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1. Introduction

With the signing of the Ýlsa Treaty of 1905, the novel concept of “nationalism” (minjokchwu) dominated the thinking of the times and also became the spiritual foundation of the anti-Japanese independence movement in Korea. Accordingly, nationalism underpinned a new form of historical study, a so-called “nationalistic history.”¹

Although nationalistic history was most intense during the Japanese colonial period when Korea lost its sovereignty, it has continued as the main historical approach in Korea from liberation to the present day. However, within the general context of nationalistic history, different themes have evolved between discrete periods, and likewise, the character of nationalistic history itself has experienced constant change with the rising quality of scholarship in the field. Moreover, even in work done on the same period, there are diverse historical interpretations owing to differences in how one defines the Korean nation (minjok), or in the often self-serving methodologies employed by historians, or even in the choice of primary sources. For these reasons, it is possible to periodize nationalistic history, and it is
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¹ “Nationalist history (minjok sahak)” refers to historical studies of the Korean nation race, whereas the very similar term minjokchwu sahak connotes a nationalistically minded interpretation of Korean history. The difference between the former and the latter is subtle and, at times, indiscernible, but it is also essential to understanding the argument below (translator’s note)
also imperative that we appreciate the individual interpretations of various scholars.

The analysis below will regard the years of Japanese rule subsequent to the establishment of the protectorate in 1905 as the lowest point in nationalistic history. This era can be subdivided into four periods: the Taehan empire, the 1910s, the 1920s, and the 1930s. Nationalistic history underwent great changes over the course of these four subperiods.

2. Late Chosŏn Origins of Nationalist History

It is generally accepted that Korean nationalism during the Taehan Empire and the Japanese colonial era was thoroughly imbued with both an anti-imperialistic national consciousness and an anti-feudal democratic consciousness. We should bear in mind, however, that a sense of both nationalism and democracy did not appear suddenly during the Taehan Empire or the colonial era, but rather, grew gradually over the three hundred years of history subsequent to the Japanese invasions of 1592 and 1598 and the incursions of the Manchus during the seventeenth century. Just as the Korean nationalism of the twentieth century had a long preceding history, nationalist history, too, had antecedents to its fruition in the 1900s.

Historians during the late Chosŏn dynasty possessed both a historical consciousness of nationalistic and democratic themes and a progressive scientific approach to history which were lacking in their early Chosŏn predecessors.2 Foreign invasions helped to promote a sense of nationalism in later Chosŏn dynasty historical studies as did changes in the world order brought about by the establishment of the Qing dynasty in China. The experience of having their country trampled underfoot by the Japanese and the Manchus left deep psychological scars on the Korean intelligentsia who prided themselves as inhabitants of a culturally advanced country in the tradition of a “little China.” And so, the invasions provided an impetus for Koreans, who, in reacting to the crises, were awakened to a sense of national identity.

Generally speaking, the first national consciousness movement among late Chosŏn intellectuals proceeded in the direction of reaffirming Chosŏn’s cultural superiority as a “little China.” After the downfall of the Ming, this sentiment was transformed into the belief that Korea alone constituted the center of true
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civilization, and in order to reinforce this unique status, the Korean *intellegentsia* adopted neo-Confucian theories of political legitimacy (*Ch'ongt'ongnon*) originally advocated by Zhu Xi. In addition, the period from the mid-seventeenth to the late eighteenth centuries witnessed the publication of a number of annotated histories (*kangmokp'yop saxi*) intended to confirm the eastward transfer of cultural orthodoxy from the Chinese mainland to the Korean peninsula.

The reaffirmation of Korea as a "little China" legitimized by neo-Confucian orthodoxy had a considerable role in fostering hostility against foreign invaders and a commensurate feeling of patriotism toward the Chosön dynasty. However, orthodox neo-Confucianism, even in its Korean incarnation, did not challenge fundamentally the prevailing China-centered view of the world. Moreover, once the Qing, whom the Koreans had regarded with contempt as barbarians, emerged as a culturally advanced nation during the reigns of the Kangxi and Qianlong emperors in the eighteenth century, it was no longer possible to dismiss the Manchus as uncivilized. This was also the case with the Japanese, Japan and the Manchus were no longer perceived solely as enemies toward whom the Koreans harbored a burning hatred and a desire for revenge, but more as equal and peacefully coexistent competitors with whom to promote cultural exchange. But along with these amicable relations with its neighbors came new imperatives to cultivate Korean national power and patriotism.

In the mid-eighteenth century, after *Tongsazang* (An Annotated Account of Korean History), the publication of annotated histories declined, and in their place, historical treatises (*kijŏnch'e*) or variations thereof were printed in greater numbers. This development showed that the era of dividing the world in half between China and the barbarian nations had passed. And with the appearance of these treatises which were composed according to a fixed style, we can see the reconstruction of a positive and more independent interpretation of Korean history. Specifically, the *kijŏnch'e* utilized the forms of *pon'gi* (records of reigning monarchs' achievements), *sega* (accounts of leading families), *yǒlŏn* (biographies of famous individuals), *chi* (descriptions of government offices, finances, geography, and other such matters), and *yŏnp'ye* (chronological records of events); all of which were used in Sima Qian's *Shujū* (Historical Records) This format was marked by the absence of a dichotomous world view where all peoples other than the Chinese are deemed

3 Histories published after the mid-eighteenth century such as Yi Chong-hwa's *Tongsazang*, Ch'ong Yag-yong's *Kangyŏk ko*, Han Ch'ŏl-yun's *Haealong yŏksa*, Hong Kyŏng-mo's *Taealong changgo*, and An Chong-hwa's *Tongsaz chŏryo*, generally do not follow the annotated history (*kangmok*) format
categorically barbaric. The kijŏnch’e were thus able to reconstruct a vision of Korean history that was independent of the old Sinocentric world view.

In this more independent world order, Koreans recognized that their history also had a cultural identity that was separate from that of China. Not only was Korea geographically distinct from China, but Koreans realized that their country had a definite individuality as regards to climate, territory, customs, language, and tastes as well. In other words, concurrent to the feelings of independence as a geographical entity came a sense of cultural uniqueness and independence. In addition, during the late Chosŏn dynasty, the recognition of Tan’gun Chosŏn which had been mentioned prominently in a number of histories, served to raise Koreans’ consciousness both of their common ancestry and of the existence of a native religion dating back to Tan’gun. These various developments were seeds that would sprout a nationalistic consciousness among Koreans in the future.

Another aspect of the changes in historiography in late Chosŏn was a renewed interest in former Korean territories in Manchuria. The Manchu and Japanese invasions made Koreans acutely aware of their country’s economic and military weaknesses, and many began to feel that the fundamental reason for this condition was the loss of land north of the Yalu River. Moreover, two costly wars had shown that however unpalatable the thought, it was indeed true that “the strong feast on the weak,” and the idea that the key to “self-strengthening” lay in recovering lost territories in Manchuria began to surge in popularity. Accordingly, progress in historical geography, as evidenced by the marked rise in the publication of geographical treatises on Old Chosŏn, the Samhan states, Koguryŏ, Paekche, and also Parhae, was a special characteristic of historiography in the late Chosŏn period.

Along with the renewed interest in the northern territories associated with self-strengthening, the question of the development and defense of Korea’s island possessions, or in general, the problem of maritime defense, became another subject of serious debate. The importance which historical documents of the late Chosŏn period assigned to island nations such as T’annaguk (Cheju Island), Usan’guk (Ullŭng Island), and Taemado (Tsushima Island), was symptomatic of this climate of opinion.

Later on, the growth of a democratic consciousness which had appeared in the
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historical studies of the late Chosŏn period would manifest itself in such measures as the breakdown of the traditional social system, the redistribution of land, an easing of the financial burdens on the peasantry, the establishment of moral principles of government, respect for the will of the common people, and the democratization of the system of local government. Of course, such progress as there was in democratic consciousness did not yet break free of the restrictions imposed by Confucian ideas regarding the people, but there is no doubt that it did pave the way for the possibility of future development of the democratic concept that sovereignty rests with the people.

Finally, we cannot overlook the fact that late Chosŏn historians, for the first time, examined historical sources critically, a method characteristic of modern historiography. Modern history has its own identity as an independent academic discipline, but in the Korean case, this independence was not easily established within the confines of a Confucian historiography which was inextricably linked to the Confucian Classics and the relationship between form and practice (ch'eyong kwan'gye). Nevertheless, even though on the surface, historical studies of the late Chosŏn period seem constricted by Confucian attitudes toward history, there were some historians who showed a surprising degree of neutrality and scientific methodology in their analyses. We can count An Chŏng-bok, Han Ch'i-yun, and Chŏng Yag-yong as representative of this group of historical specialists.

To summarize, the development of historical studies in the late Chosŏn period represented repeated efforts to reform the status quo of the discipline toward a greater consciousness of the Korean nation and democratic ideals, as well as a stronger emphasis on scientific methods. This trend is immensely significant in the subsequent creation and growth of a modern historical consciousness, namely nationalistic history.

3. The Establishment of Nationalist History during the Taehan Empire

Historiography in the late Chosŏn period was progressing steadily toward modern historical studies with its orientation towards nationalism, democracy, and science. In 1894, as a result of the Kabo Reforms, historical studies began to take on the form of what was called shin sach'ẹ, or a “new historical style;” and by the time of the Ŭlsa Treaty of 1905, there had been yet another transformation, this time into shin sahak (new historical studies), which was yet another way of referring to nationalistic history.
The *shin sach'e* of the Korean enlightenment (*kaehwa*) period was fundamentally a successor to the historical studies of the late Chosón dynasty, and hence, preserved the nationalistic, democratic, and scientific trends thereof. However, the new historical style movement did present some new features. First, it was *chungin* and not *yangban* who were the leaders of *shin sach'e*.\(^6\) Since these individuals were often on the faculties of schools established in the wake of the *Kabo* reforms, they compiled historical works in the form of textbooks for all levels of schooling. For this reason, most of the histories from the enlightenment period are textbooks.

Since the point of a textbook is to convey its contents in a compressed format, there was no need to write in an academic style citing voluminous source material. Therefore, most of the historical works of this period did not evidence progress in serious scholarship, and for the most part, they followed the annotated history format of the *Tongsa kangmok* and adhered to neo-Confucian theories of political legitimacy.\(^7\) The fact that the *chungin* who had emerged as the *intelligentsia* of this new period but who, nevertheless, had not yet surpassed the levels of *yangban* scholarship, were charged with the task of the people's historical education, also had some bearing on the style of the historical works of that period.

Second, the new historical style movement began to be influenced by the imperialistic historical view of Japan which had taken on the form of Western modern historical studies subsequent to the Meiji Restoration. Consequently, questions came to be aired, such as whether to write histories in the purely organizational format of *p'yôn*, *chang*, and *chôl*, or in a thematic manner according to topics such as politics, economy, society, or culture; and whether or not to date events according to the Western calendar. The term *shin sach'e* originated with external changes such as those above which arose when attempts were made to modernize Korean historical studies along Western standards.

However, despite these developments, the *shin sach'e* movement of the enlightenment era proved to be a hindrance to the growth of nationalistic history because of the distorted view of Korean history received from the Japanese historical studies which constituted the nucleus of *shin sach'e*. For example, erroneous statements in the *Nihon shoki* to the effect that the Japanese empress Jingu had
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subjugated Silla and that the ancient state of Imna (Japanese Mimana) in southern Korea was of Japanese origin were accepted as truth by shin sach’e historians. 8

Such fallacies were readily received because the leaders of the Korean enlightenment had an insufficiently developed notion of Korean national identity and an overly optimistic view of Japan. In other words, their idea of nationalism centered primarily on Korea’s independence from Qing China, and there was little awareness of the need to preserve the country’s autonomy vis-a-vis Japan. This focus on Qing China was a function of a wariness on the part of the Korean people instilled by the Manchu invasions and a justifiable concern that the gradual rise in Chinese political meddling and economic aggression subsequent to the opening of Korean treaty ports required immediate attention. The Japanese, for their part, encouraged Korean efforts at independence from China while plotting their own brand of aggression on the peninsula. The Korean enlightenment thinkers took such advice at face value and failed to see the danger of Japanese subjugation which lay hidden behind “independence” from China.

As regards democratic ideals, the shin sach’e school showed many of the same limits that earlier movements had manifested. Kaehwa scholars had come into contact with Western ideas such as the existence of inalienable human rights, the theory of social contract, and social theories of evolution. However, in terms of political structures, they did not progress beyond the idea of a constitutional monarchy to that of a republican form of government.

In short, when we look at the works of the enlightenment thinkers who led the shin sach’e studies movement, we can see some development of the themes of nation, democracy, and scientific methodology beyond the levels of late Chosôn historiography. But on the other hand, the influence of the Japanese colonial imperialistic view of Korean history had also begun to contaminate the movement, and its adverse effect was not inconsiderable. It is for this very reason that nationalistic historians would later claim that shin sach’e had transformed intrinsically Korean matters into something foreign, or that it was a historical movement that had betrayed Korea. 9

It was the Úlsan Treaty of 1905 that sparked the beginning of nationalistic historical studies, and it was Shin Ch’ae-ho who was the leader of this movement.
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from its inception Japan's seizure of Korean sovereignty had brought about a more serious crisis than subordination to the Qing. Accordingly, the anti-Japanese independence movement demanded a far greater degree of national solidarity and resistance than the struggle against the Chinese. Within the context of arguments for independence from Japan, there developed a nationalistic call for a bourgeois revolution to construct a republic, founded upon the ideal of a modern citizens' nation-state, the territory of which was to extend well into Manchuria. Of course, the idea of a bourgeois revolution or of expansion abroad was somewhat far-fetched at a time when Korean national sovereignty was all but lost; however, the Korean bourgeoisie was steadily growing as was the enlightened cultural movement which it led. At the same time, Korean migration into Manchuria was progressing at a rapid rate.

On the domestic front, Korean nationalism during the Taehan empire pursued an anti-feudal bourgeois revolution while internationally, it was manifest in an anti-imperialistic national freedom movement and a quest for territorial expansion into Manchuria. Romantic ambitions for national independence and expansion as well as for "modern" ideals such as liberty, equality, and the rule of reason, came to be exalted. Accordingly, Western enlightenment thinkers like Montesquieu and Kant, and romantic historians such as Carlyle and his notion of hero-worship gained immense popularity during this time.10

For example, Shin Ch'aeho in his biography of Ŭlji Mundŏk, Ŭlji Mundŏk chŏn (1908), praises the imperialistic aspect of Ŭlji Mundŏk's victories over China. In his Yongung kwa segye (The Hero and His World, 1908), he shows his romantic tendencies by paraphrasing Carlyle, "Heroes are the divine spirits who created the world, and the world is but a stage upon which heroes perform." It was Herbert Spencer's theories on social evolution that fanned the flames of romanticism among Korean nationalists during the Taehan empire. In an imperialistic world order where the strong nations feasted upon the weak, heroic individual efforts seemed to be the only way to preserve the existence of the Korean race. Thus, nationalism during the Taehan empire involved both resistance and expansion in the context of a social Darwinist view of history and the world. This form of nationalism took on the appearance of a modern religion in the guise of Taejonggyo, also called Tan'gun'gyo; and it was Shin Ch'aeho who linked this religion to Korean historical

10 Han Young-woo, "Kaehwagi An Chong-hwa ni yŏksa sŏsul (The Historical Narrative of An Chong-hwa during the Enlightenment Period)," Han'guk munhwa 8 [Korean Culture] (Seoul: Seoul National University Press, 1987), 138-140
studies

Although Taegonggyo had its earliest roots in the years immediately subsequent to the Ŭlsa Treaty of 1905, it was formally established (or "resurrected" [chunggwang]) in 1909 and flourished in the 1910s and 1920s. The doctrine of Taegonggyo professed that it was a revival of a native religion from the time of Tan’gun. Taegonggyo quickly came to exert a considerable influence on nationally minded Korean historians of the time because it offered a uniquely Korean view of history centering on Tan’gun. 11

Taegonggyo and nationalistic historical studies began almost concurrently, and they developed together in a close complementary relationship. At the time when Taegonggyo was first beginning to establish itself, Shin Ch’ae-ho was making various presentations expounding nationalistic history. With the publication of the Toksa shillon (1908), Shin laid out the methodology of the nationalistic historical studies which he advocated, and offered a new interpretation of ancient Korean history based upon this methodology. In doing so, Shin Ch’ae-ho distance himself from the earlier shin sach’e movement, and established the basis for a modern nationalistic history. 12

In the Toksa shillon, Sin severely criticized the history textbooks of the enlightenment period and thus paved the way for the creation of a "new history" or shin sahak. The textbooks were not only confined by the medieval Confucian view of history, they were also contaminated by a Japanese imperialistic view of Korean history even to the extent of enslaving it to Japan and selling off the Korean nation. Shin Ch’ae-ho was compelled to use extreme language such as "slavery" (nosŏng)


12 Han, "1910 nyŏndaeyi Shin Ch’ae-ho ni yŏksa mship" Although there is agreement among scholars that Shin Ch’ae-ho was the instrumental figure in the establishment of liberal modern history in Korea, there is some debate as to whether this foundation occurs in the Taehan empire period or in the 1920s Shin Yong-ha (Professor of Sociology, Seoul National University) concurs with the writer in viewing the compilation of Shin Ch’ae-ho’s Toksa shillon as the inauguration of modern historical studies in Korea (Shin Yong-ha, Shin Ch’ae-ho ni sŏhoe sasang yŏng’gu [Studies on the Social Theory of Shin Ch’ae-ho] (Seoul Han’gulsa, 1984). Yi Man-yŏl argues that while modern nationalistic historical studies did manifest signs of development in the Taehan era, such studies were established in strength only during the 1920s (Yi Man-yŏl, Han’guk kŏndaeyi yŏksahak ni the [Understanding Modern Korean Historical Studies] (Seoul Munhak kwa chosŏnga, 1981).
and "selling off the country" (maeguk) in criticizing the textbooks because of his strong dissatisfaction with the way they blindly accepted statements in Japanese historical documents such as the account of Empress Jingu's subjugation of Silla, the portrayal of Imna as a Japanese state, and the claim that Tan'gun and the Japanese god Susano Onomikoto were brothers.

Shin Ch'ae-ho criticized vehemently both the Confucian and the Japanese imperialistic historical viewpoints and suggested a new and alternative way of interpreting Korean history, one that had as its most fundamental goal the accurate depiction of the essence of the Korean race. He saw history, the people, and the state as a trinity-three beings, one substance: "when you take away the people, history becomes meaningless; and when you take away history, the people's enthusiasm for the state diminishes... the state is a living organism composed of the spirit of its people." The "state" to which Shin Ch'ae-ho refers is not the old medieval Chosón state, but "an organism composed of the spirit of its people," a modern nation-state. Thus, history is a means by which to raise support for the new state, since history is, in effect, an affirmation of the nation, or the people who are the constituent elements of that state.

That being the case, how exactly can we define the Korean people who are to be the dominant theme in Korean history? Shin Ch'ae-ho identified six tribes which together constituted the Korean race: Sŏnbi, Puyŏ (descended from Tan'gun), Ch'ina, Malgal, Yŏjun (Jurchen Manchus), and the T'o'jok (composed of the Han and Yemack tribes). Of these six, Shin singled out the Puyŏ as the most important group and stipulated that the others were minor tribes. He claimed, therefore, that the history of the Korean nation was essentially the history of the Puyŏ tribe (also called the Tan'gun tribe) Shin Ch'ae-ho justified his emphasis on the Puyŏ by noting that the tribe possessed a unique pedigree by virtue of its descent from heavenly offspring and that their domain covered a wide expanse of territory including both the Korean peninsula and Manchuria. In other words, Shin placed considerations of blood ties and territorial domain at the center of his concept of the nation. Such an explanation focused due attention on the Korean peninsula and its people, thus overcoming the Confucian view of history which stressed cultural self-esteem as a "little China." But at the same time, and more important in a practical sense, it advocated expansionist nationalism by emphasizing the justice and the necessity of reclaiming Manchuria.

Shin Ch'ae-ho's theory about the centrality of the Puyŏ tribe in Korean history was a successor to a tradition of historical narrative centered upon Tan'gun that had begun in late Koryŏ with the Chewang un'gi and had continued in the late Chosŏn
period with the work of historians like Hö Mok and Yi Chong-hwi. Shin considered all the ancient states of Korea such as Puyŏ, Koguryŏ, Paekche, Silla, Kaya, and Parhae as having descended from Tan’gun stock. Moreover, he looked unfavorably upon Silla’s unification of the Three Kingdoms while postively evaluating the history of Parhae because of his intense awareness of Korea’s lost territory in Manchuria and because of his conviction that the reclamation thereof was both just and necessary. The “recovery” of Manchuria was a very practical aim of Shin Ch’ae-ho’s historical studies.

4. Nationalistic History and the Influence of Taejonggyo during the 1910s

The nationalist history movement of the 1910s developed in the context of a close relationship with Taejonggyo. From its very beginning in Seoul of 1909 under the leadership of Na Ch’ŏl and O Ki-ho, Taejonggyo (originally called Tan’gun’gyo) was a religious organization set up for the goals of the independence movement, and so its doctrine and agenda were thoroughly imbued with a nationalistic flavor. By encouraging the people to follow the teachings of the three gods—Hwanin, Hwanung, and most importantly, Tan’gun —Taejonggyo sought to make time-honored Korean popular beliefs more relevant to the present. Originally, historical tales (sahwa) about the three gods were transmitted from generation to generation under the name of kogi or “ancient records.” However, Taejonggyo adherents revised these ancient records, expanded upon them to suit contemporary aims, and believed in and preached from the final products as if they were sacred scriptures. Ch’ŏnbu kŏng, Samil shin’go, Tan’gi kosa, Hwandan kogi, Shindan shilgi, Shindan munga, and Tano sago are some such books.

Although the contents of the sahwa written by the Taejonggyo followers were not always in agreement, we can summarize a number of common points. First, the area around Paektu-mountain was set up as the cradle of human civilization; thus, Korea was seen as the center of world culture. Second, the Tongi tribes (literally, “eastern bowmen”) which included not only the Puyŏ, but also the Yŏjin (Jurchen Manchus), the Mongols, and the Khitan tribes, were collectively referred to as one

13 For more on the work of Hö Mok and Yi Chong-hwi, see Han, Chosŏn hugi sahaksan yŏn’gu
14 Pak Yong-sŏk, “Taejonggyo ui tongnip undong e kwanhan yŏn’gu (A Study on the Independence Movement and Taejonggyo)”, Such’ŏng 21,22 (1977)
15 Han, “1910 nyŏndaexi minjokguinŏk yŏksa sŏsul”
large racial group, the Paedal tribe. The Paedal, in turn, were viewed as the ancestors of the Korean race. In other words, Taegonggyo fostered a pan-northeast Asianism among the descendants of the Tongi tribes which was similar to the pan-Germanism and the pan-Slavism of the West.

Third, with this expanded notion of the Korean race, it was argued that the domain of the Korean nation should be enlarged as well, to include not only the Korean peninsula and Manchuria, but also northeastern China. Accordingly, Chinese rulers who had come from this northern region like Emperor Shun of antiquity, and the Liao, the Jin, the Yuan, and the Qing emperors, were considered part of the history of the Korean nation. Fourth, the religion at the heart of Korean culture was neither Buddhism nor Confucianism, but rather a system of divine teachings delivered by Tan'gun, namely Taegonggyo. Moreover, this religion was the common faith of all the Tongi peoples, or in other words, the national religion of the Paedal tribe.

In sum, the historical view of the Taegonggyo faithful was much more ambitious both territorially and racially than that of Sin Ch'ae-ho during the Taehan period, which had focused on the centrality of the Puyó tribe in the history of the Korean nation. Whereas Shin's nationalism call for a “greater Korea” focused upon the Puyó and Manchuria, Taegonggyo nationalism urged a pan-northeast Asianism centered upon the Tongi tribes and their domains.

In actuality, the pan-Tongiism of the Taegonggyo believers served to back up the practical aims of winning over the Manchus to Korean tutelage, recovering lost Manchurian territory, and establishing a “Greater Korean” state. In addition, it was intended to make a stand against the current Japanese policy of continental expansion under the pretext of pan-Asianism and thereby to seize leadership in Manchuria. Particularly after the national disgrace of 1910, the Taegonggyo faithful set up a headquarters in Manchuria and accelerated their preaching and independence activities. They held an unusual degree of interest in the history of Parhae because they sincerely hoped to follow the example of the small band of Koguryó refugees of old who had managed to subjugate a much larger number of Malgal people and to rule all of Parhae.

In any case, Taegonggyo, established in 1909, expanded its religious influence in the aftermath of the Japanese annexation the subsequent year. Indeed, many of the Korean independence activists who had fled to Manchuria and China proper, including members of the Shinminhoe, participated in the new religion. By 1920, Taegonggyo could boast of 400,000 devotees. Not surprisingly, the Taegonggyo organization led the Korean independence movement in Manchuria, and historians
who were active in the movement like Pak Ŭn-shik, Shin Ch'ae-ho, An Hwak, Ch'oe Nam-sŏn, An Chae-hong, Chŏng In-bo, and Mun Il-p'yŏng, were either directly or indirectly influenced by the religion.

The most prolific historian during the 1910s was Pak Ŭn-shik. He fled to China right after the annexation and subsequently became a leading figure in the Taejonggyo organization. In 1911, he presented, one after another, biographies of ancient Korean heroes who had been active in Manchuria such as Kŭm T'aeko [Chinese: Jin Taizō], King Tong-myŏng, Tae Cho-yŏng, and Chŏn'gae somun. Later, with the publication of Han'guk t'ongsa (A Lamentful History of Korea, 1915) and Han'guk tongnip undongi hyŏlsa (A Bloody History of the Korean Independence Movement, 1920), Pak contributed greatly to the setting of a standard for understanding modern history from the vantage point of nationalism. Moreover, his histories of Korea disconcerted the Japanese authorities and compelled the Government-General to hurriedly edit and compile its own version of Korea's history.16

Pak Ŭn-shik was originally an enlightenment thinker with roots in the Wang Yang-ming school of Confucianism, and he had also participated in the Independence Club (Tongnip hyŏphoe). Because of his background as a Confucian scholar, even until the end of the Taehan Empire, Pak asserted that Confucianism should be the state religion of Korea. However, in the 1910s, having converted to Taejonggyo after the shock of 1910, he synthesized Confucianism, Buddhism, and Sŏn'gyo, and urged Koreans to preserve the country's soul (kuk'on) and to use the kuk'on as a foundation to build in Manchuria a rich and powerful "Greater Korea" state where all would be equal. Pak understood "history" to be a combination of shin (god) and hon (soul), and "country" (kukka) in terms of hyŏng (form) and paek (spirit). If shin and hon survive, then hyŏng and paek can be brought back to life. Pak's spiritualistic historical viewpoint which shows the influence of the subjective perspective espoused by Wang Yang-ming Confucianism, approached history from a religious dimension.

Among the historians influenced by Taejonggyo during the 1910s, Shin Ch'ae-ho's accomplishments are unforgettable. In 1910, he wrote Tongguk kodae sŏn'gyo ko (A Study on the Ancient Korean Religion of Sŏn'gyo) where he claimed that

16 Ibid, and Shin Yong-ha, Pak Ŭn-shikŭi sacho sasang yŏn'gu [Studies on the Social Theory of Pak Ŭn-shik] (Seoul: Seoul National University Press, 1982)

17 A faith native to Korea and associated with the god-spirit Sŏn, originally a man whose ascetic lifestyle allowed him to escape his earthly existence and become a deity (translator's note)
Sŏn’gyo was religion native to Korea. Five years later, he published *Kkum hanil* (*Dream Heaven*, 1915), a narrative of Korea’s ancient history written in the style of a historical tale (*sahwa*) and informed by the tenets of Sŏn’gyo.\(^{18}\)

The *sahwa* were originally romanticized historical narratives, and the large majority of histories produced by *Taejonggyo* devotees were written in that format. The series of biographies of ancient heroes by Pak Ūn-shik which I mentioned earlier also followed the *sahwa* form, and even Shin Ch’ae-ho was no exception to the trend. Since dreams could be used to stir up the reader’s most intense emotions, the dream motif was an important characteristic and an oft-employed technique of the *sahwa* genre during the 1910s.

However, during the latter part of the decade, Shin Ch’ae-ho returned to a more cool-headed and academic approach toward history which he showed in his systematic treatment of ancient Korean culture entitled *Chosŏn sanggo munhwasa* (*A History of Ancient Korean Culture*, 1919-1921\(^7\)). The view of ancient Korean history that he presented in this book and in *Kkum hanil* was radically different from that which he had reflected earlier in *Toksa shillon*. It was in the two later books that Shin Ch’ae-ho interpreted the folk religion (*munjok chonggyo*) of Sŏn’gyo [*Nangga sasang*] as the essence of Korean national culture, referred to all of the *Tong†* tribes as Korean peoples, recognized Tan’gun Chosŏn culture as the origin of all east Asian civilization, and divided the political system of the Tan’gun era into three capitals (*kyŏng*) and five districts (*pu*). Such interpretations of ancient Korean history showed clearly the influence of *Taejonggyo* doctrine and scripture. But on the other hand, in the *Chosŏn sanggo munhwasa*, Sm showed, as well, an increasing trend toward more scientific methods in historical research by emphasizing the importance of the critical evaluation of primary sources, archaeology, epigraphy, and comparative linguistics in historical studies. Although the Taejonggyo religion had a considerable effect on his historical perspective, Shin Ch’ae-ho, nevertheless, was a pioneer in elevating the study of Korean history to a more scientific and modern plane.

Another historian of the 1910s, Ch’oe Nam-sŏn, established himself as an authority on Tan’gun and ancient Chosŏn studies, having published a number of important works on the period, most notably *Ko Chosŏnin ʻat China yŏnhae singminya* (*The Colonies of Ancient Korean Peoples along the China Coast*, 1915) and *Kyego ch’a jon - Tan’gun kūp Puyŏ shijŏl* (*Studies on Antiquity: the Age of

\(^{18}\) Han, “1910 nyŏndaehŭ Shin Ch’ae-ho’ŭi yŏksa shíshik”
Tan'gun and Puyŏ, 1916-1918). Ch'oe, who had dropped out of his studies at Waseda University in Japan where he had been one of the first foreign students, was heavily influenced by Taejonggyo in his interpretation of ancient Korean history. He traced fifty successive generations of Tan'gun descent, and posited that states such as Sŏn'gūn and Hwe located in northeastern China during the early Zhou dynasty were colonies settled by people from Old Chosŏn. However, Ch'oe Nam-sŏn did not count all of the Tongi tribes as Korean, and in his more narrow definition, we can see his divergence from the Taejonggyo perspective on the Korean nation. In the 1920s, Ch'oe's scholarship had undergone radical change, but this will be discussed later.

One person who cannot be forgotten in connection with the history of nationalism during the 1910s is Kim Kyo-hŏn (1868-?). Early in his career, he participated in both the Tongnip hyŏphoe and the Shinminhoe, but after the Japanese annexation he became very much involved with Taejonggyo, and in 1916, he succeeded Na Ch'ŏl as the religion's second patriarch (1916-1923). He played a pivotal role in formulating and organizing the religious principles of Taejonggyo, and he also provided a great stimulus for the Korean independence movement in Manchuria by writing Korean history textbooks for military cadets studying in Manchuria. Some such books were Shindan shulgi (The Veritable Records of the God Tan'gun, 1914), Shundan minsa (A Popular History of the God Tan'gun, 1914), and Tanjo sago (An Account of Tan'gun, the Great Ancestor). Among the important characteristics of Kim's historical narrative was his inclusion of the so-called "Northern tribes" like Liao, Jin, Yuan, and Qing in his treatment of Korean (Paedaljok) history. He also presented in minute detail, the course of Sŏnjgyo which he considered a national religion native to Korea from the time of Tan'gun. In addition, Kim used common folk sources handed down from generation to generation to reconstruct a narrative of culture during the Tan'gun period. Although Kim Kyo-hŏn's historical consciousness and method did not break completely from the sahwa mold, he was relatively honest in the gathering of sources. Moreover, his contribution to consolidating and organizing the fruits of the research of late Chosŏn scholars like Yi Ik, Hŏ Mok, An Chŏng-bok, Yi Chong-hwi, and Pak Chi-won was substantial. Kim's Shindan minsa is of particular significance because it was the first piece of historical writing to treat the whole of Korean history from Tan'gun to the end of the Chosŏn dynasty from the perspective of nationalism.

19 Ch'oe Nam-sŏn, "Kyego ch'ajon-Tan'gun kŭp Puyŏ shijŏl," Ch'ŏngch'ın 14 (1918).
20 Han, "1910 nyŏnda ui minjokch'ulbok yŏksa sŏsul."
Another of the Korean independence fighters in Manchuria during the 1910s whose historical work deserves mention is Yi Sang-ryong. In 1911, he fled to Sōgando and there established the Shinhŭng Military School where he devoted himself to the education of young men of talent for the movement to restore Korean independence. During this time, he wrote two important books: Sōsarok (A Record of The Westward Migrations [of the Korean People], 1911) and Taedong yŏksa (A History of Korea, 1913). The latter book is no longer in existence so it is impossible to know its contents, but the former employed previously unused Chinese sources like the Manzhou yuanluu kao and the Manzhou dizhi in order to construct a new interpretation of ancient Korean history.

Yi Sang-ryong stipulated that history "raised the dignity of the country and fostered patriotism (kungmin chŏngshin)." He also claimed that Manchuria was Korean territory, and acting under the premise that the Jurchen Manchus were of Korean racial stock, he argued that Korean history had a dualistic nature, divided between a northern history centering on Manchuria and a southern version centering on the Korean peninsula. Among the two, the northern current which constituted the mainstream of Korean history was the story of the Tan’gun race which had been active without interruption until Parhae, during which time Suksin and Japan were subject nations subordinate to Tan’gun. Moreover, Yi asserted that the history of the Tan’gun people had not been broken, even during later years, since the four Han commanderies and the state of Kija were concentrated in a small portion of the Liaotung peninsula and not in the territory of the Korean peoples. Like Kim Kyobŏn and Pak Ŭn-shik before him, Yi Sang-ryong’s insistence that the Manchu tribes were of Korean ethnic stock and that the history of the Korean nation should be centered squarely on Manchuria was connected to the practical aim of constructing a greater Chosŏn state in Manchuria which would incorporate the Manchu people.

5. Divergent Trends in Nationalist History during the 1920s

1) Compromised Nationalist History

In the 1920s, corresponding to the spread of workers’ and peasants’ movements fueled by socialist ideology and the strengthening of the Japanese assimilation policy, nationalistic history, too, had grown more than ever before and now was experiencing specialization and differentiation within its ranks. The March First
Movement of 1919 was a turning point at which the Japanese realized that a policy of cultural assimilation would be more effective in furthering colonial rule than military force and suppression; hence, they adopted the so-called "cultural policy". It was in their attempts to distort Korean history that the Japanese expended the most energy toward the goal of fully assimilating the Korean people as citizens of Japan. The Japanese had a long history of trying to misconstrue Korean history, and even after the Meiji Restoration, books like Otori Keitsukei's *Chosen kibun* (1885), Shigeno, Hisakome, and Hoshino's *Kokushikan* (1890), and Hayashi Taisuke's *Chosenshu* (1892), were published in succession erroneously claiming that Japan had dominated Korea in ancient times and that the Japanese and the Korean peoples were descended from the same ancestors.

After the Russo-Japanese War of 1905, Japan began its imperialistic advance into Manchuria, and studies of the so-called "Manchurian-Korean" historical school appeared which subordinated Korean history to that of the Asian continent. The activities of nationalistic Korean historians like Pak Ün-shik subsequent to 1910 alarmed the Japanese, and in 1915, acting through the office of the *Chungch'uwon*, the Japanese colonial authorities commenced the task of systematically re-editing the whole of Korean history. This signalled the beginning of the Japanese government's direct involvement in the systematic distortion of Korean history.

The 1919 March First Movement impressed upon the Japanese the importance of rewriting Korean history, and so the Government-General in 1922 established a committee for the editing and compilation of Korean history, the Chosenshi henshukai (Korean: Chosónsa p'yŏnshuhoe). The committee took charge of compiling the *Chosenshi* (*The History of Chosón*), a massive 35-volume comprehensive history of Korea. The Japanese authorities also launched a project to survey places and artifacts of historical value (*koseki chosa jigyo*, Korean: *kōjīk chosa saeyp*) in Korea. During this period, the Japanese concentrated most of their efforts in the area of ancient history, they were particularly interested in academically nullifying the existence of Tan'gun, the spiritual font of the Korean independence movement.

This new situation in the 1920s led to diversification in the course of Korean nationalism. Some passive nationalists argued for either national renovation (*mnyok kaejo*) or home rule (*chach'i*) within the Japanese empire and groped for compromise with the Japanese, while others held fast without compromise,

---

22 Yi Man-yŏl, *Han'guk kŏndaeyŏksahakŭt thae*
advocating instead, a nationalism of the masses.

(1) Ch’oe Nam-san (1890-1957)

The most prominent of the historians who belonged to the compromised nationalist faction was Ch’oe Nam-san. Born of the chungin class, Ch’oe had studied at Waseda University and later expanded his publishing activities through the Kwangmunhoe. From the 1920s onward, he presented numerous studies on Tan’gun and came to be regarded as an authority on the subject. However, in 1928, he began his descent down the treacherous road of collaboration by becoming a member of the Chosenshi henshukai, and in 1935, he supported Japanese policies regarding worship at Shinto shrines. As a result, he was ostracized as an anti-nationalist after liberation.

Ch’oe Nam-san’s studies on Tan’gun and ancient Korean history differed on a number of points from the work of uncompromised nationalist historians. First, Ch’oe divided the ancient civilizations of the world into three cultural groups: the Indo-European, Chinese, and Purham cultures. Thus, he established Purham as one of the world’s three great civilizations, and he placed Korea’s ancient culture at the center of the Purham cultural region. To the west, the territory of the Purham culture included the Balkan peninsula, the Caspian Sea, the Black Sea, Central Asia, Mongolia, and Manchuria; while to the east, it extended to Japan and Liu Qiu [Okinawa]. Ch’oe’s Purham culture was, in essence, an expansion of Taejonggyo’s Tongi culture to include Japan; thus recognizing the cultural homogeneity between Japan and Korea. In later days, this argument was to be used as an academic basis to justify Korean worship at Shinto shrines.

Second, Ch’oe inferred that Tan’gun was a universally revered figure within the large super-nation which constituted the Purham culture. In other words, Tan’gun

---

23 The representative figure of the national renovation group is Yi Kwang-su who wrote Minjok kaejorun in 1922. In this book, he lists as some of the innate characteristics of the Korean race mendacity, egotism, sloth, untruthfulness, cowardice, and the lack of a societal instinct. Such tendencies, he proposed, could be overcome only by constant practice and strenuous effort. The sort of argument, although it might have some basis in fact, had considerable role in glossing over the underlying contradictions in the colonial system. As for the home rule movement, it first appeared around 1924 and its central medium was the Dong-A Ilbo newspaper.

24 Ch’oe Nam-san wrote a number of books in the 1920s and 1930s on Tan’gun and ancient history Chojoen yoksja tonggok kanghwadae (1922), Purham munhwa won (1925-1927), Assi Chosa (1925), Tan’gun non (1925), Tan’gun puin i i mang (1925), Salman’gyo Ch’agi (1927), Tan’gun kip ki yon’gu (1928), Tan’gun kwa sam hwang o che (1928), Yoksja nil tonghwa yon Choson (1928), Tan’gun shunja i ko i (1928), Chojoensa i i Kia min China i i Kia ka amida (1928), Choson yoksja kanghwada (1928-1930), and Han’guk ki ko shindo wa ilbon i ko shindo wa i i yusasong (1935).
...was not just the progenitor of the Korean nation, he was a divinity who existed all throughout the Purham civilization. Ch’oe abandoned the notion of Tan’gun as ruler of the Paedal nation, and in his writings, emphasized the concept of Tan’gun as the subject of a religion native to the entire Purham region. However, because of the tendency to interpret such a native faith (t’osok sinang) as shamanism, Ch’oe’s theories had the net effect of diluting Tan’gun’s nationalistic image.

There are some aspects of nationalism in the scholarship of Ch’oe Nam-sŏn. In an essay he wrote early in 1922, Ch’oe passionately urged the establishment of Chosŏnhak, or Korean studies. He spelled out his position in the following manner:

- It is true that now we have finally been awakened to our nationhood. But there is still confusion in our awakening: we must be liberated from our minds. Independence will come through ideas. Independence must reign in our studies. In particular, a mindset that protects us, ideas that display our true selves, learning that will illuminate our true nature, this is how we can realize absolute freedom, complete independence. By Korean hands will Korean studies be established. On our earth, by our strength, the glorious scriptures of a greater Korea within which circulates Korean blood, without stunted by the breath of Korea, will be made. I know that you will heed the call of honor. 25

In his discussion of Korean studies above, Ch’oe referred to psychological, ideological, and academic independence; however, his nationalist sentiment seems to have been rather limited. Ch’oe was more interested in asserting superiority over Japanese scholars in the academic arena and speeding the development of Asian studies than in recovering the confidence of the Korean people in their history and cultivating a spirit of independence. More than anything else, Ch’oe’s advocacy of Korean studies was a reaction to the Japanese project to survey items and places of historical value in Korea, the koseki chosa jīgyō. In truth, his great emphasis on the independence of Korean studies stemmed not from positive feelings of confidence in the history of the Korean people, but from his own negative feelings of disgust. Indeed, at the end of this very work where he so stressed the need for independent Korean studies, Ch’oe Nam-sŏn pointed out anti-societal instincts and exclusionary self-exaltation as defects in the Korean race. In his 1928 discourse entitled Yŏksa nil t’onghayŏ pon Chosŏnin (Koreans as seen through Their History), Ch’oe singled out as negative aspects of the Korean national character: a tendency toward “serving the great” (sadaeb'yŏk), heteronomy (t’ayulsŏng), a lack of organizational capabilities,

25 Ch’oe Nam-sŏn, Chosŏn yŏksa t’ongsok kanghwa kaeje (1922)
dogmatism (hyŏngshik pyŏng), and optimism (nakch'ŏnsŏng). In his conclusion, he characterized Korean history in the following manner: "Tepid, sickly sweet, and yawn-inducing, Korean history is an endless succession of records that will put anyone to sleep... Contemporary Koreans will see that their deformities are but the end-product of a long process when they look at their history."

If the fundamental character of Korean history was indeed that of a record confirming the deformities of the Korean people, then Ch'oe Nam-sŏn's strong emphasis on the Korean spirit (Chosŏn shin) and Korean studies was no more than empty sentimental rhetoric. Ch'oe's self-critical outlook on Korean history shows in stark relief how deeply he had been contaminated by the Japanese colonial view of history. Of course, it is also true that this negative interpretation of Korean history resulted from his desire for progress and reform through introspection; moreover, we cannot deny the educative significance of Ch'oe's ideas. However, like Yi Kwang-su, the advocate of national renovation (minjok kaejo) who ended up degrading himself to the level of a collaborator, it was no accident that Ch'oe Nam-sŏn, too, would wind up walking a similar road.

In 1928, the same year that he criticized the defects of the Korean character, he became a member of the Chosenshi henshukai and began aiding the Japanese in the systematic distortion of Korean history. In 1935, he gave a lecture which emphasized the similarities between ancient Korean and Japanese religions; thus, lending support to the Japanese policy requiring Korean worship at Shinto shrines. Furthermore, by 1926, Ch'oe had already come to support the so-called "home rule" movement proposed by a portion of the Korean intelligentsia, thereby giving up all hope for an independent Korea.

As a chungin, Ch'oe was a product of utilitarian thinking, and as a student in Japan he was introduced only to the cultural historical approach of the Frenchman Guizot and Rankean positivism. And so, although his historical studies contributed not inconsiderably to the expertization of the field; during the 1920s, a time when the labor movement and socialist ideology were increasing in popularity, he could not help but be confined to a compromised ideology which lacked a foundation among the masses. In the end, Ch'oe Nam-sŏn's compromised posture led him to become an anti-nationalist collaborator.

(2) An Hwak (1888-1946?)

The name of An Hwak figures prominently among compromised nationalistic historians during the 1920s. Born of a chungin family, he studied political science in Japan. An had questionable nationalist credentials because he avoided direct
confrontation with the Japanese and chose rather to engage in his academic activities under a conciliatory relationship with the Government-General. 26

However, he denounced both the sentimentalistic and nostalgic nationalist scholars of the 1910s and the Japanese colonial scholarship which emphasized Korean heteronomy and stagnation. An Hwak attempted, instead, to organize an independent and progressive interpretation of Korean history. Influenced by the modern European method of cultural history currently popular in China and Japan, 27 An made plans to publish a comprehensive history of Korea subdivided into sections on the history of the Korean people as well as its political, economic, cultural, and military history. This opus came in competition with the publication of the Japanese-sponsored five-volume survey of Korean history entitled Chosenshi koza (1923-24). The eight-volume Choson munmyongs'a (A History of Korean Civilization) which An had planned was never completed, but the parts of it which were published, namely Choson munhaksa (A History of Korean Literature, 1921) and Choson chongch'isa (A History of Korean Politics [Choson munmyongs'a], 1920-23), can be considered his definitive works. In particular, the latter was not a narrowly-defined political history, but a chronicle of the lives of the Korean people. Furthermore, this book, in which references were made to 8,500 documents, was typical of the great pains that An Hwak took in his scholarship.

The historical view reflected in An's writings proclaimed the independence and evolution of Korean history. "Independence" meant self-reliance and autonomy in Korea's relations with China, and "evolution" referred to the political and social development of Korean history from ancient times through Koryo and Choson. The theme of self-reliance in Korean history had originally been proposed by the

26 For more on the life and scholarship of An Hwak, refer to Ch'oe Won-shik, "An Chasan üi kukhak-Choson munhaksa üil chungsumiro" (An Hwak's National Studies—Focusing on the History of Korean Literature), Shomsang 8 (1981), Han Young-woo, "Han'guk k'indae yoksahak ka Choson sidaes ulae (Modern Korean Historical Studies and the Interpretation of the History of the Choson Dynasty)", Inmun kwahak üi saerum pahgyang [New Directions in the Humanities], (1984), and Yi Tae-jin, "An Hwak üi saengae wa kukhak seyge (The Career of An Hwak and the World of Korean Studies), Ko Pyong-ik sijaeng hoegap kunyom sahak nonch'ong, Yoks wa in'gan üi taejung [A Collection of Essays in Commemoration of the Sixtieth Birthday of Professor Ko Pyong-ik History and the Human Race] (Seoul Hanul, 1984)

27 Liang Qichao was the main proponent of the new method of cultural history in China, while Nanto Kominami did likewise in Japan. Liang wrote a comprehensive history of China under the name of a "cultural history," and he contributed greatly to expanding the domain of historical research to include politics, economics, and culture. Nanto, a Chinese historian at Kyoto Imperial University, laid the foundation for cultural historical studies in Japan. It would appear that An Hwak's historical work was very much influenced by these two individuals.
nationalist historians of the 1910s; however, their focus was limited to ancient history, and for them, the fundamental component of the self-reliance issue was the occupation (or non-occupation) of Manchuria. Thus, they characterized Korean history after the loss of Manchuria by unified Silla as a period of retrogression in the development of self-reliance. Of course, in theory, the nationalist historians believed in the progress of history, but they could not bring themselves to confirm the actual circumstances of this progress in the history of the Koryŏ and Chosŏn dynasties. This was because the nationalist historians of the 1910s interpreted Korean history with the practical aim of recovering Manchurian territory firmly in mind.

It was precisely because An Hwak did not share this ambition of recovering Manchuria that he could view positively Korean history after Unified Silla's "loss" of Manchuria. An believed that historical development was manifest not in territorial changes, but in the transformation of social and political systems and in the unification of the people within a nation. He could, therefore, evaluate favorably the significance of the Silla unification, and compare and contrast the aristocratic rule of the Koryŏ period with the development of what he called the "enlightened authoritarianism" of the Chosŏn dynasty. An argued that during the Chosŏn period, the power of the throne had been strengthened in comparison to Koryŏ, and that an absolute monarchy had come into being. Under this new political system, the power of the aristocracy was weakened, and the relative status of general subjects and commoners was elevated. He also refuted the negative opinions of Japanese scholars and Korean historians like Yi Kŏn-ch'ang regarding the factional struggles of the Chosŏn dynasty. An chose, instead, to interpret the factionalism constructively as symptomatic of the expansion of government oversight in military and land taxation as well as the grain loan system, and as the origin of modern party politics.

In addition, An Hwak saw Yi T'aejo's nation-building efforts as the victory of a reformist party: he interpreted the Chosŏn dynasty's economic policies as state socialism, its tributary subordination to China as peaceful and reciprocal (hohye sŏllin) foreign relations founded upon the principle of Korea's sovereignty, and the yangban as a socially-open class rather than a fixed hereditary caste. In short, An effected a monumental change of the negative view of the Chosŏn dynasty held by both nationalistic and colonialistic historians who had emphasized only the heteronomy and the stagnation of that era.

Another important theme in An Hwak's perception of Korean political history is the development of self-government. The factional struggles of the Chosŏn dynasty
are themselves not unrelated to the issue of autonomy, but he attached greater importance to the tradition of self-rule as evidenced by the *hwabae* institution of Silla, the *sasingwan* of Koryŏ, and local organizations such as the *yuhoe* [hyanggye] and the *hyanghoe* [hyangch'ŏng] of the Chosŏn period. An went so far as to liken the system of self-government in the Chosŏn dynasty to a constitutional monarchy or a republic.

There can be no doubt that An Hwak's original analysis constituted great progress from the historians of the 1910s and that he widened the scope of historical interpretation in Korea, particularly in regards to medieval and modern Korean history. Nevertheless, his scholarship failed to trigger a strong anti-Japanese spirit during the crucial 1920s, but served, rather, to support the calls of compromised nationalists for self-rule within the Japanese empire.  

2) **Mass-Centered Nationalist History and Shin Ch'ae-ho**

The individual who made the greatest contribution to historical research while adhering firmly to an uncompromised nationalist line in the 1920s was Shin Ch'ae-ho. During this time, he labored mightily to elevate nationalism to new heights by introducing unprecedented developments in both the nationalist movement and the field of historical research.

In the 1920s, Shin, the nationalist activist, came under the influence of the anarchist theories of the Russian thinker Kropotkin (1842-1921). Subsequently, in his efforts to put these theories to practice, he involved himself in counterfeiting activities for which he served a prison term. Like socialism and communism, anarchism disclaimed private property and stressed revolution, but it also differed from the other ideologies in its rejection of social reforms dependent on movements led by organizations such as states, political parties, or even labor unions.

In the anarchist scheme of things, social transformation could be had only through a direct revolution of the masses, the “masses” referring not to a particular class, but to a spontaneous body of autonomous individuals. Human beings were seen as naturally good and inclined to help each other; thus, social change could be effected if one could only act upon the natural feelings of autonomous individuals.

---

28 An Hwak's fixation on the growth of self-government in his interpretation of Korean political history was founded upon theories of republican government which had been popular during the Taehan Empire. Thus, his ideas were independent of the claims for home rule launched by Korean advocating "national reconstruction" during the early 1920s. However, because his works were published during the early 1920s, they came to be used by compromised nationalists to back up their home rule argument.
Anarchism resembled liberalism in its high esteem for the autonomy of the individual. Shin Ch’ae-ho was inclined to espouse Kropotkin’s theories of anarchism because he realized, on the one hand, that nationalism based on social evolutionary ideas of survival of the fittest and the strong feasting on the weak slipped into the self-contradiction of justifying the rule of strong nations. On the other hand, Shin realized the need to develop an argument that corresponded to the class movement which socialism advocated. In other words, he recognized in the concepts of mutual aid and equality inherent in anarchism powerful ideological weapons with which he could criticize both imperialism and classism (kyegǔpchuŭi) as well as promote equality within the nation. Accordingly, in terms of his independence activities during the 1920s, Shin tactfully gave the impression that he had retreated somewhat from his earlier nationalistic stance. In his scholarship, too, he seemed to have shed the notion of using historical studies to instill patriotism, choosing instead to emphasize the notion of “history for history’s sake” and directing his efforts at more evidential and objective scholarship.

However, despite changes such as those mentioned above, the Shin Ch’ae-ho of the 1920s was still essentially a nationalist and a bourgeois historian. Although he placed emphasis on the masses, he thought it still “frivolous fancy” to write at that time about the evolution of a Korean mass identity. He saw pure Korean history as history that took Korea as its sole subject, a truly Korean nation, a Korea of great people. Even as Shin rejected extremist nationalism (kuksugwu) as a form of aggressive militarism, he was apprehensive about criticizing such extreme nationalistic attitudes for fear of diluting his historical consciousness.

Liang Qichao, the Chinese bourgeois historian of the late Qing and the early Republican periods, exerted a tremendous influence on Shin Ch’ae-ho during the 1920s. Shin had been influenced by Liang’s ideas as early as the Taehan era, but it was in the 1920s that he became interested in the latter’s historiography. Shin was particularly swayed by Liang’s Zhongguo lishi yangjiufa (Methods for the Study of Chinese History, 1922), the historical methodology that he presented in the introduction to Chosŏn sanggosa, with the possible exception of Shin’s ideas on the struggle between “us and them” (a wa pi-aŭ t’ujaeng), had much in common with

---

29 See the definition of “anarchism” in the Encyclopedia of Social Science
30 “Chosŏnsa Ch’ŏngni e taehan sŏl” (Personal Misgivings concerning the Interpretation of Korean History), Kaegŏng’im Tan’gae Shin Ch’ae-ho Chŏnjip, chung (The Collected Works of Tan’gae Shin Ch’ae-ho, vol 2, revised edition)
that of the Chinese historian. Shin’s interpretation in the Chosŏn sanggosa of the policies of Wang Mang as an ancient form of socialism and the rule of Emperor Tang Taizong as national socialism are borrowed from Liang’s own assertions. Furthermore, just as Liang who was fundamentally a bourgeois thinker had acknowledged the economic merits of socialism, Shin, too, embraced socialist economic theories because of the repudiation of private property implicit in anarchism. However, Shin showed no interest in materialistic views of history and never sided with the cause of class revolution. In this way, his historical perspective was an ultimately nationalistic one which borrowed from the cultural historical approach.

Thus, during the 1920s, having reformed his nationalistic stance, Shin Ch’ae-ho contributed many original ideas concerning the culture, geography, and institutions of antiquity which betrayed a newfound commitment to the critical examination of source materials and to a cultural approach to history. His new methods were evident first in Chosŏnsa yŏn’gu ch’o (A Draft Study of Korean History, 1922-1925) and later again in Chosŏnsa (A History of Korea, 1931). The main arguments presented in these works were as follows.

First, he recast the Tan’gun of Old Chosŏn as the ruler of the Sudu as opposed to the Paedal tribes, and based upon the legends of the three gods during the Tan’gun period, he equated the three emperors (sam hwang) with the three Han states (sam Han) and also with the three capitals (sam kyŏng). Along the same lines, Shin placed the five districts (o pu) of old within the context of the legends of the Five Emperors (o che).

Second, of the three Han (and the three capitals), he placed the Shinhan state of the Hae clan at Harbin from which they occupied the area around Beijing and Shanggu. After their defeat at the hands of the Xiongnu (Hun) tribes, the Shinhan were succeeded by the Puyŏ, and some refugees from the former Shinhan state fled southward and settled on the right bank of the Naktong River where they established the autonomous district of Chinhun. The Marhan nation of the Han lineage, another of the three Han, was originally situated near P’yŏngyang but was

---

31 Liang Qichao had presented his modern bourgeois method of historical research as early as the 1900s in works such as Zhongguoshi xuren (Discourses on Chinese History, 1901) and Xin shuxue (New History, 1902). Shin Ch’ae-ho’s Toksa shillon reflects Liang’s influence, probably through the writings of Yinhungshi (Korean, Ŭnhung-shil). However, it was with the 1922 publication of Zhongguo lishi yongjuja that Liang presented his theories concerning history in their most definite and systematic form, and the historical methodology outlined in the introduction to Shin’s Chosŏn sanggosa shows clearly the influence of this key work.
later forced out by Kijun, the King of Kija Chosŏn, and some survivors went south where they came to rule the states of Chinhan and Pyŏnhan. The last of the three Han, the Purhan nation of the Ki lineage, was pushed out of its stronghold at Ansiŏn by Wiman and subsequently established the autonomous district of Pyŏnhan on the left bank of the Naktong River. In this way, Shin argued that the three Han states did not originate in any one particular area, but rather had their origins in various places in the north which they relinquished later in their movement down the Korean peninsula. This distinction between earlier and later stages of state development during the Samhan period is one of the most original interpretations in Shin Ch'ae-ho's scholarship.

Third, he recognized as fact the legends about Kija's coming eastward and claimed that Kija, an adherent of the Sudugyo religion native to Chosŏn, had fled to Korea because it was the land of his faith. It was his descendant who became king in 323 B.C. Fourth, Shin Ch'ae-ho argued that the so-called Han commanderies were falsely reported to have been established in the Liaodong area; thus, Old Chosŏn was never a colony of Han China. In fact, due to the existence of the Nangnangguk state of the Ch'oe clan at Pyongyang, there was an uninterrupted history of autonomy in ancient Korea. Fifth, of the Three Kingdoms, Koguryŏ was the first to construct a centralized state; Paekche ruled Western Liaodong, Shandong, Jiangsu, Zhejiang, Yuzhou, and the surrounding areas; while Silla occupied territory up to the northeastern region of Jilin during the reign of King Chinhŭng.

Although Shin Ch'ae-ho's later views on ancient history were fundamentally unchanged from the 1910s in their focus on Manchuria and portrayal of a thriving Tan'gun Chosŏn state, it was also evident that he had largely cast off the influence of Taejonggyo in his new identification of Tan'gun as the ruler of the Sudu (not the Paedal) and in his lack of reference to Taejonggyo scriptures such as Samul shin'go and Chŏnbu kyŏng which he now considered apocryphal. Shin's organization of ancient history served as the standard for nationalist historians in the 1930s and exerted a considerable influence on An Chae-hong, Chŏng In-bo, and others.

It must also be mentioned that there were many works published during the 1920s by historians who were still heavily under the sway of Taejonggyo and who were thus not as mindful of critically examining their sources. Among such books, we can number Yi Won-t'ae's Paedaljak kangyŏk hyŏngsedo (1923), Shin T'ae-yun's Paedal Chosŏn chŏngsa (1928), and Kim Kwang's Taedong sagang (1928).
6. The "New Nationalist History" of the 1930s and the Korean Studies Movement

1) Ideological Divisions during the 1930s

Subsequent to the Manchurian Incident of 1931 the Japanese accelerated their imperialistic oppression and more severely enforced assimilationist policies in Korea. Through the institution of policies like compulsory worship at Shinto shrines (1935) and the forced adoption of Japanese surnames (1940), the Japanese colonial authorities made starkly clear their intent to make all Koreans citizens of the Japanese empire. The unbridled ambitions that led to the second Sino-Japanese War in 1937 and the Second World War in 1939 sharply exposed the fangs of Japanese imperialism to the world, while within the empire, nationalist movements among the colonized were crushed to death at their roots.

During this time, most of the nationalists who had been inclined to compromise with the Japanese ended up as collaborators, and it was the Korean workers and peasants who played the main role in the nationalist movement. The Korean communist movement which had first appeared in the late 1910s intensified in the late 1920s after allying itself with the Comintern, and by the 1930s, the movement had expanded to the extent of instigating hundreds of incidents involving tenant-farmers and workers every year. The expansion of the communist movement compounded differences between the political right and the left in Korea. It also set the stage for the self-cultivation of differing ideologies corresponding to the right-left rupture and consequently induced debates between the two groups.

And so during the 1930s, a decade characterized by ideological divisions and disputes, the study of history, too, separated into three branches. The extreme rightist scholars who sympathized with the cause of compromised nationalism either became collaborators who supported the Japanese assimilationist policies or adopted a purely academic approach to history by devoting themselves to broadening the field of cultural history and to specializing in the science of historical study. The historians who established the Chmdan hakhoe and whose activities were centered upon this organization were members of this group. These individuals who were educated at the finest institutions in Korea and Japan were instrumental in refining and specializing the study of history. They were responsible not only for the rapid development of techniques of critically investigating source materials but also for the transmission of bourgeois historical theory received from the modern West in the early twentieth century. However, they were reluctant to
confront the Japanese and even cooperated with the Japanese authorities on a number of occasions. Thus, a great weakness of this first group was their inability to conform in practice to the exigencies of the nationalist cause during the 1930s.

Marxist scholarship constituted a second branch of historical studies during the 1930s. Yi Pug-man, Paek Nam-un, and Yi Ch'ông-won were the most prominent of the scholars who led the Marxist historical movement in order to provide a theoretical foundation for the communist movement. Paek Nam-un, in particular, was greatly influenced by the pioneering work of the Japanese Marxist historian Hanigoro Paek accordingly set forward in a logical argument the methodology of the materialistic view of history and also penned two works of evidential scholarship, Chosŏn sahoe kyŏngjesa (A Socioeconomic History of Korea, 1933) and Chosŏn ponggŏn sahoe kyŏngjesa (A Socioeconomic History of Feudal Korea, 1937).

Despite its careless treatment of the special characteristics of the problem of the Korean nation and its partiality toward theory over evidence, Marxist historical scholarship contributed enormously to shedding the focus of historical studies on the ruling class and cultivating instead the field of socioeconomic history which was directly connected to the material lives of the masses.

Finally, there was a third stream of historical studies in the 1930s that followed a middle path in terms of ideology differing in character both from the Marxist scholarship of the extreme left and the purely academic approach to history. These historians were nationalists who refused compromise with the Japanese and who agreed with the socialist concept of equality, harboring an intent to construct a mass society through a new cooperative effort among all the classes. Although looking back we can refer to these individuals as mass-centered nationalists, they themselves referred to their ideology as “new nationalism” (shin minjokch'leŭi).

The new nationalists of the 1930s had their ideological roots in Shin Ch'ae-ho and were essentially his successors and the developers of his ideas. From the latter part of the 1930s, they launched the so-called “Korean Studies” movement and displayed a style of scholarship that was at odds with both the extreme left and the extreme right. An Chae-hong, Mun Il-p'yŏng, and Ch'ong In-bo were prominent figures in this group of historians. At this point, it would behoove us to discuss individually the activities of each of these men.

2) The Historical Studies of An Chae-hong

After having concentrated in politics and economics at Waseda University, An Chae-hong (ho [pen name]: Minse; 1891-1965) returned to Korea in the 1910s
where he came under the influence of Shin Ch’ae-ho and Taejonggyo. During the 1920s, he led the Shin’ghanhoe (1927-1931) movement as its spokesman and helped promote the construction of a middle party, the so-called “Chungangdang,” to counteract extremists of both the political right and the left. He stuck to the concept of tasari, a mutual interdependence amongst the people achieved through unity and cooperation between the right and the left. In 1945, he referred to his political ideas as “new nationalism and new democracy” and acting upon these principles, he participated in the Kōn’guk chunbi vvwonhoe (Preparatory Committee for the Establishment of the Korean State) and in the Chosŏn Kangmindang (Korean Citizens’ Party). He was later abducted and taken to north Korea in 1950.

Although An Chae-hong’s activities as an independence movement activist and as a politician were noteworthy, his accomplishments as a historian and a leader of the Korean Studies movement during the 1930s were also important. Among senior nationalist historians, An respected and was influenced most by Shin Ch’ae-ho; however, he also criticized Shin’s historical work as transitional, romantic, and overly conceptual. An believed that the exigencies of his time demanded scientific methods and a socioeconomic view of history. But although the scientific approach to history and the socioeconomic historical perspective which he advocated implied at least a partial acceptance of a materialistic view of history, An Chae-hong did not support the dogmatic adoption of such a view. An warned that the dogmatism of a purely materialistic view of history, while “acceptable as one norm for explaining the course of social development, can lead to gross misinterpretations by overlooking long-lasting underlying structures like history and attitudes which have been refined and cultivated over time.” An’s caution arose out of his criticism of the communists’ formalistic theory of revolution as an “infantile error” or as “exceedingly internationalistic idealism.”

Whether in his political line as an independence fighter or in the method of his historical analysis, An Chae-hong rejected both the extreme right and the extreme left. His academic attempts to toe the middle line took the form of the Korean Studies movement. Originally, the term “Korean Studies” had been introduced in the early 1920s by Ch’oe Nam-sŏn, and it implied a vague sort of academic independence from Japan. In other words, Korean Studies referred to scholarship, ideas, and a mentality that would enlighten, display, and protect the individual, or in

Ch’oe’s own words, studies “within which circulated Korean blood, without, steamed by the breath of Korea.” Moreover, the fundamental core of Korean Studies was Tan’gun who in turn could be located in the traditions of ancient religion, namely, that of the Purham culture.

However, the Korean Studies which An and Chŏng In-bo advanced in 1934 on the occasion of a seminar commemorating the 99th anniversary of the death of Tasan Chŏng Yag-yong, was not only an academic response to Japan’s colonial assimilationist policies, it also reflected wariness directed against a dogmatically materialistic historical view and the international communist movement. The “Korean Studies” which they proclaimed was “a product native to Korea, a peculiarity of Korean culture, and something that explicated and academically systematized Korean traditions.” But Korean Studies was not concerned solely with emphasizing Korea’s distinctiveness. By weaving Korean color into the fabric of world culture, the movement directed itself toward a so-called “national internationalism / international nationalism” by which the Korean nation would offer something to the world and in return receive something from the rest of the world. This unity between the Korean nation and the world would in actuality lead to a productive fusion of nationalism and socialism. Such theories provided support for An Chae-hong’s philosophy of mutual interdependence among the people (manmin kongsaeng) through which he sought to achieve a harmonic balance between the problems of nation and of class.

An’s Korean Studies movement was attacked by both the rightists and the leftists of his time. Leftist historians criticized it as “petit bourgeois exclusivism,” “reactionary conservatism,” and “sentimental restorationism.” This was natural from the Marxist point of view which advocated the universality of world history as

33 In his 1922 work Chosŏn yŏksa t’ongsok kanghwada kaeje, Ch’oe Nam-sŏn stated that Korean studies would be established by Korean hands.
34 Han, “An Chae-hong’un shûn mingokch’ŏn wa sahak.”
35 For example, the leftist historian Paek Nam-un had the following to say about the Korean Studies movement in the introduction to his Chosŏn sahoe kŏngesa “it is an attempt to make for Korean cultural history its own particular macrocosm mystical, sentimental it is a reactionary thing that denies the commonality of the historical laws of human social progress” Yi Ch’ŏng-won, another leftist historian, wrote in his Chosŏn yŏksa tokpon (Korean History Reader, 1936) “mired in Confucian precepts, policy-bound, semi-feudal, Korean Studies’ devotes itself religiously to the investigation of a sacred and inviolable ‘five thousand year old native Korean collective soul (o ch’ŏmnyŏn’gan ŭi ḏo),’ stipulating that the Korean historical process is distinctively independent from the history of the rest of the world. It (Korean Studies) has concluded that Tan’gun is the genius behind the whole exercise, its hero of heroes wears clothing borrowed from Yi Sun-shin, and the people regurgitating its nonsense, wearing the mask of Chŏng Yag-yong, are distorting history.”
opposed to the emphasis on the distinctiveness of Korean history which was fundamental to the Korean Studies movement. Such an attitude could only invite the criticism of the left since it had the result of repudiating the universal inevitability of class revolution.

An Chae-hong’s accomplishments as a scholar of ancient history were just as remarkable as his achievements as a nationalist ideologue. In terms of his research on showing how the Korean nation had already taken shape in ancient times in the form of consanguineous, territorial, and destined (unmyŏng) or historical communities, An was adopting wholesale the views of earlier nationalistic historians beginning with Shin Ch’ae-ho. As for his position that the original current of Korean national culture since antiquity could be found in the Purham culture, this was a view largely influenced by Ch’oe Nam-sôn. Nevertheless, An Chae-hong’s historical view differed in several ways from those of his predecessors.

First, he did not include the whole of the Tongi tribes in his definition of the Korean race. This showed how An’s understanding of Korean identity had become more objective and how he had backed off from the expansionist historical perspective of the 1910s which had as its most pressing practical goal the recovery of Manchuria.

Second, An Chae-hong’s study of ancient history36 concentrated more on elucidating processes of social and political development than on evidential studies of geography. He also invoked Morgan’s theories of social development which were popular among anthropologists of that time and put out a new interpretation of the development of ancient society. An posited that ancient Korean society had progressed from matrilineal societies (e.g. Asadal society) to patrilineal tribal societies, then on to city-states formed by tribal alliances (i.e. Tan’gun Chosŏn

---

36 After the start of the second Sino-Japanese War in 1937, An devoted himself to research on ancient history, publishing in 1947 a collection of treatises entitled Chosŏn sanggosa gam (A Mirror of Ancient Korean History). The contents of this work are as follows:

Volume 1 (1) Kija Chosŏn ko [An Account of Kija Chosŏn], (2) Asadal kwa Paegak, P’yŏngyang, and Puyŏ byŏn[Distinctions between the Asadal and Paegak, P’yŏngyang, and Puyŏ], (3) Koguryŏ kŏn’guk saŏng ko [An Account of Affairs Pertaining to the Construction of the Koguryŏ State], (4) Koguryŏ chikkwan ko [An Account of the Koguryŏ Bureaucracy], (5) Silla kŏn’guk saŏng ko [An Account of Affairs Pertaining to the Construction of the Silla State], (6) Silla kwanguk koryak [A Brief Account of the Silla bureaucracy], (7) Sam Han’guk kwa kŏ p’opsok ko [A short Account of the Six Kara States]

Volume 2 (1) Puyŏ Chosŏn ko [An Account of Puyŏ Chosŏn], (2) Park, pal, paed wŏnch’ik kwa kŭi sunhwan kongsik [The Principle of “park,” “pal,” “paed,” and their circular form], (3) Koguryŏ wa P’yŏngyang pyolgo [A Specific Account of Koguryŏ and P’yŏngyang], (4) Paekhesea ch’onggo [A Comprehensive Account of the History of Paekhesea], (5) Chosŏn sangdae chiri munhwa ko [An Account of the Geography and Culture of Korea in Ancient times]
[Puyŏ Chosŏn]), and more recently to feudal aristocratic states (i.e. Three Kingdoms). In order to prove this interpretation of ancient social development in Korea, he employed rules of comparative linguistics. The first rule was that of "kt," "chu," and "ch'it;" the second law was the progressive development of "tal," "pul," and "na;" and the third principle was that of "park," "pal," and "paed."

The rule of "kt," "chu," and "ch'it" stipulates that headmen and elders in Korean clan society were called "kt," "chu," and "ch'it," and that this practice continued among later generations. As society became more complex, the terms came to refer to tribal chieftains, regional feudal lords, court nobility of the ancient states, or others occupying high positions at court. Using this argument, An Chae-hong translated "Kija" not as a proper noun but as a common noun, "K'uch'i" referring to high nobility. In this way, he interpreted Kija Chosŏn as a dynastic revolution involving the class of high nobles, or the k'uch'i. The second linguistic principle concerning the progression of "tal," "pul," and "na," postulates a progressive change ("tal" to "pul" to "na") in the terminology for naming territories and mountains in ancient times. According to this law, "Asadal [Assidal]," "Paegagang [Paeadal]," "Shinsa [Parkpul]," "Pullae [Pulla]," and "P'yŏngyang [Pena]" are all names for the same place.

The third principle of "park," "pul," and "paed," states that the names of ancient races, nations, and perhaps place names, also underwent change. Thus, "Chosŏn," "Paengmin'guk," "Palguk," "Puyŏguk," "T'aebaekkuk," "Hwan'guk," and "Tan'guk" all indicate the same country.

Another very important aspect of An Chae-hong's research on ancient Korean history was his work on the history of Kaya. This continued and developed upon the suspended efforts that Shin Ch'aeho had mapped out in his later years. Along with Ch'oe Nam-sŏn's claims in Assi Chosŏn (The Dawning of Korean History, 1925) that settlers from the Korean peninsula had constructed an ancient Japanese state and later in Hanil kwan'gye ili yoksajŏk koch'al (A Historical Investigation of Japanese-Korean Relations, 1953) that the political consolidation of the Yamato state in early Japan had been engineered by Korean immigrants, An's argument regarding Kaya advances in Japan constitutes a key factor in deepening our understanding of the history of relations between Japan and Korea in ancient times.

3) The Historical Studies of Mun Il-p'yŏng

Along with An Chae-hong, Mun Il-p'yŏng (ho: Hoam; 1888-1939) was another individual who contributed enormously to progressive nationalism and to the popularization of historical studies during the 1930s. Born in Ŭiju in North P'yŏngan
province, Mun studied political science and history as a student in Japan. He then went over to China where he directed the Hongjesa movement with Pak Ün-shik, Shin Ch’ae-ho, Hong Myǒng-hdí, and Cho So-ang. While there, he came under the influence of both the political right and the left and participated in the Shin’ganhoe movement in the 1920s. In the 1930s, until his death at the age of fifty-two in 1939, he published a series of newspaper articles on history and its theory.

Unlike more senior nationalist historians who emphasized studies in ancient history, Mun Il-p’yǒng directed his historical studies toward the Chosǒn period; in fact, he and An Hwak were instrumental in cultivating the study of modern Korean history during the 1920s. It is important to note that at the foundation of Mun’s historical perspective lay the twin theses of the “masses” and the “Korean spirit (Chosǒn shum)”37

Mun Il-p’yǒng’s “Korean spirit” can be contrasted to terms like hon (soul) or ὀλ (collective spirit) singled out by other nationalists to indicate a national religion usually in the life patterns of ancient as opposed to modern times. But “Korean spirit,” although it does share a nationalist coloration, connotes a state of mind intent upon helping the people in their everyday lives. The representative expressions of this mentality were King Sejong’s policy of commissioning the creation of a Korean alphabet and the Srhak (Practical Learning) school of the late Chosǒn dynasty.

Mun regarded the native tongue and script as the nucleus of a national identity, and since a language is completed by the creation of a script, he saw the invention of the Korean alphabet as the fulfillment of the Korean language, the birth of Korean literature, and the fertile soil for Korean Studies. In an essay entitled “Saan ūro pon Chosǒn (Korea as seen through a Historical Perspective)” he described the significance of the invention of the Korean script in the following manner:

The Korean language was probably born together with the Korean race sometime in the distant past, but its use has finally neared complete fulfillment after waiting long for the invention of a Korean script — Korean literature — whether in form or in content — has only become true Korean literature after it has become possible to record Korean words with Korean letters. When we consider this, the historical record verifies that Korean studies has, for the first time, been able to increase the value of its existence, solely through the invention and the development of the Korean script — If so,
then the Korean script, at the same time that it was born of the Korean spirit, served as the fertilizer that nourishes Korean Studies.

If one were to claim that the Korean script were indeed the fruit of the Korean spirit and that it possessed an important significance as the nourishment for Korean studies, it would be natural to view the Chosŏn period subsequent to the invention of the Korean alphabet as the period during which the Korean spirit underwent the most marked development. Indeed, Mun Il-p’yoŋ stipulated that Chosŏn civilization was a climactic completion assimilating the glory of both Silla and Koryŏ: “If we were to compare this to water, Silla would be the font; bubbling up again, the water flows down the Koryŏ stream and gathers at the Chosŏn reservoir. Having achieved a lasting civilization of utilitarian welfare (iyong husaeng), Chosŏn flows alone: mixing with Silla and Koryŏ is not permitted.” In other words, Korean civilization during the Chosŏn dynasty was characterized by the possession of a “lasting foundation of utilitarian welfare.” Moreover, Mun stated that Sejong, as the key figure behind the invention of the Korean alphabet which is the quintessence of Korean civilization, “will not lose his place as the paragon of the ideological world in the age of mass civilization that will come one day.” Here, we can see clearly the mass-based, utilitarian, and nationalistic implications of Mun Il-p’yoŋ’s notion of the Korean spirit.

Operating from this perspective, Mun saw Sirhak as the reappearance of the Korean spirit and he understood the mentality of Sirhak’s investigation of practical affairs as a means for Korean Studies to establish a self-identity. Both Mun and An Chae-hong recognized Sirhak as the forerunner of the Korean Studies movement.

Mun Il-p’yoŋ compared the discovery of the twin concepts of the masses and society to the “discovery of a new world” and suggested looking for the true essence of the masses in history. His mass-oriented historical view went so far as to interpret class struggle of the masses as the motive force behind historical progress. Mun’s understanding of the “masses” was not confined to the narrow definition of a non-ruling class. By the “masses,” he was referring to the vast majority of citizens apart from the small minority of the aristocratic class, and thus there was a definite difference between his concept and the class theory proposed by the materialistic view of history. Accordingly, Mun Il-p’yoŋ was a nationalist who placed nation above class and who desired from the viewpoint of nationalism the advance of the Korean nation into the international community. He also poured an extraordinary amount of interest into the history of foreign relations because he supported enriching and strengthening the nation through beneficial intercourse with other
countries. In particular, his *Taemi kwan’gye osunmyŏnsa (A History of Fifty Years of Relations with the United States)* is a valuable piece of scholarship because it is the first history of Korean-American relations done from the perspective of mass-based nationalism.

Mun Il-p’yŏng shared with other nationalist historians a common grief over the demise of “greater Koreanism” with Koguryŏ and the victory of “lesser Koreanism” with the unification of the Three Kingdoms by Silla. In this respect, he did regard the history of Koryŏ and Chosŏn as a period of decline. Moreover, he located the cause of this decline in a set of moral principles (*juri*) that lacked a utilitarian view of international affairs and was hopelessly bound to the obligations of orthodox neo-Confucianism.

In short, during the 1910s and 1920s, Mun Il-p’yŏng uplifted a sentimentalistic and overly conceptualized nationalism to a mass-oriented brand, devoted himself to studying the mass culture that was linked in actuality to the masses, and contributed particularly to the cultivation of cultural historical studies of the Chosŏn period and the history of foreign relations.

4) The Historical Studies of Chŏng In-bo

Among the nationalist historians of the 1930s, we cannot forget the name of Chŏng In-bo (*ho*: Widang; 1892-?). During the Taehan era, he had studied Wang Yang-mung Confucianism with famous scholars of the school like Yi Kŏn-bang and Pak Ŭn-sik. In the 1910s, he fled to China where he set up the Tongiesa and was active in the Restoration movement during which time he was converted to Taegonggyo. In the 1930s, as a leader of the Korean Studies movement along with An Chae-hong and others, he surfaced as an important personality in rightist historiography. He presented “Yangmyŏnhak yŏllon (An Extension Discussion of Wang Yang-mung Confucianism)” in 1930, “Och’ŏnnyŏn’gan Chosŏn ŭi ŏl (The Collective Spirit of Korea over Five Thousand Years)” in 1935, and published *Chosŏnsa yŏn’gu (Studies in Korean History)* in 1947 after he had become an established authority on ancient history.

Although most of the historians active during the 1930s had concentrated in history or the social sciences at colleges in Korea or Japan, Chŏng had no such background and was forced to make himself a historian on the basis of a classical Chinese education. Chŏng In-bo had been well-versed in the nine *jing* and the ten *tong* at an early age and possessed an extensive knowledge of the Chinese classics. His scholarship showed the features of this traditional education which differentiated him from his peers. In fact, Chŏng’s two main weaknesses were his
relative backwardness in terms of a modern social science sense and his abstruse Chinese character-heavy style of writing that constituted an obstacle in terms of gaining a popular audience.

Chŏng In-bo's historiography is especially significant in terms of intellectual and ancient history. In terms of intellectual history, he concentrated primarily on the scholarship of the Sirhak school which had originated with Chŏng Yag-yong and on Wang Yang-ming Confucianism. Chŏng paid particular attention to Sirhak because he considered it a nationalist, mass-based, and utilitarian movement.

In 1934, Chŏng and An Chae-hong took the opportunity of a seminar commemorating the 99th anniversary of the death of Chŏng Yag-yong to stress the importance of Korean Studies. The "Korean Studies" which they referred to was in essence a nationalist, mass-based, and utilitarian form of scholarship that had its origins in Sirhak. However, the element of "practical learning (Sirhak)" inherent in Chosŏnhak was not simply the Sirhak philosophy of a bygone era, but also the same "practical learning" from a 1930s perspective. In other words, it was as if one were claiming that the ideology and scholarship of the late Chosŏn period could be transferred intact to scholarship in the 1930s. This belief shows a startling lack of consciousness of the inherent limitations in Sirhak's premortem ideology.

Another reason why Chŏng emphasized Sirhak and the value of Wang Yang-ming Confucianism was to find the origin of the "independent self-spirit (chashim)" in the subjective and conceptual philosophy of the Wang Yang-ming school. In other words, the most important point of departure for Chŏng's focus on nationalist and mass consciousness was a manner of seeing oneself through chasim and not t'ashim (dependent spirit). By t'ashim, he was referring particularly to Zhu Xi neo-Confucianism and Western scholarship. Neo-Confucianism was a false and deceitful doctrine that ignored the rights of the nation and the masses, while Western scholarship contained an evil that could burst into a cause of disease for the people and the nation. Only Wang Yang-ming Confucianism, founded upon an independent self-spirit, possessed the practical learning and spirit to safeguard the rights of the nation and the people.

Nationalist historians criticizing neo-Confucianism was a rather common event during the Japanese colonial period, but it was rare to see criticism of modern Western scholarship. For example, in "Yangmyŏng'hak yŏllon," Chŏng goes so far as to reject Western scholarship as a cause of disease: "subsequent to the import of Western scholarship, some quarters have become diseased and already pus is oozing; in other quarters, strangely enough, it is like study that takes place outside of the spirit and likewise does the cause of disease effect its ravages outside of the
spirit. Is this not deplorable? (1. 'Nonsul ūi yŏn'gi [Initiation of Discourse]).' The Western scholarship that Ch’ŏng In-bo attacks is academism of both the bourgeois and the Marxist varieties. This fact is confirmed in his wholesale criticism of the theories of the English scholar, the French savant, the German Doktor, and the Russian comrade.

But in truth, what Ch’ŏng is criticizing is not the Western learning itself, but the dogmatic attitude of uncritical acceptance without using the filter of chashim and shilshim. This is why Ch’ŏng sees such scholarship as dependent (t’ashim) and untrue (mushil). Because of his rejection of all modern Western social science theory regardless of right or left tendencies, Ch’ŏng was on the dim side in terms of social science among the scholars of the 1930s. Such a condition was destined to lead him reflexively to argue for the revival of outdated forms of Sirhak and Wang Yang-ming scholarship. Accordingly, Ch’ŏng In-bo’s nationalistic, mass-based, and utilitarian scholarship can be distinguished from that of individuals like An Chae-hong and Mun Il-p’yŏng whose attempts tried to sublate and unify the left and the right. One can say that Ch’ŏng’s work was severely limited by anachronistic tendencies.

On one hand, Ch’ŏng’s work on ancient history lacked originality because it followed fundamentally, almost without modification, Shin Ch’ae-ho’s interpretation of ancient history. However, in terms of fleshing out in detail the hypothetical aspects of Shin’s theories, Ch’ŏng, along with An Chae-hong, must be regarded as a successor to Shin Ch’ae-ho.

The arguments on which Ch’ŏng In-bo placed the most importance and which he explicated most elaborately were his denial of the existence of the four Han commanderies, and his new interpretation of the stele inscription in commemoration of King Kwanggaet’o. Both of these assertions, because they implied frontal confrontation with fundamental theories of the Japanese imperialistic view of history, have an important scholastic significance whether they

---

38 Ch’ŏng In-bo organized the results of his research on ancient history and published them in his two-volume Chosŏnsa yŏn’gu (Studies on the History of Korea) in 1946.

39 Ch’ŏng believed that the four Han commanderies were located primarily in the Chosŏn state of the Wi lineage which was part of Old Chosŏn. In particular, he fixed the location of Chenfan (Korean: Chinbŏn) in the area of the Taedong River, Linton (Korean: Imdun) near the Soja River in the Laotong peninsula, Shuantu (Korea: Hyŏndu) in the vicinity of the Hon River in the Laotong peninsula, and Lolang (Korean: Nangnang) in the area of the Om River (P’aesu) in the Laotonggol peninsula somewhere east of Hŏndok. Accordingly, he argued that there was no validity to the claim that the so-called Han commanderies were established in the Korean peninsula (Ch’ŏng In-bo, Chosŏnsa yŏn’gu vol. 2, chap. 9).
were true or not.

7. Conclusion

We can trace the establishment of nationalist history back to the Taehan Empire but its development extends all the way to the present. However, for the sake of convenience, we have limited our examination of the course of nationalist history to the early twentieth century, up to and including the 1930s.

By way of conclusion, let me organize and summarize the main points of this article and offer some views on the future of our topic. Nationalist history was a school of history established to support nationalism during the Taehan period. Since nationalism possessed anti-imperialistic and anti-feudalistic goals, nationalist history, too, was a form of historical studies with the unambiguous purpose of contributing to the realization of nationalism's practical aims. In terms of anti-imperialism, the concrete goal was to recover Korean territory in Manchuria. The idea of territorial reclamation developed from expansionist sentiments that had gradually increased after the Japanese and Manchu invasions. It also appeared very attractive to Koreans during a period when Japanese imperialism had all but plundered the Korean peninsula and when Qing influence in Manchuria had been weakened. Furthermore, this expansionism was ideologically buttressed by Spencer's theories of social evolution and further encouraged by the influence of romantic historical studies in the West.

As for the second nationalistic theme of anti-feudalism, it was embodied in the practical end of forming a modern nation-state through bourgeoisie revolution. In this perspective, the most urgent remnant from the old era to be overcome was the Confucian culture of the Choson dynasty. Correspondingly, there arose a highly polarized view of history that contrasted the brilliant glory of antiquity with the dark gloom of modern history. This development had the result of being counterproductive to a progressive understanding of Korean history, and ironically, the forces of enlightenment had to combat the romantic inclinations of nationalist historians. In the West, the enlightenment had occurred first, thus instilling an anti-feudal bourgeois consciousness. This had been followed by the arrival of romanticism to fuel nationalist sentiment. But in Korea, the two were introduced at the same time, and consequently, the nationalist movement had to play an additional role as an enlightening force.

In the next stage, still bound to expansionist objectives, nationalist history launched "pan-Tongi nationalism," regarding all the races resident in Manchuria as
members of the Korean race. Building upon this expansive pan-Tongi nationalism, nationalistic historians stressed the territorial concept of a greater Korean state which would encompass northeast China, Manchuria, as well as the Korean peninsula.

The chief advocate of nationalistic history during the Taehan era was Shin Ch'ae-ho whose Toksa shillon (1908) can be considered the first manifesto of nationalist history. Although he ended up recognizing the Puyŏ tribes as the main current of the Korean race, it was Taejonggyo which was largely responsible for Shin's expansion of the scope of the Korean peoples to include the Tongi tribes. During the Taehan period, Taejonggyo strengthened the religious dimension of nationalism and urged a highly romantic view of history, fervently pursuing a movement to recover Manchuria.

Nationalist history took on many different forms in the 1920s. Working within Korea, the compromised nationalist Ch'oe Nam-soon gave up on expansionism and dreams of a "greater Korea" and transformed pan-Tongiism into a cultural-regional concept called the Purham cultural area. But having forfeited an anti-Japanese aim, the cultural region theory ended up being absorbed by the "greater east Asianism" of the Japanese empire and eventually degenerated into a collaborationist argument that highlighted the cultural similarities between Korea and Japan.

Another compromised nationalist of the 1920, An Hwak, also rejected expansionism, and in its place, he positively re-evaluated the significance of Unified Silla and reconstructed a progressive version of history during Koryŏ and Chosŏn. The positive interpretation of Korean history that An devised focused on the standard of political progress from a cultural view of history. In particular, he sought to refute the theory of stagnation which colonial historians had posited by emphasizing the tradition of political self-rule in Korea. However, because An Hwak's progressive historical analysis coincided with the beginnings of the home rule movement among compromised nationalists, it was doomed to become a collaborationist argument.

During the particular circumstances that characterized the 1920s, it was Shin Ch'ae-ho who was instrumental in elevating the study of history to a scientific standard while maintaining a strong anti-Japanese line. Shin Ch'ae-ho's nationalism had once been founded upon social evolutionary theories that affirmed the dominance of the strong over the weak, and even as he resisted imperialism, there was a side of him that had envied it. But in the 1920s, Shin embraced anarchism and turned to theories advocating a direct revolution of the masses. Although his position differed from the arguments for class revolution advanced by socialism.
which had arrived as an influential new trend of the times, Shin did help direct the bourgeois-centered nationalist movement towards a greater emphasis on social equality.

As a historian, Shin Ch’ae-ho displayed a new face in the 1920s by dismissing the use of history as a platform for the independence movement and stressing the need for "history for history’s sake." Shin was keenly aware of the need for the scientification of Korean historical studies necessitated by the prospect of confronting Japanese historiography informed by Rankean positivist methodology. In short, he chose anarchism as an alternative to both imperialism and socialism. By seasoning his nationalism with a dash of leftism, and by adding science to history through evidential methods to confront the challenge of a colonial historiography buttressed by imperialism, Shin Ch’ae-ho contributed significantly to raising the standard of nationalist history to a higher level.

In the 1930s, there appeared new approaches among both the leftists and the rightists in the Korean independence movement corresponding to Japan’s outright aggression in Manchuria and the intensification of assimilationist policies directed against Koreans. On the left, the methodology of a materialistic view of history was employed resulting in the re-interpretation of Korean history and an emphasis on the necessity of a communist revolution based upon the universality of world history. Meanwhile, on the right, there appeared a stream of historical scholarship that headed in the direction of pure nationalism while compromising with the Japanese imperialists. There was another group of nationalistic rightist scholars involved with the Korean Studies movement who sought harmony and cooperation between nationalism and socialism by seeking out and academically organizing the distinct aspects of Korean culture.

Generally speaking, the leaders of the Korean Studies movement like An Chae-hong, Mun Il-p’yŏng, and Chŏng In-bo, had come to espouse the concept of the masses by means of overcoming their class biases. They urged a search for the tradition of mass-based national culture in the Sirhak school of the late Chosŏn dynasty. Such attempts to discover the national distinctiveness of Korean culture repudiated the revolutionary ideology of the materialistic perspective on the universality of world history and contained an ideology that argued for the propriety of right-left cooperation.

Facing the materialistic historical view of the extreme left in the period around liberation, the nationalistic historiography that had begun to show signs of class openness as it pushed the concept of the masses, shed a skin of ideology and reappeared as "new nationalism." This new nationalism rejected both bourgeois and
proletarian nationalism and devoted itself to the construction of a classless unified nation-state. However, whereas An Ch’ae-hong’s new nationalism was characterized by a mutual interdependence among the people inherent in the concept of tasari and focused on class cooperation, Son Chin-t’ae differed in his focus on the realization of class equality through an awakening amongst the ruling class. In addition, An advocated developing this new nationalism primarily through political ideology while Son believed in development through theories of historical interpretation. If we were to say that An Chae-hong’s historiography had its roots in historians senior to him like Shin Ch’ae-ho, we must also acknowledge that Son Chin-t’ae’s history has been influenced by the evidential school of the 1930s and the scholarship of An Hwak who had constructed a progressive interpretation of Korean history by shunning expansionism and focusing squarely on the Korean peninsula.

Since An Chae-hong entered the world of politics after liberation it was Son Chin-t’ae who exerted the most influence on post-liberation academia. However, many nationalists suffered the misfortune of being abducted to north Korea during the Korean War, and historical studies, too, were unable to avoid withering during the intense period of the Cold War. It is only with the April 1960 Students’ Movement that we have witnessed a regrafting of nationalism onto contemporary history.

As we have seen, nationalist history began with ideological objectives which were anti-imperialist, anti-feudal, and supported the construction of a bourgeoise state. But during the period around liberation, it developed into the stage of a “new nationalism” which rejected both the extreme right and the extreme left. Nationalistic history had originated from religious, mystical, and romantic historical perspectives but later developed, continuously raising its standards, into a cultural approach to history involving the critical examination of all sources.

The future path of nationalist history is inherently linked to the subject of national unification, indeed, it must ideologically re-illuminate the meaning of unification. When this does occur, the cultural method of historiography and the historical methodology focusing on social structures (prevalent in the north) will also be unified and a true Korean nationalist history will once again be reborn.

(Translated by Thomas H. Lee, A.M., Harvard University)
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