constituted authority of the government, but the censoring organs eventually became a mere instrument of power.[471]

In answering his own question, asking what circumstances contributed to the occurrence of factionalism and why it manifested in such ways, Wagner pointed out that it came from a tradition that placed strict limitations upon the royal authority, which continued from the unification of the Silla period. In addition, the ruling yangban class preserved an unusually high degree of continuity in dominating privileges and created an equilibrium. Wagner's research departed from the prewar studies on factionalism and that of Reischauer in that it searched for the reasons for factionalism from the inherent conflict within the institution, rather than "personal animosity and jealousy" or "personal aggrandizement" as it was often described during the colonial period.[472] In many ways, Wagner's view reflected the framework of Reischauer, especially in focusing on the

---

[469] Wagner, "The Literati Purges," ii.

[470] Wagner, "The Literati Purges," vi-vii.

[471] Wagner, "The Literati Purges," 428-431.

[472] Wagner considered the perspectives that looked at Yi dynasty factionalism as coming from desire for personal aggrandizement to be simple and harsh, thus differentiating his own approach from the studies of prewar period (Wagner, "The Literati Purges," iii).

reasons for longevity and continuity of the dynasty and in pointing out the Korean native institutions of weak kingship and strong aristocracy as the reason for Korea's inadaptability to the Western challenge.[473]

Even scholars who studied the earlier time periods of Korean history supported the idea that weak kingship and strong aristocracy existed as a particular political pattern in the peninsula since the unification of Silla and through the Koryŏ period, by looking for the origins of this pattern as well as of the factionalism. Chong Sun Kim, for example, examined the political and economic institutions in Silla, and traced the origin of factional struggle from the Silla period. Kim defined the political dynamic of Silla as "multi-centered despotism" in which the autocracy, bureaucracy, and aristocracy conflicted; whenever the king attempted to claim state ownership of land which could have transformed Silla's communal economy to a "higher" economic or social order, it was met by challenges from the aristocracy who desired to own the land. The merging of aristocracy and Chinese-style bureaucracy created "quasi-feudalism" which further limited and frustrated the power of king, and caused factional strife.[474] Kim further argued that this pattern of the kings' attempts and the aristocracy's opposition and the creation of "quasi-feudal" formation became a pattern of Korean political life, which was reproduced with each new dynastic cycle, therefore it continued throughout the Koryŏ and Chosŏn periods.[475] Despite the new

---

[473] It could also be that Wagner influenced Reischauer in writing the chapter on Korea, as Reischauer stated in the preface of *East Asia: the Great Tradition* that he relied on the revision by Wagner and Yi Pyŏng-do. (Reischauer, Fairbank, and Craig, *East Asia Great Tradition*, vii).

[474] Chong Sun Kim, "The Emergence of Multi-Centered Despotism in the Silla Kingdom: A Study of the Origins of Factional Struggles in Korea" (PhD. Diss., University of Washington, 1965), 517-521.

[475] Kim provided a diagram of how the dynastic cycle under multi-centered despotism was reproduced and

concept and framework, however, Kim actually followed Reischauer's narrative framework very closely in discussing how the strong native aristocracy based on Silla's Bone-rank tradition conflicted with the Chinese bureaucratic system that Korea imitated,[476] and how the irreconcilable aristocracy and centralized bureaucracy had to co-exist, which created a "peculiar political pattern" that not only weakened and frustrated the kingship, but also gave rise to factionalism.[477] Furthermore, Kim also discussed how through the process of Chinese acculturation, Korea became a "replica of Chinese society" which suffered under a "yoke of social immobility and economic inflexibility,"[478] and how the dependency on China hindered the development of the feudal stage, unlike Japan which had a distinct feudal stage.[479]

Hugh W. Kang studied the ruling elites of the early Koryŏ period, focusing on their continuity from the Silla aristocracy. He argued that Silla aristocracy not only influenced the establishment of Koryŏ political structure and the adoption of Confucianism and Chinese government system, which made the Koryŏ government retain many salient features of the Silla political tradition,[480] he found the Silla social order was essentially preserved in Koryŏ with minimal changes.[481] According to Kang, the Privy Council of

---

frustrated. (Kim, "The Emergence of Multi-Centered Despotism," 518.)

[476] Kim, "The Emergence of Multi-Centered Despotism," 520)

[477] Kim, "The Emergence of Multi-Centered Despotism," 442.)

[478] Kim, "The Emergence of Multi-Centered Despotism," 522).

[479] Kim, "The Emergence of Multi-Centered Despotism," 435).

[480] Hugh W. Kang, "The Development of the Korean Ruling Class from Late Silla to Early Koryŏ" (PhD diss., University of Washington, 1964).

[481] Kang, "The Development of the Korean Ruling Class," 305.

Koryŏ was an embodiment of the tradition of "collective leadership" represented in Hwabaek Council from the Silla period,[482] and the ruling stratum sought to maintain the cohesiveness of the group through endogamy, unanimity of opinion, and restrictions in eligibility for the key positions in the government.[483] Kang's language was much more reserved than Kim's in judging whether this aspect contributed to Korea's stasis, but he also showed a similar perspective in characterizing the Koryŏ political institutions as "weak kingship, and strong aristocracy," and in finding the root of this political pattern to come from the Silla tradition, as well as in arguing that Silla aristocracy renewed their old authority in the Koryŏ period and continued to rule as elites. This tendency to focus on the unchanging aspect of the political and social institutions, as well as the continuity of the elite class for a thousand years, contributed to the view of Korean history as unchanging and static, and contributed in strengthening the overall narrative of how Korea failed to react to the Western challenge.

Meanwhile, C. I. Eugene Kim and Hankyo Kim's book, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism, 1876-1910*,[484] analyzed the last three decades before colonization. As postwar historians, they held a critical perspective against Japanese colonialism in general, depicting it as a repression. However, the book still focused on Korea' inability to protect its own national independence and found the reason in its history. While discussing how Japanese imperialism made Korea's position precarious, Kim and Kim argued that the

---

[482] Kang, "The Development of the Korean Ruling Class," 294-295.

[483] Kang, "The Development of the Korean Ruling Class," 302.

[484] Chong Ik Eugene Kim and Hankyo Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism, 1876-1910* (Berkeley: University of California, Press 1967).

colonization of Korea came from its "own inability to bring about transformation in society to meet the changing needs." This inability came from the king's weak and ineffective leadership and factionalism that "plagued the Yi dynasty for at least three centuries."[485] They stated that there was no resilience or adaptability in the Korean political system, and how the strong traditionalism, coming from "rigid stratification of the society reinforced by the orthodox Confucianism," prevented any possibility of revolution in the society. In describing factionalism, they followed the prewar tendency to extend the time period of factionalism to the late nineteenth century Catholic persecution, and interpreted Korea's dependency on China, Russia, and Japan on the eve of its colonization as coming out of this factional strife.[486]

These dissertations and books written during the 1960s, while looking at different time periods, all contributed in strengthening the narrative framework that emphasized the unchanging nature of Korean premodern history, as well as its inadaptability and rigidity that resulted in a failure to respond to the Western challenge. Modernization theory inspired them to examine the structure and function of political/social institutions, but historians failed to find either feudal order or adaptable elites like in Japanese history. Instead, they found Korean elites' strong adherence to orthodox Confucianism, sadaejuŭi, and factionalism. Modernization theory also inspired them to look for the particular cultural pattern that may have contributed to its modernization or failure to achieve modernization. Similar to Reischauer's version of Korean history, scholars in Korean Studies found the

[485] Kim and Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism*, 220.

[486] Kim and Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism*, 220-221.

particularity of Korean premodern history in its strong aristocracy, its obsession with bloodline, and strict social cleavages between the aristocracy and the rest. This strong aristocracy resulted in the weak kingship, and became a political pattern of Korean history from Silla period and lasted until late nineteenth century. The strong aristocracy and the weak kingship also resulted in the longevity of dynasties, strict social cleavages between the aristocracy and the common people, and factionalism among the elites which hindered major changes throughout its history.

The search for particularity was encouraged by modernization theory in general. But most importantly, it was related to the precarious position of the Korean Studies in the United States, namely that it was marginalized. In order to carve out their own space within the East Asian Studies field, as well as to secure funding from the government and foundations, Korean Studies scholars had to argue the importance of researching Korean civilization, so emphasizing the particularity of Korean history distinguished it from the larger Chinese history proved its worth as a topic of study.

This very postwar knowledge of Korean history, however, was also compatible with the accumulated research of Japanese colonial scholarship, especially as related to themes of stasis, heteronomy, and factionalism. It is true that postwar scholars during the 1960s distanced themselves from Japanese colonial scholarship, noting their proclivity to write in favor of the Japanese colonial regime. However, in constructing new narrative frameworks of Korean history, the scholars did not have much source material available to them, especially for secondary sources. Japanese colonial scholarship, however, provided accumulated research on the topics they were studying, mostly positivist historical research

that did not contradict their own work. For this reason, many postwar scholars in the United States referred to Japanese colonial scholarship in their research, and some Japanese colonial historical interpretations were incorporated into their works. For example, both Yang and Henderson, as well as Wagner referred to Sin Sŏk-ho's article. Wagner stated that the debt he owed to Sin Sŏk-ho's article on the literati purges was substantial, and especially in selecting problems and issues for the discussion he deviated little from the choices made by Sin.[487] Yang and Henderson used Sin's article to explain the early Chosŏn literati purges, stating that it was from this framework that factionalism of the later Chosŏn period was born.[488] Yang and Henderson also referred to Oda Shogo regarding the struggle of 1575.[489] Chong Sun Kim, in discussing sadaejuŭi, referred to Shikata Hiroshi's article for the detailed analysis.[490] Kim discussed how saedaejuŭi emerged during the Silla period and contributed to both Koryŏ and Chosŏn becoming a "political and physical habit" of the Korean ruling class which lasted for "1200 years" and made Korea more "stubbornly

---

[487] Wagner, "The Literati Purges," ix.; Wagner also mentioned Seno Umakura and Kawai Hirotami's works as having inspired him in the beginning stages of his research, but then called those works "limited" and declared that he did not refer to them in his own work. He also mentioned Oda Shogo and Shidehara Hiroshi, but pointed out that they did not utilize Sillok materials and were quite "cursory" (Wagner, "The Literati Purges," viii.). On the other hand, Sin's articles made use of Sillok as published through Chosenshi. Sin's articles that Wagner made use of were "Chosen Seisho jidai no shinkyu tairitsu [The Conflict between the incoming and the established officials in the time of Sŏngjong," Kindai Chosŏnshi Kenkyu, Keijo: *Chosenshi Henshukai Kenkyu isan* 1, 1944; 303-406. and "Kibo Shika [Kimyo Sahwa] no yurai ni kansuru ichi kosatsu [A Study on the genesis of the literati purge of 1519," *Seikyu Gakuso*, 20, (May 1940), 1-49.

[488] Yang and Henderson, "An Outline History of Korean Confucianism," 95; Sin, "Kibo Shika no yurai ni kansuru ichi kosatsu," 1-49.

[489] Yang and Henderson, "An Outline History of Korean Confucianism," 96; Shogo Oda, *Richo Toso Gaiyo* [A General Outline of Yi Dynasty Factionalism,] p. 40.

[490] Kim, "The Emergence of Multi-Centered Despotism," 434); Shikata Hiroshi, "Kyurai no Chosen Shakai no Rekishiteki Seikaku ni tsuite [On the historical nature of the previous Chosen society]," *Chosen Gakubo* 1, (1951).

opposed the adoption of Western technology than did China" in the nineteenth century.[491] The bibliography of these dissertations listed works of Japanese colonial scholars such as Ikeuchi Hiroshi, Imanishi Ryu, Suematsu Yasukazu, Takahashi Toru, Tsuda Soukichi, Tabohashi Kiyoshi, and Okudaira Takehiko just to name a few.[492] Even though their use was mostly limited to the factual information, considering how it was framed within themes of stasis, heteronomy, and factionalism, these works were actually compatible with the postwar emphasis on the Korean dynasty's stability, longevity, social rigidity, inadaptability, and resistance to change. It is not surprising that postwar scholars in the 1960s found the Japanese colonial scholarship useful, especially because there were not many sources in English or Korean they could refer to.

They did refer to books in English which were available to them, most importantly Hulbert's *History of Korea,* which was edited and republished by C. N. Weems in 1962,[493] and McCune's and Noble's articles, as well as Nelson's book from the prewar period. Hulbert's book was listed in the bibliography of the dissertations written by Hugh Kang, Chong Sun Kim, as well as C. I. Eugene Kim and Hankyo Kim. Chong Sun Kim, for

---

[491] Kim, "The Emergence of Multi-Centered Despotism," 436-440.

[492] Yang and Henderson used Suematsu Yasukazu in tracing important dates during the Three Kingdoms period and in discussing how Confucianism was subordinate to Buddhism during the Koryŏ period (Suematsu Yasukazu's *Shirago Shi no Shomondai* [Various Problems in the History of Silla] (Tokyo: Toyo Bunko, 1954); Yang and Henderson, "An Outline History of Korean Confucianism," 84), and used Takahashi Toru in discussing how Confucianism gradually filled the void of Buddhism in the Chosŏn period, and Sin Sŏk-ho and Oda Shogo in explaining factionalism, as discussed above. (Takahashi Toru, "Chosen Jugaku Taikan [A general survey of Korean Confucianism]" in *Takahashi Toru Chosen Jugaku Ronshu*, ed. Kawahara Hideki and Kim Kwangnae (Tokyo: Chisen Shokan, 2011 [1927]); Yang and Henderson, "An Outline History of Korean Confucianism," 90.) Chong Sun Kim and Hugh Kang also made use of Ikeuchi Hiroshi, Imanishi Ryu and Suematsu Yasukazu, along with postwar scholars such as Hatada Takashi and Fujita Ryosaku.

[493] Homer B. Hulbert, *History of Korea*, ed. Clarence Norwood Weems (London: Routeledge and K. Paul, 1962

example, cited Hulbert and also adopted Hulbert's historical interpretation when stating that the dead weight of the Chinese institutional influence and blind respect for Chinese customs "stifled" the creative endeavor and indigenous character of the Korean people.[494] C. I. Eugene Kim and Hankyo Kim made use of Nelson's book as well as McCune's and Noble's works in tracing the roots of Korea's dependency on the foreign powers to sadaejuŭi. Relying on Nelson, they explained the Chinese-Korea relations to be an "extension of interpersonal relations within a family" in which China took the position of "elder brother."[495] They further discussed how Korea isolated itself due to the foreign invasions and relative military weakness, referring to McCune's and Noble's articles.[496] They argued that sadaejuŭi was not only an embodiment of the suzerain-dependent relationship but also became a "mental fixation" over the "course of centuries" which shaped the Korean response to the Western challenge, namely, to seek foreign protectors and manipulate external relations rather than carrying out any internal reforms.[497]

Scholars used Hulbert's book primarily because it was one of the few English language sources that were available to them. However, as discussed in the first chapter, Hulbert's book also contained early Japanese interpretation of Korea's stasis and

---

[494] Kim, "The Emergence of Multi-Centered Despotism," 577. Hulbert stated that the "ponderous load of Chinese civilization was laid upon Korea like incubus" which caused intellectual and moral stagnation (Hulbert, *Passing of Korea*, 33).

[495] Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders in Eastern Asia*; Kim and Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism*, 12-13.

[496] Noble, "The United States and Sino-Korean Relations," 292-304; George M. McCune, "Exchanges of envoys between Korea and Japan during the Tokugawa period," *Far Eastern Quarterly* 5 (May 1946): 308-325; Kim and Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism*, 13.

[497] Kim and Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism*, 222.

factionalism, as well as the negative influence of Chinese civilization that stifled the Korea's creativity. Significantly, Hulbert's content did not conflict with the postwar narrative framework, which emphasized the longevity and stability of the dynasty. Therefore, the old themes of stagnation, heteronomy, and factionalism were still useful. This compatibility, as well as the transnational circulation of the themes among Japanese, Korean, and American intellectuals that gave the knowledge an objective exterior, made it possible for the prewar colonial themes of Korean history to be incorporated into the early postwar knowledge of Korean history.

Use of Korean history as supplement to the history of China-Korea relations

Korean Studies at Harvard attempted to emphasize the particularity of Korean history, represented by the stability and longevity of the dynasty, in order to argue the importance of studying Korean history. Meanwhile, several scholars from the University of California at Berkeley were using another strategy to emphasize the need to study Korean history, namely that Korean primary sources could supplement the history of China-Korea relations because it contained records that were often missing in Chinese primary sources. The University of California at Berkeley established its Korean language program in 1943, and George M. McCune started teaching Korean history in 1946.[498] But it was Michael Rogers who shaped the research direction of Korean Studies at Berkeley. Rogers started out

[498] John Lie, "The Tangun Myth and Korean Studies in the United States," *Transnational Asia* 1, no. 4 (Dec 2016): 6. Lie challenges the widely accepted assumption that Wagner was the founding father of Korean Studies in the United States and argues that the University of California at Berkeley was also a significant center of Korean Studies. While not agreeing entirely with his polemics against the Wagner-Palais line, I agree that Berkeley scholars had a ~~slightly~~ somewhat different approach from the Harvard scholars.

as a scholar of Chinese, Tibetan, and Mongolian history but later extended his research focus to Koryŏ's relations to Sung, Liao, and Chin. He taught scholars such as John C. Jamieson and Gari Ledyard, who also delved into the issue of diplomatic relations of premodern Korea, arguing for the need to study Korea in order to have a more accurate picture of relations among the states of East Asia. Jamieson focused on Silla's diplomatic relations with the Tang, while Gari Ledyard explored the Koryŏ-Mongol relations, as well as the invention of the Korean alphabet during the Chosŏn period. As their focus was only on the diplomatic relations, these scholars were relatively free from the task of creating an overall narrative framework of Korean history, and also from the influence of missionaries' narrative framework from the prewar period. However, their choice of topic and emphasis also shows that their works were compatible with the prevalent narrative framework of the time. This section will explore the work of Rogers, Jamieson, and Ledyard, and examine their approaches, their epistemological break from the prewar period, as well as the enduring influences from the prewar period.

Michael Rogers wrote various articles on Korea's relations with China and other northern frontier states during the Koryŏ period.[499] One of his most influential works was the research on Koryŏ-Chin relations.[500] Writing against the interpretation that regarded Koryŏ-Chin relations of the twelfth century as a mere extension of Koryŏ-Liao relations

[499] Rogers' research on Koryŏ's diplomatic relations during the late 1950s and early 1960s includes but is not limited to the following: Michael C. Rogers, "Sung-Koryŏ Relations: Some Inhibiting Factors," *Oriens* 11, no. 1 (Dec 1958): 194-202; Michael C. Rogers, "Factionalism and Koryŏ Policy under the Northern Sung," *Journal of American Oriental Society* 79, no. 1 (Jan 1959):16-25.

[500] Michael C. Rogers, "Studies in Korean History," *T'oung Pao*, Second Series, 47-1 (1959): 30-62; Michael C. Rogers, "The Regularization of Koryŏ-Chin Relations (1116-1131)," *Central Asiatic Journal* 6, no. 1 (1961): 51-84.

from the eleventh century set out by Seno Umakuma,[501] Rogers argued that the idea of a routine transfer to the Chin is an over-simplification because the regularization of Koryŏ's relation with the Chin signified a new beginning of Koryŏ's positioning of itself within East Asia.[502] Examining the different characteristics of Koryŏ's relations to Liao, Sung, and Chin, according to their own historical context, as well as Koryŏ's domestic political ideological changes, Rogers further argued that the regularization of Koryŏ-Chin relations brought to the surface a heresy against the prevailing Confucian orthodoxy, represented by Myoch'ŏng's rebellion,[503] which made Koryŏ's international status and stance toward the northern state a matter of controversy in the Koryŏ court. With Myoch'ŏng's failure to persuade the court, Rogers argued, Koryŏ forged an ideological underpinning of posture toward the Chin which lasted until the advent of Mongols.[504]

Rogers' studies of Koryŏ's diplomatic relations showed an epistemological break from the other American works represented by McCune and Nelson, who described Korea's relationship to China as "ceremonial" or an "extension of brotherly relations," and who flatly viewed that their "sadae juŭi" lasted for several centuries without significant change.[505] According to Rogers, Koryŏ's "sadae" was interpreted as a diplomatic strategy,

---

[501] Umakuma Seno, *Chosenshi Taikei: Chuseishi* (Keijo: Chosenshi Gakkai, 1929).

[502] Rogers, "The Regularization of Koryŏ-Chin Relations," 55.

[503] Rogers, "The Regularization of Koryŏ-Chin Relations," 68.

[504] One of the interesting things about his article is that, while he listed Yi Pyŏngdo and Ikeuchi Hiroshi as references for the process of Myochŏng's rebellion, he referred to Sin Ch'aeho and Yi Sŏnkŭn in interpreting an influential nativist ideology with a lineage that goes back to the animistic-militaristic tradition of hwarang. (Yi Pyŏng-do, "Myosei no Sento Undo ni Tsuite no Ichi Kosatsu," Shigaku Zasshi 38 (Sep 1927): 874-906; Seno Umakuma, "Korai Myosei no Ran ni Tsuite," Toyo Gakubo 18, no. 2 (Dec 1929): 245-276; Sin Ch'aeho, *Chosŏnsa Yŏn'guch'o* (Seoul: 1946), Yi Sŏn-kŭn, *Hwarangdo Yŏngu,* (Seoul: 1954).

[505] Rogers still listed Nelson and Fairbank as references for the tributary relations (Rogers, "The

in contrast to Nelson's and McCune's view of it as "a habit of subservience to a stronger power extending over centuries."[506] Rogers pointed out how Koryŏ came up with diplomatic strategies to benefit itself. For example, he discussed how Koryŏ turned the Liao-Chin conflict to advantage by asserting claims to the territory of Pao-Chou (modern day Ŭiju), which was a strategically important city, and how Koryŏ gained it by establishing tributary relations with the Chin.[507] Rogers further emphasized that it was Koryŏ who cut relations with the Sung, which was an informed decision, as they knew about the Sung's precarious situation by envoy missions.[508] In pointing out Koryŏ's agency in these relations, and looking at Koryŏ's relations to northern states separately rather than lumping them together, Rogers' work was very different from the prewar studies of Korea's relations to China and other northern states.

The same strategy of looking at Korean agency in analyzing the China-Korea relations, and of emphasizing the need to study Korean history by arguing how its primary sources contains what Chinese sources do not, is deployed by John C. Jamieson in his works on Silla's relations with Tang China. Jamieson, who received a doctoral degree from Berkeley in 1969 as a student of Michael Rogers, wrote a dissertation on how Silla's King Munmu successfully repulsed the Tang to maintain the newly unified territories'

Regularization of Koryŏ-Chin Relations," 51).

[506] Nelson, *Korea and the Old Orders*, 294.

[507] Rogers, "The Regularization of Koryŏ-Chin Relations," 58.

[508] Rogers, "The Regularization of Koryŏ-Chin Relations," 63, 70-72.

integrity.[509] Jamieson stated in his preface that it was Rogers who suggested this project.[510] Unsurprisingly, Jamieson used the same strategy of discussing how Korean primary sources provide a clear picture of what has been erased or toned down in Chinese sources, and of emphasizing Korean agency surrounding diplomatic issues with China. Jamieson pointed out how Tang China's setbacks in battles with Silla and Koguryŏ were erased in Chinese sources, while the Korean sources, notably Samguk Sagi, described them in detail.[511] Furthermore, his dissertation focused on Silla's diplomatic strategy in establishing tributary relations with Tang China; in specific, Silla aimed to perform as the "perfect tributary state" in order to earn Tang's favor and to alienate Paekche and Koguryŏ from the Tang court. Silla even made use of Tang's hostage system to implant personnel in the Tang court to work as an intermediary, a figure who not only worked as a strategist in matters regarding the peninsula but also served as a kind of intelligence agent to forewarn Silla of mainland military activities.[512] Jamieson also argued that Silla persuaded Tang to attack Paekche, and cut tributary relations with Tang when Koguryŏ collapsed and Tang attempted to expand further toward the peninsula. Jamieson concluded that the Silla-Tang coalition was "a marriage of convenience," because Tang needed Silla in order to subdue Koguryŏ, and Silla needed Tang to maintain itself as the sole power in the peninsula.[513]

---

[509] John C. Jamieson, "The Samguk Sagi and the Unification Wars," PhD diss., University of California at Berkeley, 1969.

[510] Jamieson, "The Samguk Sagi," v.

[511] Jamieson, "The Samguk Sagi," 78; John C. Jamieson, "Collapse of Tang-Silla Alliance – Chinese and Korean Accounts Compared," in *Nothing Concealed: Essays in Honor of Liu Yu-Yun* Occasional Series No. 4, ed. Frederick Wakeman (Taipei: Chinese Materials and Research Aids Service Center, 1970), 85.

[512] Jamieson, "The Samguk Sagi," 40-41

[513] Jamieson, "The Samguk Sagi," 50.

Jamieson, in this way, emphasizes Korean agency in establishing relations with Tang, by pointing out it was Silla's independent decision.[514]

Gari Ledyard, who was also taught by Michael Rogers at Berkeley,[515] is known for his dissertation on the invention of the Korean alphabet in the early Chosŏn period,[516] but he wrote his M.A. thesis on Koryŏ's relations with the Mongols, which was later published as an article.[517] His article was written in opposition to Naka Michiyo's interpretation that the publication of *The Secret History of the Mongols* occurred in 1240, and the description of Mongol campaigns against Korea in 1258 contained in that book was added later.[518] Ledyard, agreeing with Arthur Waley (who argued that the book was published in the later thirteenth century), stated that the publication date was 1264 at the earliest.[519] Even in this short article, Ledyard shows the same strategy of comparing both Chinese and Korean sources, and arguing that Korean sources can compensate for what is missing in Chinese sources, such as when he discusses how *Koryŏsa* can fill the picture by giving much information that is entirely new compared to the Chinese sources, and helps scholars to resolve contradictions and correct errors in the Chinese sources.[520]

---

514 Jamieson, "The Samguk Sagi," 78.

515 Gari Ledyard stated that Michal Rogers had a strong influence on him at Berkeley (see "An Interview with Gari Ledyard," *The Review of Korean Studies* 6, no. 1 (June 2003):143-185).

516 Gari K. Ledyard, "The Korean Language Reform of 1446," PhD diss., University of California at Berkeley, 1966.

517 Gari Ledyard, "The Mongol Campaigns in Korea and the Dating of 'The Secret History of the Mongols,'" *Central Asiatic Journal* 9, no. 1 (Mar 1964): 1-22.

518 Michiyo Naka, "Chingisu Kan jintsuroku zokuhen," in *Naka Michiyo Isho* (Tokyo: 1915), 62, 64; Ledyard, "The Mongol Campaigns," 1.

519 Ledyard, "The Mongol Campaign in Korea," 16.

520 Ledyard, "The Mongol Campaign in Korea," 3.

His dissertation, on the other hand, discussed what sources King Sejong and his scholars referred to in inventing the Korean alphabet, and argued that it was the Mongol 'phags-pa alphabet that was most influential. However, he was very careful in presenting this view, as he added that the role this Mongol script played was actually minor, and that the "features of Korean Script that are really admirable" or "most remarkable" are purely Korean in origin.[521] Ledyard's use of the term "reform" instead of "invention" signifies that it was Sejong's reform of the Korean political mind that accommodated the possibility of literacy among average Koreans.[522] He discussed how the yangban elites' attempt to stall the full implementation of the reform may make it look like a failure initially, but it was a success considering how within centuries it started to be used by the yangban elites themselves.[523] While he seems to place the "reform" in the background of the conflicts between the king and the yangban, he does not necessarily engage the theme of "weak kingship and strong aristocracy," and rather argues that the king's reform eventually worked.

Neither Jamieson nor Ledyard attempted to create an overall narrative framework of Korean history, which makes it difficult to see what historical narrative they were building their work upon. However, the fact that both explored the time period and topic that marked one of the flourishing periods in the Korean history in the missionary narrative framework shows that they were not exactly challenging the previous narrative but working

[521] Ledyard, "The Korean Language Reform of 1446," 17.

[522] "An Interview with Gari Ledyard," 159.

[523] Ledyard, "The Korean Language Reform of 1446," 18.

within its boundaries. In the same way that Korean independence movement activists during the 1920s adopted the missionaries' narrative framework in order to appeal to the English-reading public while highlighting the moments that showed Korea's "creativity," such as the glorious ancient past represented by Silla's remains in Kyŏngju, or the invention of the Korean alphabet, turtle ship, and metal movable type in the fifteenth century, both scholars engaged with topics that was easier for them to highlight Korea's agency and creativity. This can be seen from how Ledyard stated in later interview that he decided to study the making of Korean alphabet because it was "one of the greatest stories that Korea has to tell."[524]

Ledyard moved to Columbia University in 1964 to become a full-time professor of Korean history,[525] while Jamieson participated in establishing the East Asian Studies Center at Berkeley in 1978 as the director of the East Asia National Resource Center and the chair of the Center for Korean Studies. Benjamin H. Hazard and Warren W. Smith, known for translating Hatada's *Chosenshi* into English in 1969, also received doctoral degrees at Berkeley (in 1967 and 1972, respectively).[526] Hazard and Smith's preface on the translated *Chosenshi* shows that they consciously distanced themselves from the Japanese colonial scholarship as they examined how themes such as stagnation, heteronomy,

---

[524] "An Interview with Gari Ledyard," 156.

[525] Ledyard stated that he was first hired as a Chinese historical linguistics specialist, so he taught that for four years before becoming a full-time Korea specialist. ("Interview with Gari Ledyard," 174-175.) Ledyard mentored scholars such as Jahyun Kim Haboush and Andre Schmid (Lie, "Tangun and the Korean Studies in the United States," 7.)

[526] Benjamin H. Hazard, "Japanese Marauding in Medieval Korea: The Wako Impact on Late Koryŏ," PhD diss., University of California Berkeley, 1967; Warren William Smith, "The Rise of Sŏwŏn: Literary Academics in Sixteenth Century Korea," PhD diss., University of California, 1972.

Mansenshi, and *Nissen Dosouron* were developed in the colonial scholarship.[527] As for Hatada's work, Hazard and Smith praised Hatada's book for finding evidence of progress in Korean history, and pointed out that its focus on the changing social economic conditions, interrelations between structures of power, and control of land could supplement the "western language accounts of Korea up to present" that only focused on the political history and foreign invasions.[528] However, they criticized Hatada for not discussing the cultural achievements of the fifteenth century Yi dynasty, and mentioned Ledyard's dissertation as one that covers this aspect.[529] This shows what scholars in Berkeley regarded as important themes in the overall narrative framework of Korean history. They attempted to emphasize Korean agency in establishing relations with China and other northern states by discussing Silla and Koryŏ's diplomatic strategies. While the flourishing fifteenth century and creation of Korean alphabet were part of the missionaries' narrative framework, instead of contrasting it with how the uses were suppressed, Ledyard emphasized how it was ultimately successful.

Conclusion

During the 1970s, the field of Korean Studies was enriched because more scholars started to study Korean history, and the analysis became more sophisticated as more research accumulated. However, the early themes and narrative frameworks of the 1960s

[527] Benjamin H. Hazard and W. Warren Smith, "Translators' Preface," in *A History of Korea*, vii-ix.

[528] Hazard and Smith, "Translators' Preface," vi.

[529] Hazard and Smith, "Translator's Preface," ix.

continued to be influential to the researches on Korean premodern history during the 1970s, especially in discussion of the Chosŏn period.

James Palais's research on the stability of the Yi dynasty in Korea shows how he departed from these early versions of Korean history while inheriting the major narrative structure. Palais, in an influential article called "Stability in Yi Dynasty Korea: Equilibrium Systems and Marginal Adjustment,"[530] stated that longevity was an achievement of the Yi dynasty as it created a stable and self-sufficient society. He concluded this by analyzing the mechanisms of the political system ("equilibrium system") that created checks and balances by restraining the king's absolutism and surveilling the bureaucracy. He also analyzed the Yi dynasty's ability to make small institutional reforms ("marginal adjustments") which enabled them to maintain their system for such a long period of time.

Palais' view departed from the prewar notion of stability in Chosŏn, both in his approach of looking at the mechanism of government operation and in his assessment of the Yi dynasty, where he argued that it was actually successful in achieving its goal of maintaining harmony and secure, stable tax revenue. Palais also departed from Reischauer's narrative that depicted the last three hundred years of the Yi dynasty as being in a "state of near collapse." However, his discussion of stability was still positioned within a narrative framework that was designed to explain Chosŏn's failure to respond to the Western challenge, as can be seen from his conclusion that Chosŏn was only capable of making small adjustments and was "not capable of transforming rapidly" in the late

[530] James Palais, "Stability in Yi Dynasty Korea: Equilibrium Systems and Marginal Adjustment," *Occasional Papers on Korea,* no. 3 (June 1975): 1-18.

nineteenth century.[531] Furthermore, the goal that the Yi dynasty managed to achieve was positioned on the opposite side of the modern virtue,[532] explaining why despite its "success" of achieving the goal it still failed to change in the late nineteenth century.[533] In this way, the theme that Korea was resistant to change continued.

American scholarship of Korean Studies during the 1970s cannot be explained simply by the continuation of themes from the 1960s; theory became much more complicated and sophisticated during the 1970s and 1980s. Scholarship was also shaped in response to a new group of scholars emerging in South Korea during the mid-1960s, who criticized the Japanese colonial scholarship, and created what they termed "internal development theory," a narrative framework that depicted Korean history as a gradual progress toward the direction of a modern industrial and democratic society. These scholars attempted to find evidence of Korean modernity, such as "sprouts of capitalism," from Chosŏn society. Much influenced by Paek Nau-un's narrative framework, this school argued that Koreans had begun to develop a capitalist economic system during the Chosŏn period, and that new "modern" thinking had begun to arise among intellectuals, which was cut short by the Japanese colonial regime. This narrative framework, while effective in pointing out the influence of Japanese colonial scholarship and creating an influential counter-narrative against the dominant narrative framework, was also a product of

---

[531] Palais, "Stability in Yi Dynasty Korea," 18.

[532] Palais stated that the Yi dynasty was not interested in "social equality, freedom of the individual, total dedication to the state wealth and power, economic affluence, heightened consumption and raised living standard," but that its goal was to maintain stability and longevity (Palais, "Stability in Yi Dynasty Korea," 17).

[533] Palais, "Stability in Yi Dynasty Korea," 2.

modernization theory that imagined Korean history as a progress to western-style modernity. Attempts to find historical evidence of capitalism called for an over-stretching interpretation that made many American scholars discredit the achievement of this school and criticize their overtly nationalistic tone. It drove American scholars to re-examine the beginning of Japanese colonization,[534] and they continued to view the Chosŏn period as a rather unchanging time that was represented by strong aristocracy, emphasis on bloodline, and strict social cleavages. Unfortunately, it is out of the scope of this dissertation to discuss further how their intellectual interaction and conversation influenced Korean Studies in the United States over the next few decades.

As discussed above, Korean Studies in the United States was established during the 1960s with support from the government and private foundations, but it does not necessarily mean that these scholars were apologists for the United States's East Asian policy. It is well known that both Wagner and Palais criticized the American government in dealing with military coups and authoritarian regimes in South Korea during the 1960s.[535] They also did not think of themselves as connected to the Japanese colonial scholarship in any way. As can be seen from many cases during the prewar period, however, scholars were products of their own historical context and part of a larger intellectual discourse. They produced new knowledge on the built foundation of previously accumulated knowledge, regardless of their political disposition. The objective exterior of the academic knowledge, especially the positivist historians' works, made it easier to be incorporated into

[534] Yuh, "The Historiography of Korea in the United States," 131-132.

[535] Edward W. Wagner, "Failure in Korea," *Foreign Affairs* 40, no. 1, (Oct 1961): 128-135.

the postwar knowledge. Furthermore, transnationally constructed Japanese colonial scholarship did not fundamentally conflict with the American knowledge of Korea from the prewar period, which gave it further authority as "objective." In this unique historical situation—in which American-produced knowledge on Korea was scarce, except for the works constructed during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—Japanese colonial scholarship provided useful factual information as well as an established interpretation to the postwar scholars in the United States.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion

This dissertation broadened the scope of the study of the knowledge construction of Korea by taking a transnational perspective, and by looking at a long period of knowledge formation. Challenging the previous studies that only considered knowledge construction of Korea to be carried out by either Koreans themselves or Japanese, as their colonizer, this dissertation demonstrates that it was constructed by multiple national authors, including the Americans, who exchanged ideas by reading across national boundaries. This dissertation interweaves intellectual traditions together that until now have been examined separately. Focusing on American intellectuals, this dissertation traced how the themes and narrative framework of Korean history traveled from the time period when Korea was being produced as a nation, to the 1960s when knowledge of Korea in the United States was established, which eventually became one of the hegemonic knowledges of Korea.

The major argument of this dissertation is two-fold. First, it argues that the discipline of Korean Studies in the postwar United States was influenced by three major intellectual traditions: American missionaries' accounts of Korea, Japanese colonial scholarship, and the postwar modernization theory under Cold War politics. Using Foucault to look at these traditions as disconnected fields in which different power politics operated, and using White's notion of historical accounts as narratives, the dissertation traced how the narrative framework of Korean history was produced in each tradition, and how the themes

and narratives from American missionaries' accounts and Japanese colonial scholarship (such as a discourse of failure and themes of stagnation, heteronomy, and factionalism) were reconfigured in the postwar scholarship to serve a new function of supporting modernization theory. By doing so, it examined the connections among three different intellectual traditions that have been only examined separately to this point. Second, it argues that knowledge of Korean history was transnationally constructed by multiple national authors, by focusing on how American scholars integrated their contemporary Japanese and Korean knowledge of Korea. By demonstrating how the knowledge was produced and circulated transnationally, it historicizes American knowledge construction of Korea within the historical context of global knowledge production of Korea.

Chapter Two examined Griffis's and Hulbert's narrative frameworks of Korean history, and argued that both Griffis and Hulbert, despite their different political inclination, ended up creating a very similar narrative framework, contributing to the creation of a general American narrative framework of Korean history as a discourse of failure. In general, the narrative framework started from a flourishing civilization in the ancient period until the seventh century, which then gradually stagnated due to the negative influences of Chinese civilization, factionalism, and foreign invasions. Despite the exceptional cases in which Koreans' creativity was shown (such as the creation of the Korean alphabet in the fifteenth century, or moving metal type, or the armored turtle ship) Korea's eventual self-imposed isolation from the outside world weakened it, and led ultimately to its loss of sovereignty because it was not prepared to meet the Western and Japanese pressures. Then, the chapter examined how Griffis and Hulbert made use of both Japanese and Korean

sources in coming up with their initial narrative framework. Building on previous studies of how Griffis relied on Japanese sources in writing his book, this dissertation added information on how Hulbert made use of Japanese scholars' new archeological findings and historical analysis, such Sekino Takashi's investigation of Silla remains in Kyŏngju, and Fukuda Tokuzo's article that argued Korea lacked feudalism in its history and remained stagnant, as well as Korean "civilization and enlightenment" thinkers' emphasis on the bravery of Koguryŏ, and importance of Tan'gun as the founding father of the nation.

Chapter Three discussed the emergence of Japanese colonial scholarship as scientific knowledge in both Japan and Korea, and its ramifications for contemporary American scholars. After examining how the Japanese knowledge was systemized as "scientific" knowledge, and themes such as stagnation, heteronomy, factionalism were developed as academic themes while new themes such as *Mansenshi* emerged, it discussed the ramifications for the Korean intellectuals. Building on previous literature on this topic, the chapter examined three different narrative frameworks that emerged in Korea: a nationalist narrative framework represented by Sin Ch'ae-ho, a Marxist narrative framework by Paek Nam-un, and the framework of positivist historians such as Yi Pyŏng-do and Sin Sŏk-ho, who worked with Japanese scholars in *Chosenshi henshukai* and Keijo Imperial University, and who shared the Japanese positivist narrative framework. Then, situating Noble and McCune's dissertations among their contemporaries, the chapter presented the argument that Noble and McCune inherited Griffis's and Hulbert's narrative framework in building their own work, and integrated Japanese colonial scholarship in order to borrow its academic authority. In this process, Korea's isolationism (and the

accompanying theme of Korea's resistance to change) was emphasized as another important cause of Korea's "failure" in addition to factionalism, stagnation, and heteronomy. The chapter further discussed how McCune often directly quoted the Japanese articles from *Seikyu Gakuso*, and also had access to the Japanese colonial interpretation through another transnational figure, Yoshi S. Kuno, whose discussion of the ancient Japanese-Korean relationship was reflected in McCune's dissertation. Finally, it discussed the wartime American publication of Korean history, focusing on Grajdanzev and Nelson and how their works were influenced by the American initial narrative framework as well as their contemporaries.

Chapter Four examined the establishment of Korean Studies in the United States, and how it was influenced by modernization theory under Cold War politics, as well as by the prewar knowledge of Korea. Building on Chang's pioneering work, it first discussed how Reischauer's narrative framework of East Asian history, designed to emphasize Japan as an ideal case of modernization, positioned Korean history within its larger narrative framework as a case of failure contrasted with Japan's success. Within this larger framework of East Asian historical narratives, Korean history was presented as a failed case whose obsession with Chinese civilization caused it to stagnate. Then, the chapter analyzed the dissertations of the first-generation scholars of Korean Studies during the 1960s to demonstrate how modernization theory encouraged them to look for the political and social institutions that hindered the cultivation of adaptability in Korean history, for which they utilized the prewar theme of factionalism. Furthermore, as these scholars were motivated to argue for the need to study Korean history, which was still marginalized in East Asian

Studies, they stressed the particularity of Korean history as differentiated from Chinese history, namely longer and more stable dynasties, due to the strict social cleavages and "weak kingship and strong aristocracy" inherited from Silla tradition. In supporting this narrative framework, the prewar themes of stagnation, isolation, and resistance to change were used. Finally, it added a brief analysis of the scholars from UC-Berkeley who took a somewhat different approach in emphasizing the need to study Korean history. These scholars of Korean-Chinese diplomatic history strategically argued that Korean primary sources could supplement what was missing in Chinese primary sources. The chapter also demonstrated the transnational circulation of knowledge by looking at how Hatada's book was incorporated into American academia, and how the first-generation American scholars quoted from Japanese scholars such as Oda Shogo, Ikeuchi Hiroshi, as well as Korean scholars such as Sin Sŏk-ho and Yi Pyŏng-do, through which they brought in themes like factionalism and heteronomy.

So how does this conclusion that the knowledge of Korean history was constructed transnationally by multiple national authors, and that the postwar knowledge was influenced by the prewar themes and narrative framework enhance our understanding of postwar Korean Studies, and the history of knowledge construction of a colonized nation? First, it complicates our understanding of Korean Studies in the United States, which has been hitherto understood as the product of Cold War power politics and modernization theory, by bringing in the influences from the prewar period. One of this dissertation's aims is to put a critical eye on the intellectual basis of postwar Korean Studies, by looking at how the prewar themes of Korean history such as such as stagnation, factionalism,

heteronomy, and isolation, were adopted along with the historical interpretations in which the Western Orientalized gaze was embedded, onto which the Japanese notion of *toyo* was projected, and on which Korean intellectuals' self-criticisms were reflected. Also, it takes into account of how modernization theory, which had in its roots the imperialist view of the world, made the postwar narrative framework of Korean history compatible with the prewar narrative framework.

However, this dissertation is not an attempt to label the postwar historians as sharing any agenda with Japanese colonial scholarship or Western imperialist discourses. Most of the postwar American scholars distanced their position from the Japanese colonial scholarship, especially those published by the Japanese government during the colonial rule, as can be seen from how Ledyard in 1965 criticized *Chosenshi no Shirube* [Guide to Korean History] published in 1936 by the Japanese Government-General of Korea, for describing Korean history as lacking independence and originality and exaggerating the negative aspects of Korean history. Ledyard criticized it as being used for Imperialist propaganda.[536] Rather, the dissertation is a discussion of how the postcolonial scholars unconsciously integrated the accumulated knowledge of Korea from the prewar period, because of its academic authority coming from the "objective" exterior of scientific knowledge, whose claim to objectivity was strengthened even more by being confirmed through transnational circulation among multiple national authors. Furthermore, the specific historical context in which modernization theory's aim to assess a nation only in

[536] Gari Ledyard "Review," Review of *A Short History of Korea*, by Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies, *Journal of American Oriental Society* 85, no. 3 (Jul 1965): 457.

terms of its modernization was compatible with prewar knowledge, which was developed as a discourse of failure. Also, due to the context in which Korean Studies was marginalized in most of the East Asian Studies programs and Korea was only regarded as one variation of Chinese civilization, the scholars in Korean Studies emphasized the particularity of Korean history as distinguished from Chinese civilization, in order to claim the necessity to study Korean history.[537]

The second aim of this dissertation is to provide a new perspective on colonial studies, in specific, the studies of how the knowledge of a colonized nation is constructed and how the prewar knowledge was reconfigured to be incorporated in the postwar scholarship of Area Studies in the United States. As Edward Said discussed in his renowned book, *Orientalism*, the colonial discourse of Orientalism was reconfigured to become the basis of area studies in the United States, which was possible due to its usability in the new set of power relations, as well as the authority it had as an accumulated knowledge.[538] However, not many studies exist which actually looked at this reconfiguration. Therefore, this dissertation looks at how the colonial knowledge of Korea was reconfigured and integrated into the new postwar knowledge as a good case study that examines the connection between prewar knowledge and postwar knowledge. Furthermore, its transnational framework provides an insight into how the knowledge of the colonized was further confirmed as "objective" knowledge, as it was transnationally circulated and endorsed by others who were not the direct colonizers, shown in how American knowledge

[537] Duncan, "Migungnae Han'guk chŏn'gŭndaesa yŏn'gu tonghyang," 172-174.

[538] Said, *Orientalism*, 299.

of Korea has been regarded as an objective knowledge. It also provides a perspective that knowledge of a colonized nation is produced in conversation with the academic paradigmata and intellectual discourses shared with scholars of other nations.

Final Remarks

This dissertation is not a comprehensive examination of knowledge produced on Korea, nor is it a thorough historiography. The aim was to provide a larger picture of knowledge construction by looking at a longer period of time, and by taking into account the knowledge production in Japan, Korea, and the United States, which enables a perspective to examine the transnational flow of knowledge. Therefore, it only gives brief descriptions of each individual scholar's work, since the goal here was not to evaluate the achievement or limitations, but merely to trace the emergence and travel of certain themes and narrative frameworks, and how they were integrated and utilized.

A final note on the limitations of this dissertation is that it was originally meant to analyze not only Korean history, but also how the literature, ethnography, archeology, and physical anthropology were interdisciplinarily woven into the knowledge construction of Korea, which this dissertation failed to achieve. While it discussed archeology and physical anthropology on a few occasions, the scope is minimal. This limitation will be remedied when this dissertation is transformed into a book manuscript. Furthermore, the Japanese colonial historiography which is briefly summarized in this dissertation, mostly relying on the secondary sources, needs to be supplemented with more delicate analysis of primary sources, especially focusing on the differences among the Japanese colonial scholars. For

example, *Nissen Dosoron* and *Mansenshi* emerged from different intellectual traditions within Japan.[539] Finally, this dissertation had to omit several pieces of analysis on the theses and dissertations of Korean students who studied abroad in the United States during the 1930s, as well as books written by Americans and Koreans regarding Korean independence during the 1920s, due to its marginal position in making the overarching argument of the dissertation. The information from those sources will be either included in the book manuscript or published separately as journal articles.

[539] Hatada, "Ilbon e isŏsŏ ŭi Han'guksa yon'gu ŭi chŏnt'ong," 82. For the difference among the Japanese colonial scholars see Jung, "Singmin Sagwan ŭi Ch'ajil, 235-268; Shin Jang, "Kyŏngsŏng Cheguk Taehak sahakkwa ŭi chajang [The Academic and Social Ramifications of History Department at Keijo Imperial University]," *Yŏksa Munje Yŏn'gu* 26 (Oct 2011): 45-83; Sang-Woo Jeong, "Chosŏnsa p'yŏnch'an saŏp chŏnhu Ilbonin yŏn'guja tŭl ŭi kaltŭng yangsang kwa saeroun yŏn'gujaŭi tŭngjang," *Sahak Yŏn'gu* 116 (Dec 2014): 143-194.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

The Korean Repository
The Korean Review
Missionary Review of the World
Gospel in All Lands
Transaction of the Korea Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society
New York Times
Harper's Weekly
Hwangsŏng Sinmun
Taehan Maeil Sinbo
Tong-a Ilbo
Kongnip sinmun
Kabyŏk
Annual Report on Reforms and Progress in Chosen
Tokyo Asahi Sinbun

Asakawa, Kanichi. *The Russo-Japanese Conflict: Its Causes and Issues*. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin And Company, 1904.

Allen, Horace Newton. *Things Korean*. New York: F. H. Revell Company, 1908.

Bishop, Isabella Bird. *Korea and Her Neighbors.* London: John Murray, 1897.

Brown, Arthur J. Matery of the Far East: the story of Korea's transformation and Japan's rise to supremacy in the Orient. New York: C. Scribner's sons, 1919.

Brown, Arthur J. "Politics and Missions in Korea," *Missionary Review of the World* 25 (Mar 1902): 180-190.

Cha, Sangch'ŏl. "Sahwa wa tangjaeng." *Kaebyŏk* 71, 1925.

Chosen Shigakkai. *Chosenshi Taikei.* Keijo: Chikazawa Shoten, 1927.

Chung, Henry. *Treaties and Conventions between Corea and Other Powers*. New York: H. S. Nichols, 1919.

Chung, Henry. *The Case of Korea: A Collection of Evidences on the Japanese domination of Korea and on the development of Korean independence movement*. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1921.

Curzon, George N. *Problems of the Far East*. Westminster: Archibald Constable and Co., 1896.

Cynn, Hugh. *The Rebirth of Korea: The Reawakening of the People, Its Causes, and the Outlook*. New York: Abingdon Press, 1920.

Dallet, Claude-Charles. *Historie de l'Egalise de Coree.* Paris: V Palme, 1874.

Dennett, Tyler. *Americans in Eastern Asia: a critical study of United States' policy in the Far East in the nineteenth century*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1922.

Feudge, Fannie Roper. "The country and people of Korea." *Gospel in All Lands* 13 (Aug 1888): 372-373.

Fukuda, Tokuzo. "Kankoku no keizai sosiki to keizai tani." *Keizaigaku Kenkyu*. Tokyo: Dobunkan, 1904.

Gale, James Scarth. *Korean Sketches*. New York: Fleming H. Revell, 1898.

Gale, James Scarth. *Korea in Transition*. New York: Young People's Missionary Movement of the United States and Canada, 1909.

Gale, James Scarth. *A History of the Korean People*, edited by Richard Rutt. Seoul: Royal Asiatic Society Korea Branch, 1927.

Gale, James. S. "The Influence of China upon Korea," *Transactions of the Korea Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1 (1900): 1-24.

Gale, James S. "Hanyang." *Transaction of Royal Asiatic Society Korea Branch* 2 (1902): 1-43.

Gifford, Daniel. *Everyday life in Korea*. New York: F. H. Revell Company, 1898.

Gilmore, George William. *Korea From Its Capital*. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication and Sabbath-School Work, 1892.

Grajdanzev, Andrew J. *Modern Korea*. New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, distributed by John Day Company, 1944.

Griffis, William E. "Korea and Its Needs" *Gospel in All Lands* 13 (Aug 1888): 370-371

Griffis, William E. *Chosen Kaika no Kigen.* Tokyo: Suikyosha, 1895.

Griffis, William E. *Corea: the Hermit Nation*. New York: C. Scribner's sons, 1882.

Griffis, William E. *The Mikado's Empire*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1876.

Hall, John Whitney. *Japanese History: new dimensions of approach and understanding*. Washington: Service Center for Teachers of History, 1961.

Hamilton, Angus. *Korea*. New York, NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904.

Hatada, Takashi. *A History of Korea.* Translated by Warren W. Smith and Benjamin H. Hazard. Santa Barbara, California: American Bibliographical Center, 1969.

Hayashi, Taisuke. *Chosenshi*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Hanshichi, 1892.

Hayashi, Taisuke. *Chosentsushi.* Tokyo: Fuzanbo, 1912.

Hayashi, Taisuke. *Chosen Kinseishi*. Tokyo: Yoshikawa Hanshichi, 1900.

Hatada, Takashi. *Shinpojiumu – Nihon to Chosen*. Keijo: Keisoshobo, 1969.

Hatada, Takashi. *Ilbonin ŭi Han'gukkwan*. Translated by Kidong Yi. Seoul: Ilchogak, 1983.

Hatada, Takashi. *Chosenshi*. Tokyo: Iwanami zensho, 1951.

Hatada, Takashi. "Chosenshi kenkyu wo kaerimite." *Chosenshi kenkyukai ronbunshu*, 15 (1978).

Hatada, Takashi. "Nihonni okeru chosensi kenkyu no dentou," *Shinpojiumu Nihon to Chosen*. Tokyo: Keishou Shobou, 1969.

Hazard, Benjamin H. "Japanese Marauding in Medieval Korea: The Wako Impact on Late Koryŏ." PhD diss., University of California Berkeley, 1967.

Higasa, Mamoru. *Nissen Kankei no Shiteki Kosatsu to Sono Kenkyu.* Tokyo: Shikai Shobo, 1930.

Hulbert, Homer B. *History of Korea*. Seoul: Methodist Pub. House, 1905.

Hulbert, Homer B. *Passing of Korea*. New York: Double Day, Page and company, 1906.

Hulbert, Homer. B. "Korean Survivals." *Transaction of the Korea Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 1 (1900): 25-50.

Hulbert, Homer B. "The Itu." *Korean Repository* 5 (Feb 1898): 47-54.

Hulbert, Homer B. “The Korean Alphabet,” *Korean Repository* 2 (Jan 1892): 1-9.

Hulbert, Homer B. “National Examination in Korea.” *Transaction of Korea Branch of Royal Asiatic Society* 14 (1923): 9-32.

Hulbert, Homer B. “The Mongols in Korea.” *Korean Repository* 5 (April 1898): 133-143.

Inaba, Iwakichi. “Chosenshi.” *Sekaishi Taikai* 11. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1935.

Inaba, Iwakichi. “Mansen fukabun no shiteki kosatsu.” *Shina Shakaishi kenkyu*. Tokyo: Daitokaku, 1922.

Inaba, Iwakichi. *Chosen Bunkashi kenkyu.* Tokyo: Yuzankaku, 1925.

Inaba, Iwakichi. “Mansenshi Taikei no Sainishiki.” *Seikyu Gakuso* 11 (1933):1-25; 12 (1933):58-76; 13 (1933):92-109; 14 (1933):56-74.

Inaba, Iwakichi. *Chosenshi Manshushi*. Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1938.

Ireland, A. *The New Korea*. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1926.

Jamieson, John C. “The Samguk Sagi and the Unification Wars.” PhD diss., University of California at Berkeley, 1969.

Jamieson, John C. “Collapse of Tang-Silla Alliance – Chinese and Korean Accounts Compared.” In *Nothing Concealed: Essays in Honor of Liu Yu-Yun* Occasional Series No. 4, edited by Frederick Wakeman. Taipei: Chinese Materials and Research Aids Service Center, 1970.

Jones, George Heber. *Korea: Land People and Customs*. Cincinati, OH: Jennings and Graham, 1907.

Jones, George H. “Historical Notes on the Reigning Dynasty.” *Korean Repository* 3 (Sep 1896): 343-349.

Jones, George H. “The Japanese Invasion,” *Korean Repository* 2, (Jan 1892): 10-16.

Kang, Hugh W. “The Development of the Korean Ruling Class from Late Silla to Early Koryŏ.” PhD diss., University of Washington, 1964.

Kang, Yonghill. *The Grass Roof*. New York: Charles Scribner’s sons, 1932.

Kennan, George. “Korean People: The Product of Decayed Civilization.” *Outlook* 81 (Oct 1905): 409-416.

Kim, Chong Sun. “The Emergence of Multi-Centered Despotism in the Silla Kingdom: A Study of the Origins of Factional Struggles in Korea.” PhD diss., University of Washington, 1965.

Kim, Chong Ik Eugene and Hankyo Kim. *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism, 1876-1910.* Berkeley: University of California, Press, 1967.

Kim, Hellen K. “Rural Education for the Regeneration of Korea.” PhD diss., Columbia University, 1931.

Koh, Hesung Chun. “Religion, Social Structure and Economic Development in Yi Dynasty Korea.” PhD diss., Boston University, 1959.

Kume, Kunitake. *Dai Nippon Kodai Jadai Shi*. Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1915.

Kuno, Yoshi Saburo. *Japanese Expansion on the Asiatic continent*, vol. 1. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1937.

Kuroita, Katsumi. “Chosen no Rekishiteki Kansatsu.” *Chosen* 78 (1921)

Ladd, George T. *In Korea with Marquis Ito*. New York: C. Scribner’s Sons, 1908.

Lattimore, Owen. *Manchuria: Cradle of Conflict*. New York: The Macmillan company, 1935.

Ledyard, Gari K. “The Korean Language Reform of 1446.” PhD diss., University of California at Berkeley, 1966.

Ledyard, Gari “The Mongol Campaigns in Korea and the Dating of ‘The Secret History of the Mongols.’” *Central Asiatic Journal* 9, no. 1 (Mar 1964): 1-22.

Lee, Hoon K. *Land Utilization and Rural Economy in Korea*. Shanghai: Kelly and Walsh Ltd., 1936.

McCune, George McAfee. “Korean Relations with China and Japan, 1800-1864.” PhD diss., University of California Berkeley, 1941.

McCune, George M. “Exchanges of envoys between Korea and Japan during the Tokugawa period.” *Far Eastern Quarterly* 5 (May 1946): 308-325.

McCune, George M. *Korea Today*. Boston: Harvard University Press, 1950.

McCune, George M. *Notes on History of Korea: Early Korea*. New York: Korean Research Associates, 1952.

McCune, Shannon. *Climate of Korea: Climatic Elements*. Michigan: University Lithoprinters, 1941.

McCune, Shannon. *Korea*. New York: N. Doubleday, 1965.

McCune, Shannon. *Korea's Heritage: A Regional and Social Geography*. Rutland, Vermont and Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle Co., 1956.

McKenzie, Frederick A. *The Tragedy of Korea*. New York: Dutton. 1908.

McKenzie, Frederick A. *Korea's Fight for Freedom.* New York: Flemming H. Revell Co., 1928.

Miura, Hiroyuki. "Bukeiseido no hattatsu" *Houseishi no Kenkyu*. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1925.

Nakata, Kaoru. "Ocho Jidai no Shoten in Kansuru Kenkyu" *Kokukagakkai zasshi* 20, no. 3, (1906).

Nakamura, Hidetaka. *Chosenshi – Kokushi no Kaigaish ino Koukan.* Tokyo: Shikai Shobo, 1935.

Nelson, Melvin Frederick. *Korea and the Old Orders in Eastern Asia*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1946.

Noble, Harold Joyce. "Korea and Her Relations with the United States before 1895." PhD diss., University of California Berkeley, 1931.

Noble, Harold Joyce. *What It Takes to Rule Japan*. New York: U.S. Camera Publishing Corps, 1946.

Noble, Harold Joyce. *Embassy at War*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1975.

Oda, Shogo. "Richo no hoto rakujo shite tenshukyo ni oyobu." *Seikyu Gakuso* 1 (Aug 1930): 1-26.

Okudaira, Takehiko. *Chosen kaikoku kosho shimatsu*. Tokyo: Toko Shoin, 1935.

Osgood, Cornelius. *The Koreans and their Culture*. New York: Ronald Press, 1951.

Paik, George L. *The History of Protestant Mission in Korea, 1832-1910*. Seoul: Yonsei University Press, 1927.

Palais, James B. "Korea on the Eve of Kanghwa Treaty, 1873-1876." PhD diss., Harvard University, 1968.

Palais, James. "Stability in Yi Dynasty Korea: Equilibrium Systems and Marginal Adjustment." *Occasional Papers on Korea,* no. 3 (June 1975): 1-18.

Reischuaer, Edwin O. and George M. McCune, "Romanization of Korean Language Based upon its Phonetic Structure." *Transactions of Korea Branch of Royal Asiatic Society* 29 (1939): 1-55.

Reischauer, Edwin O., John K. Fairbank, and Albert Craig. *East Asia: The Great Tradition*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1960.

Reischauer, Edwin O., John K. Fairbank, and Albert Craig. *East Asia: The Modern Transformation*. Massachusettes, Houghton Mifflin, 1965.

Reischauer, Edwin O. *My Life Between Japan and America*. New York: Harper and Row, 1986.

Reischauer, Edwin O. *Ennin's Travels in Tang China*. New York: The Roland Press, co. 1955.

Rogers, Michael C. "Sung-Koryŏ Relations: Some Inhibiting Factors." *Oriens* 11, no. 1 (Dec 1958): 194-202.

Rogers, Michael C. "Factionalism and Koryŏ Policy under the Northern Sung." *Journal of American Oriental Society* 79, no. 1 (Jan 1959): 16-25.

Rogers, Michael C. "Studies in Korean History." *T'oung Pao*, Second Series, 47-1 (1959): 30-62.

Rogers, Michael C. "The Regularization of Koryŏ-Chin Relations (1116-1131)." *Central Asiatic Journal* 6, no. 1 (1961): 51-84.

Ross, John. *History of Corea: Ancient and Modern with Description of Manners and Customs, Language and Geography*. Paiseley: J & R Parlane, 1879.

Seno, Umakuma. "Chosen tousou no kigen wo ronsite shikatono kankeini ronkyusuru." In *Shiratori Kanreki Kinen Toyoshi Ronso*, edited by Ikeuchi Hiroshi. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1925.

Seno, Umakuma. “Korai Myosei no Ran ni Tsuite.” *Toyo Gakubo* 18, no. 2 (Dec 1929): 245-276.

Shidehara, Taira. *Kankoku Seisoshi*. Tokyo: Sanseido Shoten, 1907.

Shinobu, Junpei. *Kanhanto*. Tokyo: Tokyobo shoten hatsubai, 1901.

Sin, Ch’aeho. *Chosŏnsa Yŏn’guch’o*. Seoul: 1946.

Sin, Sŏkho. “Heiko Shihini Tsuite.” *Seikyu Gakuso* 1 (1930): 85-104, (1931): 79-97

Sin, Sŏkho. “Chosen Seisho jidai no shinkyu tairitsu.” *Kindai Chosŏnshi Kenkyu.* Keijo: *Chosenshi Henshukai Kenkyu isan* 1, 1944.

Sin, Sŏkho. “Kibo Shika no yurai ni kansuru ichi kosatsu.” *Seikyu Gakuso* 20 (May 1940): 1-49.

Shikata, Hiroshi, “Kyurai no Chosen Shakai no Rekishiteki Seikaku ni tsuite.” *Chosen Gakubo* 1 (1951).

Smith, Warren William. “The Rise of Sŏwŏn: Literary Academics in Sixteenth Century Korea.” PhD diss., University of California, 1972.

Suematsu, Yasukazu. *Shirago Shi no Shomondai*. Tokyo: Toyo Bunko, 1954.

Suematsu, Yasukazu. “Chosenshi (1)-(22)” *Chosen Gyosei*. Keijo: Teikoku Chiho Gyosei Gakkaisen honbu, 1938-1939.

Suh, Doo Soo. “Korean Studies in the U.S.” *Koreana Quarterly* 4, no. 1 (1962): 119-123.

Takahashi, Toru, “Chosen Jugaku Taikan [A general survey of Korean Confucianism].” In *Takahashi Toru Chosen Jugaku Ronshu*, edited by Kawahara Hideki and Kim Kwangnae. Tokyo: Chisen Shokan, 1927.

Uchida, Ginzo. *Nihon Kinseishi*. Tokyo: Heibonsa, 1903.

Undrwood, Lillias. *Fifteen Years Among the Top-knots or Life in Korea*. New York: American Tract Society, 1904.

Underwood, Horace H. *Modern Education in Korea*. New York: International Press, 1926.

Wagner, Edward W. “The Literati Purges: Case Studies in the Factionalism of the Early Yi dynasty.” PhD diss., Harvard University, 1959.

Wells, J. H. “An Appreciation.” *The Korea Review* 5 (Nov 1905): 425-427.

Yang, Key P. and Gregory Henderson. “An Outline History of Korean Confucianism Part 1: The Early Period and Yi Factionalism.” *The Journal of Asian Studies*, vol 18, No. 1 (Nov 1958): 81-101.

Yi, Kibaek. *Han’guksa sillon*. Seoul: Ilchogak, 1967.

Yi, Kiebaek. “Sŏron.” *Kuksasillon*. Seoul: Taesŏngsa, 1961.

Yi, Kwangsu. “Minjok Kaejoron.” *Kaebyŏk* 23 (May 1922): 18-72.

Yi, Pyŏng-do. “Myosei no Sento Undo ni Tsuite no Ichi Kosatsu.” *Shigaku Zasshi* 38 (Sep 1927): 874-906.

Yi, Sang-baek. *Han’guksa, kŭnse hugi p’yŏn*. Seoul: Ŭryu munhwasa, 1965.

Yi, Sŏn-gŭn. *Han’guksa, ch’oe kŭnse p’yŏn*. Seoul: Ŭryu munhwasa, 1961.

Yi Sŏn-gŭn, *Hwarangdo Yŏngu.* Seoul: 1954.

Yoshida, Togo. *Tojo Nipponshi*. Tokyo: Waseda University Press, 1917.

Zong, In-sob. *Folktales from Korea*. London: Routeledge and Kegan Paul, 1952.

SECONDARY SOURCES

English-language Sources

Armstrong, Charles. “Development and Directions of Korean Studies in the United States.” *The Journal of Contemporary Korean Studies* 1, no. 1 (Dec 2014): 35-48.

An, Jong-Chol. “Making Korea Distinct: George M. McCune and his Korean studies.” *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 17 (Dec 2004): 155-192.

Atkins, E. Taylor. *Primitive Selves: Korana in the Japanese Gaze: 1910-1945*. University of California Press, 2010.

Balibar, Etiene. “The Nation Form: History and Ideology,” in *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities*, edited by Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein. New York: Verso, 1991.

Beaucahmp, Edward R. *An American Teacher in Early Meiji Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1976.

Breuker, Remco E. "Contested objectivities: Ikeuchi Hiroshi, Kim Sanggi and the tradition of Oriental history (Tōyōshigaku) in Japan and Korea." *East Asian History* 29 (2005): 69-106.

Caprio, Mark. "Japanese and American images of Koreans: a tale of two occupations." In *Trans-Pacific relations: America, Europe, and Asia in the twentieth century*, edited by Richard Jenson, John Davidann, and Yoneyuki Sugita. London: Praeger, 2003.

Caprio, Mark. *Japanese Assimilation Policies in Colonial Korea, 1910-1945.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2009.

Chatterjee, Partha. *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.

Cheong, Sung-hwa. "William Elliot Griffis and Emerging American Images on Korea." *The Review of Korean Studies* 3, no. 2 (2000): 53-72.

Conrad, Sebastian. "The Colonial Ties are Liquidated: Modernization theory, Postwar Japan and the Global Cold War." *Past and Present* 216, no. 1 (Aug 2012): 181-214.

Choi, Hyaeweol. *Gender and Mission Encounters in Korea.* Berkely and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2009.

Choi, Hyaeweol. "Christian Modernity in the Missionary Discourse of Korea, 1905-1910." *East Asian History* 29 (2005): 39-58.

Clark Donald N. *Living Dangerously in Korea: The Western Experience 1900-1950*. Norwalk, CT: Eastbridge, 2003.

Cummings, Bruce. "Boundary Displacement." In *Learning Places: The Afterlives of Area Studies*, edited Masao Miyoshi and Harry D. Harootunian. Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.

Cummings, Bruce. "Archeology, Descent, Emergence: Japan in British/American Hegemony, 1900-1950." In *Japan in the World*, edited by Masao Miyoshi and Harry Harootunian. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1993.

Dennehy, Kristine. "Memories of Colonial Korea in Postwar Japan." PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2002.

Editorial Board. "An Interview with Gari Ledyard." *The Review of Korean Studies* 6, no. 1

(June 2003): 143-185.

Eisenstadt, Shmuel N. *Modernization: Protest and Change*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.; Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Em, Henry. *The Great Enterprise: Sovereignty and Historiography in Modern Korea*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2013.

Foucault, Michel. "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History." In *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, edited by D. F. Bouchard. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.

Fujitani, Takashi. *Race for Empire: Koreans as Japanese and Japanese as American during World War II*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 2012.

Harootunian, Harry. *The Empire's New Clothes: Paradigm Lost, and Regained*. Chicago: Prickly Paradigm Press, 2005.

Harootunian, Harry. *History's Disquiet: Modernity, Cultural Practice, and the Question of Everyday Life*, The Wellek Library Lectures. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.

Harootunian, Harry and Masao Miyoshi. *Learning Places: The Afterlives of Area Studies.* Durham: Duke University Press, 2002.

Harootunian, Harry, and Masao Miyoshi. *Japan in the World*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1993.

Hunt, Michael H. *The American Ascendancy: How the United States Gained and Viewed Global Dominance*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

Jo, Yoong-hee. "Joseon and Her People Shown in the Travel Report of Campbell in the Late 19th Century." *The Review of Korea Studies* 11, no. 1 (Mar 2008): 47-66.

Kim, Do-hyung, John Duncan, and Dong-no Kim. *Reform and Modernity in the Taehan Empire*. Seoul: Jimoondang, 2006.

Kim, Hanmee Na. "The Meanings of America in Modern Korea: A Study of Korean Diplomatic, Cultural, and Intellectual Engagement with America, 1852-1945." PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2014.

Kim, Jimin. "Representing the Invisible: American Perception of Colonial Korea, 1910-1945." PhD diss., Columbia University, 2011.

Kim, Sooja. “The Modern Korean Nation, Tan’gun, and Historical Memory in Late Nineteenth to Early Twentieth Century Korea.” *International Journal of Korean History* 19, no. 2 (Aug 2014): 213-240.

Lee, James F. “Magnificent Personality: Korea through the Eyes of Western Women.” *Korean Culture* 14, no.1 (Spring, 1993): 32-38.

Lew, Walter. “One Orientalist Mirror of Korea: George N. Curzon’s ‘Problem of the Far East’.” *Korean Culture* vol 12, no.1 (Spring 1991): 6-10.

Lew Young Ick. *Early Korean Encounters with the United States and Japan*. Seoul: Royal Asiatic Society, Korea Branch, 2008.

Lie, John. “The Tangun Myth and Korean Studies in the United States.” *Transnational Asia* 1, no. 4 (Dec 2016): 1-43.

MacDonald, Donald S. “The Study of Korea in the United States.” *Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society Korea Branch* 65 (1990): 41-48

Miller, Owen. “Marxism and East Asian History: From Eurocentrism and Nationalism to Marxist Universalism.” *Marxism 2*17 no. 3 (2010): 202-238.

Miller, Owen. “The Idea of Stagnation in Korean History from Fukuda Tokuzo to the New Right.” *Korean Histories* 2, no. 1 (2010): 1-12.

Nahm Andrew C. “The Development of Korean Studies in the United States.” *Journal of Korean Studies* 1, no. 2 (1971): 9-42.

Oppenheim, Robert. “Introduction: The Multi-sited History of the Anthropology of Korea.” *Journal of Korean Studies* 21, no. 2 (Fall 2016): 301-323.

Oppenheim, Robert. *An Asian Frontier: American Anthropology and Korea, 1882-1945.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2016.

Oak, Sung-Deuk. “North American Missionaries’ Understanding of the Tan’gun and Kija Myths of Korea, 1884-1934.” *Acta Koreana* 5 (Jan 2001): 51-73.

Pai, Hyung Il. *Constructing “Korean” Origin: A Critical Review of Archeology, Historiography, and Racial Myth in Korean State-Formation Theories*. Boston: Harvard University Press, 2000.

Quinones, Kenneth C. “The Kunse Chosŏn Chŏnggam and Modern Korean historiography.” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 40. No. 2 (Dec 1980): 507-548.

Sakai, Naoki and Hyon Joo Yoo. *The Trans-Pacific Imagination: Rethinking Boundary, Culture and Society*. Hackensack, N.J.: World Scientific, 2012.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.

Schmid, Andre. *Korea between Empires, 1895-1919*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2002.

Schmid, Andre. "Colonialism and the 'Korea Problem' in the Historiography of Modern Japan: A Review Article." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 59, no. 4 (Nov 2000): 962-963.

Schmid, Andre. "Two Americans in Seoul: Evaluating Oriental Empire, 1905-1910." *Korean Histories* 2 (2010): 7-23.

Schmid, Andre. "Korean Studies at the Periphery and as a Mediator in US-Korean Relations." *Sai* 4 (2008): 9-34.

Shavit, David. *The United States in Asia*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1990.

Suh, Serk-bae. *Treacherous Translations: Culture, Nationalism, and colonialism in Korea and Japan from 1910s to 1960s.* Berkeley: Global, Area, and International Archive, 2013.

Tanaka, Stefan. *Japan's Orient: Rendering Pasts into History*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.

Tipps, Dean C. "Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study of Societies: A Critical Perspective," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 15, no. 2 (Mar 1973): 199-226.

Underwood, Elizabeth. *Challenged Identities: North American Missionaries in Korea, 1884-1934*. Seoul: Royal Asiatic Society Korea Branch, 2003.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. "The Unintended Consequences of Cold War Area Studies." In *The Cold War and the University: Toward an Intellectual History of the Post War Years*, edited by Noam Chomsky. New York: The New Press, 1997.

Walraven, Boudewjin. "The Natives Next Door: Ethnology in Colonial Korea." In *Anthropology and Colonialism in Asia and Oceania*, edited by J. G. van Bremen and A. Shimizu. Richmond: Curzon, 1998.

White, Hayden. *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

Yoon, Jong-pil. “A Japanese Egypt: Korea as Depicted by Early Twentieth-century British Newspapers,” *Acta Koreana* 19, no. 2 (Dec 2016): 31-57.

Yuh, Leighanne. “The Historiography of Korea in the United States.” *International Journal of Korean History* 15, no. 2 (Aug 2010): 127-144.

Korean and Japanese Sources

An, Jong-Chol. “Chuil taesa Edŭwin Raishawŏ ŭi kŭndaehwaron kwa Han’guksa insik [Edwin O. Reischauer’s Modernization Theory and Perception of Korea as a Japanese ambassador].” *Yŏksa munje yŏn’gu* 29 (April 2013): 293-322.

An, Jong-Chol. “William Griffis ŭi ilbon kwa Han’guk insik” [William Griffis’ perception of Korea and Japan].” *Ilbon yŏn’gu* 15 (Feb 2011) : 439-461.

Chang, Sei-Jin. “Raishawŏ, Tongasia, kwŏllyŏk/chisik ŭi t’ek’ŭnoloji – Chŏnhu Miguk ŭi chiyŏk yŏn’gu wa Han’gukak ŭi paech’i [Edwin O. Reischuaer, East Asia, and the technology of power/knowledge].” *Sanghŏ hakbo* 6 (Oct 2012): 87-140.

Chang, Chae-yong. “Kŭndae Sŏyangin ŭi chŏsul e natanan Han’guksa insik [Perceptions of Korean History as Reflected in Western Sources predating 1945].” PhD diss., Kangwŏn University, 2016.

Cho, Tonggŏl. *Hanguk kŭndae* sahaksa [Korean Modern Historiography]. Seoul: Yŏksa Konggan, 2010.

Cho, Tonggŏl, Han, Yŏng-u, and Park, Chan-seung. *Hangukŭi Yŏksaga wa yŏnsahak* [Korean Historians and History]. Seoul: Changbi, 1994.

Choi, Hye-Joo. “Kŭndae Ilbonŭi Han’guksagwan kwa yŏksa waegok [Modern Japan’s Historical View on Korea and Historical Distortion].” *Han’guk tongnip undongsa yŏn’gu* 35 (Mar 2010): 273-313.

Do, Myoun-hoi. “Chosŏn ch’ongdokpu ŭi munhwa chŏngch’aek kwa Han’guksa kusŏng ch’egye – Chosŏn pandosa wa Chosŏnsa ŭi kiljabi rŭl chungsim ŭro [The Cultural Policy of Government-General in Korea and Its Construction of Korean History].” *Yŏksa hakpo* 222 (June 2014): 67-97.

Do, Myoun-hoi. “Han’guk kŭndae yŏksahak ŭi ch’angch’ul kwa t’ongsa ch’egye ŭi hwangnip [Creation of Modern Historiography and Establishment of the System of Linear History in Korea].” *Yŏksawa hyŏnsil* 70 (Dec 2008): 171-206.

Do, Myoun-hoi, and Yun Hae-dong. *Yŏksahak ŭi segi: 20-segi Han'guk kwa Ilbon ŭi yŏksahak* [The Century of Historiography: The historiography of Korea and Japan during 20th century]. Seoul: Hyumŏnisŭtŭ Ch'ulp'an Kŭrup, 2000.

Duncan, John. "Migungnae chŏn'gundaesa yŏn'gu tonghyang [Research Trends of Premodern Korean History in the United States]." *Yŏksawa hyŏnsil* 23 (Mar 1997): 170-188

Em, Henry. "Migungnae Han'guk kŭnhyŏndaesa yŏn'gu tonghyang [Research Trends of Korean Modern history in the United States]." *Yŏksawa hyŏnsil* 23 (Mar 1997): 189-202

Han, Kyumu. "Kaeil ŭi Han'guk insik kwa Han'guk kyohoe e kich'in yŏnghyang, 1898-1910 nyŏn ŭl chungsim ŭro [James S. Gale's Perception of Korea and His Influence on Korean Church from 1898-1910]." *Han'guk kidokkyowa yŏksa* 4 (Dec 1995): 161-176

Hatada, Takashi. "Ilbon e isŏŏ ŭi Han'guksa yŏn'gu'ŭi chŏnt'ong [Tradition of Korean Studies in Japan]." *Han'guksa simingangjwa* 1 (Aug 1987): 70-91.

Jang, Shin. "Kyŏngsŏng Cheguk Taehak sahakkwa ŭi chajang [The Academic and Social Ramifications of History Department at Keijo Imperial University]." *Yŏksa munje yŏn'gu* 26 (Oct 2011): 45-83.

Jung, Jun-Young. "Pi ŭi injongjuŭi wa sikminchi ŭihak: Kyŏngsŏng Chedae pŏbŭihak kyosil ŭi hyŏraekhyŏng illyuhak [Racism of "Blood" and colonial medicine: Blood Group Anthropology Studies at Keijo University's Department of Forensic Medicine]." *Ŭisahak* 21, no. 3 (Dec 2012): 513-549.

Jung, Jun-Young. "Singmin sagwan ŭi ch'ajil – Chosŏn sahakhoe wa 1920 nyŏndae singminsahak ŭi chedohwa [Chosenshigakkai and the Institutionalization of Colonial Historiography by Japanese Historians in Colonial Korea]." *Han'guk sahaksa hakpo* 35 (Dec 2016): 235-270.

Jeong, Sang-woo "Ilcheha Ilbonin hakcha tŭl ŭi Han'guksa e taehan t'ongsajŏk ihae [Japanese scholars' Attempt at a "General History of Korea" during the Japanese occupation period: examination of their works from the mid-1930s]." *Yŏksawa hyŏnsil* 104 (June 2017), 94.

Jeong, Sang-woo. "Chosŏnsa p'yŏnch'an saŏp chŏnhu Ilbonin yŏn'guja tŭl ŭi kaltŭng yangsang kwa saeroun yŏn'gujaŭi tŭngjang [The Conflict of Japanese Researchers and Emergence of New Researchers around Chosenshi compilation]." *Sahak yŏn'gu* 116 (Dec 2014): 143-194.

Jeong, Sang-woo. “Kŭndae yŏksahak ŭrosŏŭi Mansŏnsa [Mansenshi as a modern historiography].” In *Singminjuŭi yŏksahak kwa cheguk*, edited by Yun Haedong. Seoul: Chaekkwa Hamke, 2016.

Jeong, Yon-Tae. “19segi huban 20segi cho sŏyangin ŭi Han’gukkwan [The Korean image in the eyes of the Westerners from late 19th century to the early 20th century].” *Yŏksawa hyŏnsil* 34 (Dec 1999): 159-206.

Kang, Chinch’ŏl. “Chŏngch’esŏng iron pip’an [Critique against the Stagnation Theory].” *Han’guksa Siminganjwa* 1 (Aug 1987): 23-39.

Kang, Sang Jung. *Orientarizumu no Kanata e* [Beyond Orientalism]. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1996.

Ki, You-Jung. “Kyŏngsŏng Chedae chŏngch’ihak kangjwa wa singminji Chosŏn esŏŭi ŭimi [Lectures on Political Studies in Keijo Imperial University and its Significance in Colonized Chosŏn].” *Tongbanhakchi* 163 (Sep 2013): 211-238.

Kim, Do-hyung. “Hanmal chinilpa ŭi tŭngjang kwa munmyŏngkaehwaron [Emergence of Pro-Japanese Collaboraters and the Discussion on Civilization and Enlightnement].” *Yŏksa pip’yŏng* 23 (1993): 126-137.

Kim, Wangbae. “Ŭndun ŭi wangguk, Han’gukhak ŭi maenga wa sŏn’guja tŭl [Hermit Kingdom: Sprouts and Pioneers of Korean Studies].” *Chŏngsin munhwa yŏn’gu* 22, no. 3 (Autumn 1999): 5-28.

Kim, Yŏnghun. “Naesyŏnŏl Chioguraepiggi bon koria – 1890 nyŏn ihu sisŏn ŭi pyŏnhwa wa ŭimi [The Way Korea was seen by National Geographic - Changes in Perspectives from 1890 and its Significance].” In *Kŭnhyŏndae Han’guk e taehan oeguk ŭi sisŏn*, edited by Song Yŏngbin. Seoul: Ewha University Press, 2006.

Kim, Yong-sŏp. “Ilbon Han’guk e isŏsŏ Han’guksa sŏsul.” *Yŏksa hakpo* 31 (1966): 128-147.

Ko, Jung-hyoo. “Singminji sidae Miguk chisikin ŭi Han’guk munje insik – Taep’yŏngyang munje yŏn’guhoe rŭl chungsimŭro [The U.S. Intellectuals’ Perception of Korean Matters during the Japanese Occupation – An approach to the Institute of Pacific Relations].” *Yŏksawa hyŏnsil* 58 (Dec 2005): 118-147.

Ko, Jung-hyoo. “A. J. Kŭrajedanjebŭ wa Hyŏndae Han’guk [Andrew J. Grajdanze and Modern Korea].” *Han’guksa yŏn’gu* 126 (Sep 2004): 244-260.

Lee, Su Ki. “Kaehanggi Sŏyanginŭi yŏhaengi rŭl tonghae pon Han’gukkwan [The Images of Late Chosun Dynasty in the Western Travels].” PhD diss., Han’guk University of Foreign Studies, 2014.

Lee, Yeong-Mi, “Hanmi sugyo ijŏn ŭi Sŏyangin ŭi Hanguk yŏksa sŏsul [Korean History Writing prior to Korea-US Treaty],” *Hanguksa yŏn’gu* 148 (2010): 169-197.

Lee, Yongmin, “Kaeil kwa Hŏlbŏtŭ ŭi Han’guksa ihae [Understanding of Korean History by Gale and Hulbert].” *Kyohoe sahak* 6, no 1 (Jan 2007): 161-203.

Mitsui Takashi, “Chŏnhu Ilbonesŏŭi Chosŏnsahak ŭi kaesi wa sahaksasang [Japan’s Historiography of Korea and its images in 1950-60s].” Han’guksa yŏn’gu 153 (Jun 2011): 343-369.

Mitsui Takashi, “Ilsŏndongjoron ŭi hakmunjŏk kiban e kwanhan siron [A Study on the Origins and Development of Ilsŏndongjoron in Modern Japanese Academism before and after the Japanese Annexation of Korea].” *Han’guk munhwa* 33 (Jun 2004): 247-270.

Miyajima, Hiroshi. “Ilbon kuksaŭi sŏngnip kwa han’guksa e taehan insik – pongkŏnje e taehan nonŭirŭl chungsimŭro [The Establishment of Japanese National History and Its Perception of Korean history: focusing on the discussion of feudalism].” *Hanil kongdong yŏn’gu ch’ongsŏ* 2 (Mar 2000): 307-340.

Nam, Yongwoo. “Hayashi Shihei ŭi ŏpchŏk: Samguk T’ongnam tosŏl kwa pudo ŭi Tokdo rŭl chungsim ŭro.” *Yŏngt’o haeyang yŏn’gu* 11 (Jun 2016): 118-157.

Park, Chan-Heung. “Mansŏnsa esŏŭi kodae Manchu yŏksa e taehan insik [A Study on the Ancient History of Manchuria Interpreted through Mansenshi].” *Han’guk kodaesa yŏn’gu* 76 (Dec 2014): 127-165.

Ryu, Dae Young. *Chogi Miguk sŏn’gyosa yŏn’gu* [Studies on the Early American Missionaries in Korea]. Seoul: Han’guk kidokkyo yŏksa yŏn’guso, 2001.

Ryu, Dae Young. *Kaehwagi Chosŏn kwa Miguk sŏn’gyosa* [American missionaries and Chosŏn during the enlightenment period]. Seoul: Han’guk kidokkyo yŏksa yŏn’guso, 2004.

Schmid, Andre. “Oriental singminjuŭi ŭi tojŏn: Anglo-American pip’an ŭi han’gye [The Challenge Posed by the Oriental Colonialism; the limitation of the criticism by the Anglo-American].” *Yŏksa munje yŏn’gu* 12 (June 2004): 157-186.

Shin, Kayoung. “Imna Ilbonbu yŏn’guwa singminjuŭi yŏksagwan [Studies in Mimana Nihonfu and the colnial view of history].” *Yŏksa pip’yŏng* 115 (May 2016): 232-251.

Sin, Pongnyong. “Sŏsedongjŏmgi Han’gugin kwa sŏguin ŭi sangho insik [The inter-perception of Korean and the Westerners in the period of Western intrusion to the East].” *Han’guk munhwa yŏngu* 27 (Dec 2004): 62-93

So, John. “Hŏlbŏtŭ sŏnkyosaŭi han’guksa yŏn’gu [Research on primary sources of Homer B. Hulbert’s Korean history].” *Taehak kwa Sŏnkyo* 30 (June 2016): 103-124.

Song, Yŏngbin. “Nasyŏnal chiogŭraepiggi pon Han’guk kwa Ilbon ŭi 100nyŏn [100 years between Korea and Japan, seen by National Geographic].” In *Kŭnhyŏndae Han’guk e taehan oeguk ŭi sisŏn*, edited by Song Yŏngbin. Seoul: Ewha University Press, 2006.

Takashi, Hiroshi. “Ilbon misulsa wa Chosŏn misulsa ŭi sŏngnip [Establishment of Japanese Art History and Korean Art History.” In *Kuksaŭi Sinhwarŭl nŏmŏsŏ*, edited by Lim Jihyun and Yi Sŏng-si, Seoul: Humanist, 2004.

Takashi, Mitsui. “Chŏnhu Ilbonesŏ ŭi Chosŏnsahak ŭi kaesi wa sahaksasang [Japan’s Historiography of Korea and its images in 1950-60s].” *Han’guksa yŏn’gu* 153 (June 2011): 343-369.

Wee, Kaya. “Hansagun hanbandosŏl ŭn Singminsahak ŭi sanmul in’ga [Is the Theory of the Four Han Chinese commanderies in Korean Peninsula a Colnialist view?].” *Yŏksa pip’yŏng* 115 (Feb 2016): 238-261.

Yi, Hun-sang. “Miguk ŭi Han’guksa yŏn’gu- Edŭwadŭ wagŭnŏ ŭi Chosŏnsidae yŏn’gu wa irŭl tulŏssan nonjŏmdŭl [Korean Studies in the United States – Edward Wagner’s research on Chosŏn period and the involved issues].” *Yŏksa pip’yŏng* 59 (2002): 99-125.

Yi, Manyŏl. “19segi mal Ilbon ŭi Han’guksa yŏn’gu.” In *Ch’ŏngil chŏnjaeng kwa Hanil kwan’gye*,” edited by Han’guksa Yŏn’guhoe. Seoul: Ilchogak, 1985.

Yi, Manyŏl. “Sŏn’gyosa Ŏndŏudŭ ŭi ch’ogi hwaldong e kwanhan yŏn’gu [A study on the early activities of Horace G. Underwood].” *Han’guk kidokkyo wa yŏksa* 14 (Feb 2001): 9-46.

Yi, Manyŏl. *Han’guk kŭndae yŏksahak ŭi hŭrŭm* [Development of Korean Modern Historiography]. Seoul: Purŭn Yŏksa, 2007.

Yi, Paeyong. “Sŏyangini pon Han’guk kŭndae sahoe [Korean modern society seen by Westerners].” *Ehwa sahak yŏngu* 28 (2001): 105-125.

Yi, T'aejin. "Tangp'asŏngnon pip'an [A critique of discussions on Factionalism]." *Han'guksa simingangjwa* 1 (Aug 1987): 53-69.