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THE POLITICS OF KOREA'S PAST:  
THE LEGACY OF JAPANESE COLONIAL 
ARCHAEOLOGY IN THE KOREAN PENINSULA

Hyung Il Pai

The disciplines of archaeology and ancient history were instrumental in the process of Korean national identity formation in post-colonial South Korea. However, its intellectual legacy can be traced to Japan’s empire-building colonial administrators and scholars dating from the period of invasion and colonial occupation of the Korean peninsula in the early twentieth century. This article discusses how changing political agendas, shifting ideological positions of ‘colonial racism’ and subsequent nationalistic anti-Japanese resistance movements in the Korean peninsula influenced the development of Korean archaeological and historical theories.

The Politics of National Historiography and Archaeology in Korea

The history of the Korean peninsula in the past one hundred years can be characterized as follows: its sovereignty and territory was lost to a foreign aggressor, namely Japan; it was subsequently subjugated as a colonial nation, liberated by the United States and the Soviet Union, and then divided after the Korean War. The succession of violent social and political upheavals has influenced not only the course of Korean civilization, but also the intellectual climate of Korean scholars. In the post-colonial period, academia has been dominated by the school of nationalist historiography (minjok sabak) represented by specialists in ancient Korea such as Yi Pyǒng-do, Kim Chae-wǒn, Yi Ki-baek, Kim Wǒl-lyong, Kim Ch’ǒl-jun, Ch’on Kwan-u, and Kim Chǒng-bae. As leading scholars in the disciplines of archaeology, ancient history and art history, they were relied on to provide ‘scientific’ explanations and material evidence from excavated sites and monuments to prove the origins of a unique and ancient ‘Korean’ identity. According to the nationalistic scheme, Korea’s history can be characterized as one of continuous national

My 1992 research trip to Tokyo was aided by a grant from the Social Science Research Council Committee on Korean Studies, New York. The main sources for this study are found at the Tōyō Bunko (Oriental Library), Tokyo, and the Tokyo University Institute of Oriental Culture Library. The former houses the Umehara Sueji Collection consisting of thousands of files of correspondence, original maps, diagrams, and photographs of excavated sites and artifacts published in the Kosetsu Chōsa Kōkōku [Reports on Investigations of Ancient Sites] series (see Tōyō Gakujutsu Kyōkai [Asian Studies Committee], Tōyō Bunko, Tokyo, 1966). Umehara Sueji was the premier archaeologist during the colonial era along with Sekino Tadashi, Hamada Kōsaku, Fujita Ryōsaku, and Imamura Ryū, to name just a few. His works on Korean archaeology span more than sixty years (Umehara Sueji, “Nikkai heigō no kikan ni okonawareta hanto no kosetsu chōsa to hōzon jigyō ni tazawaiwa hito kōkōgaku to kōkōgaku” [Remembrances of archaeological investigations and the preservation of Korean sites during the Japanese colonial period], Chōsen gakubō 51 [1969]: 95–148). Many of the leading experts in Korean archaeology and ancient history who became pioneers of Korean studies in the early twentieth century were graduates of and professors at Tokyo University’s history and architecture departments, and their reports on and collections of Korean artifacts are now preserved at Tokyo University Library and Museum (Tokyo University of Strasbourg).
In the aftermath of the Korean War, these patriotic historians were responsible for steering the direction of the cultural and historical education of South Korea’s students and citizens. Their textbooks determined school curricula at all levels, emphasizing the teaching of national histories and literature that highlighted the bravery of heroes and martyrs who had fought for Korean independence since time immemorial. As they also served on committees for the management of cultural properties, they controlled, in addition, the selection of monuments, fortresses, and shrines to be reconstructed, preserved and promoted as national sites and symbols of independence battles and struggles. These committees also determined the days to be designated as national holidays, such as Kaech’on-jol (Korean Creation Day) and Hangul-nal (Korean Alphabet Day), which mark the founding of the Korean nation on October 3rd, 2333 BC, and the invention of the Korean script on October 9th, 1446, respectively.

The historians’ nationalistic agenda was avidly supported by military regimes headed by former generals who came to power through coups and influencing the outcome of presidential elections. The terms in office of presidents Park Chong-hee (1961–80), Chon Du-hwan (1982–86) and No Tae-woo (1986–92) were successive one-man dictatorships that lasted a total of thirty years. These rulers focused on enhancing their own political prestige and legitimacy by manipulating the government, education, the media, and cultural resources, while their military regimes forged a national solidarity by promoting the uniform state ideologies of anti-communism and anti-imperialism. The Korean economic miracle that has risen from the ashes of the Korean War—which remains a vivid memory for many—has also contributed significantly to boosting a unifying sense of national pride and common historical destiny.

Thus, the nationalist thrust of historical education and cultural policies, authoritarian governments, and rapid economic development have profoundly influenced South Korea’s formation of a unique sense of national solidarity and identity in this century. The main pillar of Korean national identity was founded upon the presumed historical existence of a homogenous (tamul) and pure Korean race that occupied the unified Korean territorial state of Kochoson, centered on Pyŏngyang and encompassing the regions of Liao-

---

1 Dates in brackets indicate the years these powers invaded the peninsula. Most historical works play down the fact that Korean dynasties and their invaders conducted many diplomatic exchanges over such matters as the hostage system and military and marriage alliances, in addition to active trade and commerce. For example, the Tang military alliance with Silla during the mid-seventh century was critical to Silla’s success in uni-
ifying the Korean peninsula (John Jamieson, “The Samguk Sagi and the unification wars” [PhD diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1969]). During the Silla and Koryo dynasties, many heirs to the throne were sent to the Chinese court for education and as a symbol of Korea’s tributary status. These very ‘sini-
fied’ princes, who later became kings, were instrumental in introducing many aspects of higher Chinese civilization into Korea, including religion, the fine arts, and literature. They also sometimes became ‘double agents’ while residing in Chinese courts since they had close access to decision-making at the center of power. Hence the hostage system served the twin purposes of cultural exchange and intelligence-gathering for participating Korean dynasties throughout the ages.

2 Yi Son-gun, “Umi minjokkasseongwa ilchεn sitbunhwaeki kwankyε” [The relations between our Korean national movement and Japanese imperialism and culture under colonial occupation], in Han gug minjokkashang taebye [A general introduction to the history of Korean national philosophy] (Seoul: Koryo Taehakkyo, 1971), vol.1; Chang Tae-mu, Taehan wonipŏn [Great heroes in Korea] (Seoul: Asea Munhwasa, 1981); Tanje Sin Ch’ae-ho sŏnsang Kŏnyŏm-hoe [Sin Ch’ae-ho Commemorative Committee], Tanje Sin Ch’ae-ho chŏnji [The complete works of Sin Ch’ae-ho], 2nd ed. (Seoul: Hyŏngsŏl, 1987), vol.1 (hereafter referred to as Complete works of Sin Ch’ae-ho).

3 Kim Yong-sŏp, “Ilhong guke issŏsŏi Hanguksa sŏsal” [Historical writings on Korea in Korea and Japan], Yoksa bakho 31 (1966): 128–47; Yoksa hakhoe, ed., Han gug sŏsit pansonŏng [Reflections on Korean history] (Seoul: Shingu Munhwasa, 1973); Yi Kibae, Hanguksa shinnŏn [A new history of Korea], revised ed. (Seoul: Ilchogak, 1976);
ning and Chi-lin in north-east China and the northern part of the Korean peninsula. The key narrative for this mythical ethnic ‘Korean’ regeneration drama was derived from the thirteenth-century text of the Samguk Yusa which recorded the legend of Tung-n, born of the union between the son of heaven (Hwanung) and a bear-turned-woman (Ungnyö). When Tung-n’s miraculous birth as the father of the Korean nation (Kukjo) was calculated to have occurred in 2333 BC, the dawn of Korean civilization was pushed back to predate that of Japan and rival that of ancient China. Consequently, Korea’s cultural heritage and national lineage is commonly described today as being “five thousand years old” because it is traced back in time to Tung-n’s birth as the founder of Kochosôn.

Tung-n’s birth was not only magical, it also occurred on top of Paektusan, Korea’s highest mountain situated between the borders of the PCR and Hanmyöng-pukdo. Traditionally regarded as the most sacred mountain in the realm of Korean geomancy, Paektusan is deeply imbued in Buddhist and Taoist beliefs. It was also chosen as the sacred symbol representing North Korea’s state ideology of cbuch’ë (independence and solidarity) because, according to communist revolutionary lore, the ‘great leader’ Kim Il-sông had waged anti-Japanese resistance from this mountain top. In the 1980s, a log cabin was constructed deep in the mountain in consecration of this ‘holy site’ as the birthplace of Kim Chang-il, the ‘dear leader’. Paektusan has therefore played a pivotal role in North Korea in legitimizing the ‘traditional dynastic’ system of father-to-son linear succession both unheard of in Marxist philosophy nor ever practised in any other communist state. Paektusan, as the sanctified homeland of all Koreans, is now North Korea’s most popular tourist spot.

The national salvation myth of Tung-n originated with the religion of Taechong-gyo, whose adherents worshipped Tung-n as the future savior of the Korean race from Japanese oppression. This religion was founded in 1905, the year Korea became a Japanese protectorate, by an anti-Japanese revolutionary and charismatic leader named Nach’ol. Today’s national historians trace their intellectual lineage likewise to such leaders and intellectuals of anti-Japanese resistance movements as Sin Ch’aeho and Ch’oe Nam-sŏn. Revered as “fathers of Korean historiography,” they were the first to put forward theories, in the 1930s, on the ancient mythological racial origins of a ‘unified’ and ‘independent’ Korean state. The desire of nationalist intellectuals for Korean political independence under Japanese colonial rule was manifested in their claims that an ancient, sacred terrain-zone existed in the “glorious” age of the gods and heroes of the Tung-n period. Hence, the school of nationalist historians credit themselves with the “rediscovery” of a new racial history of Korea traceable directly back to Tung-n’s Kochosôn and sealed in the common blood lineage of the national spirit of independence and struggle.

Since the early twentieth century, therefore, the most important political agenda for national historians was to assert the antiquity, the racial/cultural superiority, and the development of a unique Korean civilization that needed...

16 Yi Kwang-su, Minjok keigeoreun [Theories of racial improvement], in Yi Kwang-su choson [The complete works of Yi Kwang-su] (Seoul: Samjungdang, 1961), pp. 159–217.


21 Dates for the Three Kingdoms of Silla, Paekche and Koguryo in this article are estimates based on archaeological remains (Kim Wok-kyo, Han’guk kogobak kaseol [Introduction to Korean archaeology], 3rd ed. [Seoul: Iwha, 1963]) and do not rely on traditional historical chronologies. Histories differ considerably on the earlier founding dates for Silla (57 BC–AD 935), Koguryo (57 BC–AD 668), and Paekche (37 BC–AD 660) since they are taken from the thirteenth-century no outside help. As part of their efforts to prove Korea’s “historical independence,” they have unanimously denounced the archaeological and historical studies of the Japanese colonial period as all part of an “imperialistic” scholarly conspiracy [ilche oyon bakhja] to loot the country of its cultural and artistic objects. Despite their vehement anti-colonial rhetoric, I would suggest that the contemporary Korean national historical framework advocating racial purity, the permanent nature of racial characteristics, and the historical destiny of the nation is firmly entrenched in early twentieth-century Japanese colonial ideologies. This is because post-colonial Korean historians and archaeologists have internalized the basic colonial racist attitudes of Japanese scholars as documented in their earliest ‘Chōsenjin’朝鮮人(Korean people) studies from the period following the annexation of Korea in 1910. Most importantly, those Korean scholars have adopted the colonial racial hypothesis concerning the ‘Tungus/Tong-i’ or the ‘Mancurian’ origins of all Far Eastern races without realizing the inherent racial and colonial biases underlying their assumptions about the ‘primitive’ nature of the indigenous peoples inhabiting the Amur and North Korea.

Such racial theories were proposed by the pioneers of Tōyōgaku such as Shiratori Kurakichi白鳥倉吉, Torii Ryūzō鳥居龍三 and Sekino Tadashi関野貞, who were the first to introduce the imported Western disciplines of ethnography, archaeology, and art history into the peninsula, and used their historical and racial arguments to justify not only the annexation of Korea but Japan’s invasions of China.

The intellectual heritage of Korean national historiography thus dates back to the late nineteenth century and must be understood as part of the colonial legacy of Japanese imperialism in north-east Asia. The turn-of-the-century pioneering Japanese colonial scholars left behind a wealth of firsthand research on many subjects ranging from Korean religion, music, customs, geography, sociology, psychology, agriculture and fishing to finance. Of this published material, it is well known among East Asian historians and archaeologists that the most outstanding scholarship—as regards research, accuracy, and publication record—was the archaeological and cultural properties research of the Chōsen Sōtokufu朝鮮総督府 (Government-General of [colonial] Korea) and the Chōsen Koseki Kenkyūkai朝鮮古跡研究会 (Society for the Study of Korean Antiquities).

Soldiers, Scholars, and Bureaucrats: a Survey of Korean Archaeology in the Colonial Period (1905–1945)

At the end of the nineteenth century, the Choson government showed no interest in the monumental remains of either the Three Kingdoms (fourth to seventh century AD) or the preceding Koryo dynasty (AD 918–1392). There was, however, some interest in the preservation of burial mounds on account of Yangban ancestor-worship rituals. Fujita Ryōzak藤田光栄,
former director of the Chōsen Sōtoku Fu Hakubutsukan (Museum of the Government-General of Chosen) and professor at Keijō Teikoku Daigaku (Keijō [Seoul] Imperial University). They attributed this neglect to the penchant of Yi dynasty Confucianists for written documents. Their interest stemmed from the Sillak tradition study of inscriptions from pagodas, steles, and Buddhist sculpture. However, even the most enlightened Sillak scholars maintained that prehistoric stone tools were made by lightning bolts and were thus manufactured by nature and not by man. Before the arrival of Japanese scholars in the Korean peninsula, therefore, what we know today as the fields of archaeology and ethnography did not exist. Japanese archaeologists who came to Korea all noted this neglect of the physical and cultural relics of former dynasties and constantly deplored the fact that with each passing day, precious monuments were being lost.

When the newly-formed Meiji government established its first diplomatic relations with the Yi dynasty kingdom in 1876 with the signing of the Kangwha Treaty, Japanese intellectuals and scholars, who were trying to come to grips with the changing role of Japan in East Asia, naturally turned their focus onto the Korean peninsula which soon, in the aftermath of the Sino-Japanese War of 1894–95, became identified and studied as part of the Japanese imperial state and its past. The earliest Japanese Chōsēn studies in Japan were initiated, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, by Shiratori Kurakichi and Torii Ruyū, who wrote on such topics as the historical tribes of the Puyō, Koguryō, the legends of Chōsēn (Tangun, Kija, Wiman, etc.), and the Han dynasty commandery of Lolang as gleaned from ancient Chinese texts. With Japan's expanding colonial interest in Manchuria and China, Korea was also incorporated into Manchurian history and geography in so-called Mansenshï studies.

/records of the Samguk Sagi /The first archaeological remains of kohun (tumuli burials) and artifacts cannot be dated to as early as the first century BC. Dr Kenneth Gardiner has pointed out to me that Koguryō's historical existence as early as the first century BC is validated by records in the Han shu that mention the kingdom and its ruler during the time of Wang Mang (pers. comm. 1993). Nonetheless, I am not aware of any reliably-dated Koguryō archaeological find from this period.


Keijō Imperial University was renamed Seoul National University in 1946. Fujita, as head of the museum, was in charge of most of the excavation teams throughout the colonial period.

Fujita Ryōsaku, "Chōsēn no koseki chōsa to kohon no enkaku" [The process of researching and preserving ancient Korean monuments], Chōsengakukonkeki [Korea almanac] (Keijō: Chōsēn Sōtoku Fu, 1935), pp.1027–47; idem, On Korean studies.


Ibid.

Hatada, Japanese view of Korea, p.182.

The word 'Chosón' is used throughout this article to refer to colonial-period institutions, research organizations, book titles, proper names, etc. because it was the name for the Korean peninsula, the Korean people, and the Yi-dynasty kingdom of 'Choson' at that time. I wish to note here that usage of this term is for convenience and historical accuracy only, and /does not hold any derogatory connotations whatsoever. The rendering of all colonial-period institutions, books, organizations, edicts, etc. is in Japanese. When appearing for the first time in the text, they are translated into English in brackets. Translations are taken directly from Japanese colonial reports unless otherwise indicated.


Hatada Takashi questions the validity of the definition of 'Mansenshï' by Japanese scholars. He insists that Manchuria and Korea cannot be classified together as sharing the same history since the basis for a country's history is 'race'. He writes that "Korea is a distinct nation, with a separate language and culture, and to portray Korean history as part of Manchenshi is to deny the existence of the Choson race" (Hatada, Japanese view of Korea, p.182). He attributes this association with Manchuria as being responsible for the early twentieth-century Korean studies by Ikekichi Hiroshi, Tsuda Sōkichi, and Imamichi Ryō that focussed on ancient Korea and its relations to early tribes in Manchuria (p.196). I do not agree with the opinion of Hatada and other South Korean scholars that the early Japanese studies of 'Mansenshï' (such as that by Ikekichi Hiroshi, Mansenshï kenkyû [A study of Manchurian and Korean history] [Kyoto: Sōkoku-sha, 1951]) were all invalid. This is because it has been well documented archaeologically, historically, and ethnographically that the expansive and environmentally diverse regions of North China throughout the ages, from early prehistoric Neolithic times (c. 5000 BC) onwards, was the homeland to innumerable tribal and ethnic groups as well as serving as the center of many successive nomadic conquering states and empires. They have included the empires of the Hsiung-nu, Hsiian-pi, Jurchen, Khitans, Mongols, and, most recently, the founders of the Ch'ing dynasty in China. The archaeological, art historical, and cultural remains of the Korean peninsula also reflect direct contact, conflict, and adaptation to the shifting hegemonies that arose in the Ordos, the Mongolian grasslands, and the Inner Asian steppe.

I therefore believe it is futile to search for the origins of the Korean race in these vast regions as Korean historians and archaeo-
In 1916, the first laws regulating cultural properties were promulgated. During the Yi dynasty, strict laws had been applied only to periods postdating the Koryo dynasty and purely concerned the destruction of royal burial mounds. An official, without formal government intervention, might occasionally, through love for his village or nostalgia, be prompted to preserve a monument, while temples and government offices were repaired only as needed. As a result, Korean relics and monuments were falling into rapid decay and suffering indiscriminate looting. It was also reported that during the chaos of the Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese (1904–05) wars the Japanese Imperial Army had looted many Korean relics. In order to prevent further losses, eight articles were drawn up for enforcement:

- Article 1 defined koseki 古蹟 (ancient monuments) or ibutsu 遺物 (ancient remains) as follows: prehistoric sites that have yielded bones, neolithic tools, shell mounds, subterranean dwellings, burial mounds, fortresses, palace sites, gates, signal stations, government offices, shrines, ritual altars, temples, and kilns. Artifacts and related historical remains such as pagodas, stele, bells, bronze Buddhas, stone lanterns, and handicrafts were also included in this category. (The present system of kokubo 国宝 (Korean National Treasure) designation originated with the Japanese implementation of this article.)
- Article 2 stated that when koseki or ibutsu remains and artifacts were identified, they were to be registered with their designation, category and size, location, name and address of owner, state of preservation, associated legends and myths, and method of preservation.
- Article 3 stated that if these remains or artifacts were disturbed or tampered with in any way, the perpetrator was to be reported and taken to the police station within three days. The head of police was then to pass on the report to the Sōkoku office.
- Article 4 outlined the procedures for koseki registration on special forms.
- Articles 5–8 laid down rules concerning the official permission needed from the Sōtukufu for the removal, repair, and preservation of remains.

The Japanese colonial government was thus responsible for the registration of hundreds of archaeological and historical sites and monuments with the help of rigid and comprehensive laws. These regulations concerning the preservation of Korean cultural properties also prohibited the outflow of materials and antiquities from Chōsen, though smuggling continued at free ports such as Pusan and Sin'uju. With the promulgation of the preservation laws, the Sōtukufu organized the Chōsen Koseki Chōsa linkai (Commission for the Investigation of Historic Remains). While the two main purposes of this organization were scholarly research and education and the establishment of cultural facilities for the Sōtukufu, it also served as the main consulting body for all surveys and for the preservation, repair, construction and registration activities of the colonial government. The Commission was also responsible for studies of remains, museum exhibits, collections of articles, measurements, photography, reproductions, and engineering, and for reporting on such activities. Its membership was made up of specialists in Korean and Japanese universities such as Sekino, Kuroita and Imanishi. Hence, some of the best minds in Japan were engaged in scholarship at the frontier in Chōsen. In 1918 they were joined by Hamada Kōsaku, Harada Yoshihiko, Harada Shouji, Ikeuchi Hiroshi, and Umehara Sueti.  

The years 1916–21 saw major discoveries in the excavation of sites from the Chosun, Silla, Koguryo, Paekche, and Imna (Kaya) periods. Excavations in those five years numbered over 110. The first Koguryo fortress was found in the Tung-kou region of Manchuria in 1905 by Torii Ryūzō. He also identified Taewang-myo and Changun-ch'ong. Koguryo burial types marked by stepped stone-piled mounds and animal-mask-design eave tiles. Artifacts such as eave tiles and architectural and Buddhist sculptural pieces collected.

---

45 Fujita, "Ancient Korean monuments."
46 This tomb is now considered to belong to King Kwanggaeto'o (AD 391–413) whose conquests of Silla and Paekche were recorded on his stele erected in AD 414.
in the latter survey now form part of the East Asian collection at the Tokyo University Museum. In 1909, Imanishi Ryū surveyed Koguryo remains in P’yŏngyang and discovered a fortress at Kangdong-ku Hanwang-myŏ. In 1911, the Kangső kobun painted tombs were unearthed by Imanishi, Yatsui, and Kuriyama. These burial frescoes are outstanding for their colors, vibrancy, and dynamic depictions of the Koguryo people at home, in their palaces, dancing, hunting, wrestling, etc. The paintings were also extensively investigated, measured, and copied. Very few Koguryo burial goods were found since they had been looted long before. In 1916, these Kangsó paintings were again copied by Koizumi Akio. It was eventually revealed that the vaulted ceilings and paintings had belonged to the tombs of kings. Excavations were conducted by Kuriyama on the first capital of Koguryo in the Tung-kou region on the upper reaches of the Tumen river in southern Manchuria. These excavations revealed that Koguryo tomb construction had influenced the chamber burials and tomb paintings of Paekche and Silla to the south.

During the 1920s and 1930s, Mikami Tsugio 三上次 男 surveyed the Koguryo region for the South Manchurian Railway Company. In 1938, he reported, the Chosong Joseki Kenkyukai, feeling that they could not just stand by and watch thousands of mounds destroyed by railroad construction, made a strong plea to the railroad authorities for permission to conduct research. Their work and preservation activities helped save the tombs of Taewang-nung and Changun-ch’ong from being engulfed by city construction.

In 1915, Sekino, Yatsui, and Kuriyama excavated ten Lolang burials. These Lolang excavations marked a turning-point in the history of Korean archaeology for they were the first scientific excavations conducted on the peninsula in their use of measuring techniques, movable camps, and photography. Their excavation reports, too, were unmatched in the excellence of maps, records and drawings, and the quality of publication (see Figures 6 and 7). At that time, brick tombs and multi-chambered tombs yielding Han-dynasty (second century BC–second century AD) burial-goods such as lacquer, jade, pottery, gold and jewelry were found nowhere else in the world. By the end of the period of colonial rule, Japanese scholars had identified more than two thousand burials and had excavated hundreds. Their most important achievement was no doubt the identification of T’osongni, the headquarters of the Lolang commandery south of the Taedong river across from P’yŏngyang. Other Han sites and burials were ascribed dates from the first century BC to the fourth century AD by the inscriptions found on lacquerware, seals, and bricks.
In the last ten years, controversy over the existence of Lolang has fired a lively debate in the Republic of Korea. This controversy was led by Professor Yun Nae-lyoon of Tan’guk University who adopted a position North Korean scholars had already taken for more than forty years. In 1949, Hong Ki-mun had denied the existence of the Han Chinese commandery of Lolang in the Korean peninsula so as to preclude any ‘outside’ influence on the prehistoric development of an indigenous Korean sovereign state. He held that the remains found in Pyorthang were merely Chinese imports among Koguryo remains. He also dismissed the findings by Japanese scholars of Han Chinese ‘Lolang’ inscribed bricks and seals as colonial-period forgeries manufactured by locals who sold them to Japanese administrators and soldiers for high prices. Hong’s ‘driven by market forces’ argument to my mind lacks credibility, however, because the large body of the day-labourers at archaeological sites was made up of illiterate peasants highly unlikely to have been able to paint and inscribe ancient Chinese characters on lacquerware, stone steles and Han bricks. The accusations of nationalist archaeologists that Japanese planted and tampered with archaeological material contradict the evidence of actual museum collect-

Archaeological activities and studies continue to be carried out today by Chinese archaeologists in Koguryo sites (Li Tien-fu, “Chi-an Kao-kou li-mu yen-chhi: A study of Koguryo tombs in Chi-an”, in Tung-pei Kiao-kua yii li-shih [Archaeology and history in the northeast] (Beijing: Wenwu Chi’-pan-shé, 1982), pp.16-35; Ch’ae Mu-jang, Koguryo, Palhua munhwa [The culture of Koguryo and Palhua] (Seoul: Chihmungang, 1982).

The South Manchurian Railway Company was the leader in commercial development and territorial expansion in China and Korea. There are numerous studies of this highly influential corporation during the colonial era from a variety of perspectives (John Young, The research activities of the South Manchurian Railway Company, 1907-1945—a history and bibliography (New York: East Asian Institute, Columbia University, 1966). It also established a research department (Manetsu Chōsabu) which employed the brightest minds of the time to conduct geological, geographical, agricultural, economic, ethnographic, archaeological, and historical studies of Manchuria and Korea. Many of the historians and archaeologists mentioned in this work were also employed in this research department (Hara Kakutei, “Manetsu chōsabu no rekishi to Aja kenkyū” [The history of the Research Department of the South Manchurian Railroad and the study of Asia], Aja Kenkyū Zasshi 20-24 (1976-83); idem, Manetsu chōsabu Tōga [East Asian Research Institute of the South Manchurian Railroad Company (Tokyo: Keisō Shobó, 1986); Ihs’ Takeo, Manetsu ni iru to, trans. Joshua A Fogel, Life along the South Manchurian Railway—the memoirs of Ihs’ Takes (Armonk, N.Y.: M. E. Sharpe, 1986). The company published its archaeological and historical findings in the series entitled Manetsu rekishi chiri [Manchurian history and geography], Manetsu chiri rekishi kenkyū bökkoku [Manchurian and Korean geography and history reports], ed. Tokyō Teikoku Daigaku (Tokyo, 1915-41).


Chōsen Sōkoku, Rakurōgun jidai no iseki [Archaeological remains of the Lolang period] (Tokyo, 1927). The Chōsen Sōkoku (abbreviated hereafter as CSTF) was in existence from 1915 to 1945.

Ibid.

Komai Kazuchika, Rakurōgun chishi [The seat of local government of Lolang], Kōkogaku kenkyū (Tokyo: Tokyō Daigaku Kōkogaku Kenkyūshitsu, 1965).

ions made up of thousands of genuine artifacts from hundreds of excavated burials and the architectural remains of Han brick fortresses. The archaeological data consistently corroborate the historical records of Lolang as the center of Han Chinese administration, trade, and technology in the Korean peninsula. The influence of Han China in writing, military weapons, pottery-making, lacquerware, jewelry and architectural styles imported from Lolang may be seen in the development of the Three Kingdoms in the Korean peninsula and the Early Kofun states in Japan.

In 1918, the public was astounded by the revelation of artifacts from Silla tombs—spectacular gold crowns, silver and gold jewelry, imported Roman glassware, and elegant pottery. Nothing of indigenous origin had yet been discovered in the Korean peninsula displaying such splendid workmanship, refined detail, or variety. The burials were accidently discovered when a solid gold crown was unearthed from the floor of a farmhouse. Kūnikwan-ch'ŏng, Kūmnyŏng-ch'ŏng, Sŏbong-ch'ŏng, and Yangsan Pupu-ch'ŏng, around Taegu and Kyŏngju in Kyŏngsangbuk-do province, were all subsequently excavated. Among the Three Kingdoms-period kobun remains, Silla burial-goods are the best preserved because the architecture of Silla tombs placed the mortuary chamber deep beneath the mound, which acted as a deterrent to grave-robbers through the centuries.

The great temple site of the Unified Silla period (AD 668–918), Hwangnyongsaji, was discovered in 1916. In scale and grandeur it is the largest known temple-complex site in Korean history, and excavations continue today. Japanese archaeologists also measured and recorded the remains of the temple of Sach'ŏnwangsaj and Ch'ŏmsŏngdae, both in Kyŏngju. Paekche remains of earth fortresses and stone burials were found at the bend of the South Han river in the vicinity of Sŏkch'ŏndong and Mongch'on-dong in Seoul. The later capitals of Paekche were relocated in the cities of Kongju and Puyŏ. Pannam-myŏn, a very large

58 Ibid.
59 Ibid., p.95.
60 Ibid.


A major exhibition of Kaya artifacts jointly sponsored by the Seoul National Museum, the Tokyo National Museum and the Asahi Newspaper Corporation of Japan, opened in June 1992 at the Tokyo National Museum, later travelling to the Kyoto National Museum as well as the Fukushima Prefectural Museum of Art (Tokyo National Museum, ed., Kaya bunta ten [Asahi Shinbun, 1992]). The exhibition was a landmark for it was the first joint South Korean-Japanese scholarly effort to bring together in one place Korean and Japanese tumulus artifacts consisting of bronze and iron weapons, armour, mirrors, gold crowns, horse equipment, and "horse riders" were excavated from sites in both Korea and the Japanese archipelago. For the last hundred years, the geographical source and inspiration of early royal burial artifacts have incited fierce debates over 'horse riders' who supposedly swept through Korea on their way to conquering Japan (Gari Ledyard, "Galloping along with the horse riders: looking for the founders of Japan," Journal of Japanese Studies 1.2 (1975):
urn-burial concentration with gold crowns and jewelry, was found in Ch'ungch'ongnam-do and was identified as belonging to the Early Paekche period. Royal burials were also found at Nungsanni.

Kaya stone cist graves covered with mounds were located on high hilltops in south-east Korea in Ch'angnyeong, Koryo, Songiu and Kimhae. Archaeologists Hamada, Imanishi, and Kuroita discovered that though these remains were similar to those of Paekche and Silla, there was evidence of strong and undeniable ties to remains in Kyushu, as reflected in the historical records of the Nibon Shoki.62

After 1916, preservation activities were carried out by the Chosen Sotokufu and the museum. Money was scarce and was therefore spent on only the most important monuments and those in imminent danger of collapse. They repaired the East Gate (Tongdaemun) in Seoul, put fences around burial mounds, and stabilized the foundations of pagodas. The Museum and the Gakumuka (Department of Research Activity) also embarked on an extensive project for the reconstruction of Pulguksa (Figure 9) and Sokkulam (Figure 10) to counter the erosion caused by hundreds of years of neglect and decay.63 These sites have been praised—deservedly—as the most outstanding architectural monuments of Korea's past in their beauty and engineering.64

The restoration of Sokkulam took sixteen years to complete and that of Pulguksa eight. The colonial engineers were especially careful to preserve the original form and style of these Buddhist monuments which dated to the eighth century, the height of Silla culture and artistic achievement. They also worked on Pusoksa Muryang Sujon (thirteenth century), which is the oldest wooden monument standing today and dates to the mid-Koryo period.

As one of the Chosen Sotokufu's preservation activities, important monuments that were too far away to be safeguarded were moved to the Museum grounds. Included among these were many pagodas, stelae, and stone lanterns which can still be seen during a walk around Kyongbok Palace in the center of Seoul. The museum staff also determined which monuments, sites and arti-
facts would be designated 'National Treasures' (kokubō) and displayed in their collections. Museum catalogues were printed with explanations and descriptions of features in Japanese, English, and occasionally classical Chinese, but never in Korean. It was therefore Japanese colonial scholars and bureaucrats who first defined the aesthetic criteria for the "valuable cultural objects and museum pieces" that would represent Korea's past.

In 1913, Sekino began work on the first volume of the Chōsen Koseki Zufu (Album of Ancient Korean Sites and Monuments) series, cataloguing photos, maps, and illustrations in fifteen volumes. Over a period of twenty years (1915-35), they covered Lolang remains, Three Kingdoms burials, Buddhist temples, ceramics, Buddhist sculpture, and Yi dynasty paintings. The seven volumes of the Koseki Chōsa Tokubetsu Hōkokushū (Special Reports on Investigations of Ancient Sites [1919-30]) also documented the major excavations of Lolang graves, Silla tombs and Koguryo sites. The Koseki Chōsa Hōkoku (Reports on Investigations of Ancient Sites in nineteen volumes, 1918-37) were annual surveys and reports of excavations throughout the peninsula. The Chōsen Koseki Kenkyūkai from 1934 to 1940 published additional reports, the Koseki Chōsa Gaiyō (Survey Reports on Investigations of Ancient Sites), on the research unit's activities and excavations of major Lolang sites and Three Kingdoms burials.

The Colonial Racial Framework and the Decline of Korean Civilization

The earliest Japanese scholarship on Korea made immense contributions in the archaeological discovery of the Three Kingdoms by putting the first museum collections on display, classifying prehistoric artifacts, and instituting laws and regulations for the preservation of ancient sites and monuments. Their research publications also defined the standard for scientific archaeological excavations and documentation, surpassing the publications of any other country during that period in the quality of their photographs, maps, and illustrations. These pioneers were also instrumental in schooling, even after independence in 1945, the next generation of Korean archaeologists, since there was then no Korean adequately trained to conduct excavations. Japanese excavation and recording techniques in digging, mapping, and illustration styles still influence present-day Korean archaeological training and publications a hundred years later. Even today, Korean excavation reports closely resemble the Japanese colonial
prototypes in their overall presentation, organization, and layout. Present analyses also emphasize artifact illustration and classification (Figure 11) and cultural historical analysis, as did the Japanese. This disciplinary continuity in academic training and reporting has no doubt been facilitated by the similarity between the Korean and Japanese languages, as reflected in their extensive commonality in archaeological and art historical vocabulary.

Despite the contributions of Japanese archaeologists and historians, their overall general interpretative framework left a lot to be desired. Their anthropological surveys, studies of documents, and archaeological data were invariably selectively used to reconstruct a unilinear development of Korean civilization along evolutionary historical lines, dependent on a sequence of racial conquests, that highlighted the following four main themes: (1) the theory of 'Nissen dōsoror'日鮮同祖論, i.e. the common ancestral origins of the Korean and Japanese races; (2) the assertion that Japanese emperors ruled Korea in ancient times (fourth–seventh century AD); (3) the idea that the development of Korean history was mainly influenced by the impact of Chinese civilization from without and therefore lacked unique Korean origins; (4) the backwardness/stagnation view of Korean civilization.⁶⁹

Along with historical and archaeological research, ethnographic studies were carried out by Japanese administrators and scholars throughout the period of the annexation of Korea and colonial rule (1905–45). Prominent Japanese specialists conducted 'Chōsenjin' studies which documented the 'racial characteristics' of the Koreans. They covered every possible aspect of Korean customs, character, philosophy, religion, psychology, and even criminal behavior.⁷⁰ As manuals for colonial rule, Chōsenjin studies noted that the study of Korean people and their language, history, customs, etc., was necessary for future success in colonial rule and the eventual benefit of the empire.⁷¹

67 Dr. Kim Chae-wôn, the first head of the National Museum of Korea after 1945, noted in his autobiography that Arimitsu Kyoichi, who had worked on Korean archaeology throughout the colonial period, remained behind in Seoul even after Japan's surrender in order to ensure the safety of these precious artifacts (Kim Chae-wôn, Pangmulsewen kwa bongpyǒngsaeng [My life with the National Museum] [Seoul: Tangudang, 1992], p.96). A representative of the American occupation force was also there to keep a watchful eye when the museum collections were turned over to the custody of Dr. Kim. He further commented on how this event cemented his lifelong friendship with Arimitsu (p.97).

68 Ibid., p.96.


70 CSTP, Chōsenjin [The Korean people] (Keijō: Chōsen Insatsu, 1920); idem, Chōsenjin no shi tai to sekaku [The thought and character of the Korean people] (Keijō: Chōshashūryō Dainihonsha, 1927).

71 CSTP, Chōsenjin no shi tai to sekaku.

Figure 11
Classification of Silla pottery by the Society for the Preservation of Kyōngju Antiquities (Album of ancient Korean sites and monuments, vol.3 [1916])
These works attributed Korean backwardness to two main characteristics: *taritsusei* 他律性 (a lack of independence) and *shibai shugi* 事大主義 (a servile attitude towards bigger nations). Other negative racial features identified were a lack of creativity, stress on formality, illiteracy, a tendency to factional strife, an inability to distinguish private possessions and public property, individualism, and authoritarianism. These faults were traced to the rule of the Yangban literati and their constant striving to be bureaucrats. Thus, according to colonial government reports, the country's decline was due to the entrenched Confucianism and factionalism of the Yi dynasty. Japanese administrators pointed out that bad government on the part of the ruling dynasty was to blame for the plight of the Chōsen people. In their analysis, they also argued that Koreans could hardly be blamed for their faults because they had been surrounded by superpowers since ancient times.

To the north there were the steppe nomads and the Russian empire, to the west the supreme force of China, and to the east Japan. Under such unpromising conditions, the Japanese studies concluded, a Korean civilization could not have developed very far. Having reached this assessment, the Japanese colonial administration felt obliged to drag the Koreans out of their dark age since they were incapable of doing it themselves. It had therefore enforced its enlightened rule of assimilation (*dōka* 同化) under which Koreans would become Japanese and subjects of the Emperor (*tennōka* 天皇化). The argument for Japan's innate racial superiority justified the imposition of Japanese-language education and immersion in the study of Japanese history and culture. As colonial rulers, the Japanese believed that through correct government the Koreans would gradually lose their bad characteristics and be inspired by their superior race.

Among the negative analyses of the Korean people and their history and culture, it is the Japanese colonial interpretations of early Korean history and prehistory that have incited the greatest controversy. This is because theories concerning invasion and conquest by the early Taika 'Japanese' army during the Mimana era are considered by historians to be directly tied to the imperial origins of early Japanese states and the formation of Korea's Three Kingdoms. Korean historians still accuse their Japanese counterparts of deliberately fabricating the contents of the King Kwanggaeto stele inscriptions (since it is well documented that the unified 'Japanese' state in its present manifestation is a product of the Meiji period belonging to the last century (Carol Gluck, *Japan's modern myths* [Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1985]). Most Japanese scholars today, however, with very few exceptions (see Amino Yoshikiko, "Deconstructing 'Japan'," *East Asian History* 3 [1992]: 121–42), continue to use the word 'Nihon' because they identify with and believe in an unbroken imperial state lineage (Fujinari Takashi, "Inventing, forgetting, remembering") symbolizing a racial continuity that can be traced back to the ancient and mythical era mentioned in the revered texts of the *Nihon shoki* and *Kojiki* (c. seventh century). The Korean pronunciation is 'Imma' and the problem of Imma remains the most important source of controversy among Japanese and Korean scholars of ancient history. Over the decades, Japanese scholars (such as Oda Shōgo, *General history of Chōsen*, and Saeki Arkiyo, *Kōka o hirui* [King Kwanggaeto stele] [Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobunkan, 1979]) have maintained...
in their attempts to manufacture an historical precedent for the occupation of Korea in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Nationalistic historians on both sides of the Straits of Japan today, therefore, still equate historical military conquests with a past racial, cultural, and military superiority.

Post-War nationalist historians have unanimously denounced Japanese colonial theories that emphasize Korea’s racial and cultural inferiority to Japan and dependence on China (sadae) as all “part of an evil plot” devised by “Japanese colonial-government-employed (oyong) scholars whose malicious poisoning completely distorted Korean history.” “Japanese imperialist historiography” (Iche buwang-guk saktuan) is therefore targeted today as the main colonial weapon used to “annihilate” Korea’s racial and cultural identity (minjok malsal). As a result, Japanese colonial contributions to the discovery, preservation and scholarly study of Korea’s ancient remains and monuments are collectively ignored, while those pioneering scholars have become the main scapegoats of the colonial era as “tainted racists and imperialists” who ultimately provided the intellectual and historical justification for colonial occupation.

There is no doubt that despite their recognized scholarly contributions, the Japanese archaeological and historical framework was indeed represented by the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century ideology of colonial racism. Colonial racism has been a major element in the conception of empire around the world in the last two centuries, promoted by colonial overlords who attempted to “weld dynastic legitimacy and national community” by generalizing a principle of innate and inherited superiority over their domains. Japanese colonial scholarship also emphasized the importance of race, racial invasion, and territorial conquest as determining factors in the rise and fall of nations. Their racially deterministic views were echoed in colonial studies on the periodization of Korea’s art historical monuments and archaeological remains. In the field of art history, Sekino Tadashi was the first scholar to document and study early Korean Buddhist remains in Kyŏngju, which he considered the peak of her artistic achievement.

Dr. Sekino, who was the first to recognize the significant influence of Korea’s Buddhist art on Nara and Heian art and sculpture, revealed that he “only began to understand the relationship between Japan and China through the study of Korea,” because “on the one hand, Korea exported Chinese culture to

that an early Japanese colony run by the Yamato state was established in the South-eastern part of Korea between AD 365 and 561 (Nihon shoki dates) and lasted for about two hundred years. It was from this military outpost that armies were launched to attack the kingdoms of Paekche and Silla. The main body of inscriptions supporting their analysis came from the rubbings of the stele of King Kwanggong of the Koguryŏ Kingdom. Rubbings of this stele (dated to AD 410) were taken by a Japanese military officer to Japan in 1883. The stele itself is situated in Tung-kou in the Chinese province of Chi-lin. It became the object of intense scrutiny by major scholars such as Torii Ryoza, Sekino Tadashi, Kurotsu Katsumi, and Keuchi Hiroshi. But to this day the authenticity of the stele’s inscriptions and the interpretation of its meaning but nonetheless historic content is contested by the most prominent Korean historians, including Ch’ŏn Kwan-u and Kim Chŏng-jae. They refute the accuracy of all Japanese translations and interpretations and have gone on to accuse the Japanese scholars of outright forgeries on the stele itself (Ch’ŏn Kwan-u, “A new interpretation of Mimana,” parts 1 and 2, Korea Journal 14 [Feb. 1974]: 9–23; Apr. 1974]: 31–44) in a conspiracy to prove an ancient precedent for Japanese conquest 1,500 years before the present century. Kim Chŏng-jae, Han’guk kogosanmok seonjosa [New trends in ancient Korean history] (Seoul: Koryŏ Taeakkyyo, 1980), p. 145). The debate remains unresolved after more than a hundred years of research (H. C. Chŏn, Kodari ni niiteru Chosŏn [A view of Chosen in ancient history] (Tokyo: Chŏsen Seiensha, 1981).

Hatada Takashi, Japanese view of Korea, idem, New history of Korea.

Yoko Hakho, Reflections on Korean history, pp. 8–9.

Kim Hong-sŏn, “Mich'egukch'usijadillie ŭihan Namchosŏn munhwaho yumulli ryakč'ak-wa p'akoe,” [The plunder and destruction of South Korea's cultural relics by American imperialists], Kogos Minsool 3 (1965): 128–47.

Yi U-am and Kang Man-g'il, Han’guk sot’ickoyŏksa [Historical consciousness in Korea] (Seoul: Ch'angjaig Kwe Pipyŏng, 1976).

Reischauer, “Japanese archaeological work.”


Sekino Tadashi, Korean architecture, idem, Art history of Korea. Sekino designated Sŏk'ulam and Pulgoksa as the highest points of Korean artistic achievement (Sekino, Art history of Korea). I believe that Sekino's vivid interest in Silla art was also largely determined by the problem of 'negative evidence', i.e. non-Silla cultural remains in the rest of the peninsula were not as well preserved as Silla remains. Silla Buddhist remains are mostly found on carved rock surfaces tucked away on remote slopes of Namsan mountain outside Kyŏngju and have therefore escaped the many vicissitudes of war and vandalism throughout the centuries. Thus, the artistic and architectural achievements of Silla compared to those of the other kingdoms are greatly over-represented in the archaeological record.
Japan yet at the same time it was also influenced by Japanese art.90 He believed, however, that Korean art began to deteriorate after the Unified Silla period (AD 668—936). Sekino was further convinced that the size of the country inhibited the development of Korean art, which never achieved full independence, the monuments remaining small in scale and proportion.91 He concluded that surveys of ancient Korea revealed that “the Chōsen race has a natural ability for excellent art and if the Choson Sŏtokuŭi encourages them, they could perhaps regain their former glory.” He blamed the five hundred years of Yi dynasty misrule for causing “a race that was once capable of such superb creativity to lose its interest in art.”92 From this conclusion it would appear that Sekino saw even artistic achievement as being the product of intrinsic racial talent.

Fujita Ryōsaku was the Japanese archaeologist who headed the Sotokafu Museum and research departments.93 His views on the development of ancient Korean civilization reflected typical colonial archaeological interpretations.94 He is acknowledged as the first scholar to divide the history of ancient Korea into four periods: the Stone Age, the Mixed Metal/Stone Tools Age (kinseki beiyōki 金石併用期),95 Han-dynasty Lolang culture, and the Three Kingdoms. The Stone Age, according to Fujita, was represented by comb-pattern pottery found at Amsari on the banks of the Han river. He maintained that Korean Neolithic remains resembled those in Siberia and Manchuria,96 agreeing with Torii Ryūzō who had first identified prehistoric remains in Korea.97 Fujita was also the first to classify Korea’s dolmens into two types—Northern and Southern—based on their regional distribution and stylistic differences. He proposed that the bronze artifacts from dolmens belonged to the first “metal-using” race called “the Yemaeok” who, around the end of Zhou (c. seventh century BC) had migrated from the Shan-tung and Ho-pei region into the northeastern Korean provinces of P’yŏng-nam-do and Hwanghae-do. The Yemaeok soon exerted their domination over the former primitive culture,98 settling down to form the sedentary clan villages of semi-subterranean dwellings of the earliest type excavated. This was the period Fujita named the age of ‘mixed metal/stone tools’, its archaeological marker being the Korean slim-dagger (sebyōng dong-gomi) found throughout the peninsula.

For Fujita, the ‘mixed metal/stone tool’ culture constituted the archaeological proof of Shiratori’s “historic” arrival of the Yemaeok.99 He also took the Wetzbit accounts of the Eastern Barbarians as describing Korea’s ancient “shamanistic” burial customs, clothes, and religion, further demonstrating ancient Korea’s closer cultural ties to the northern nomadic ‘Tungus’ rather than later Han Chinese influences.100 Fujita held that this “northern strain Scythian connection” was signified by “the kind of metal technology, weapon-design, and decorative motifs unearthed in the Korean peninsula.”101

According to Fujita, the sinification of the “indigenous Yemaeok states” of the Korean peninsula occurred with the invasion of Han Wu-ti and the establishment of the Han commandery system in 108 BC. This main cultural force emanated from “Han Lolang culture,” which he dubbed “the lighthouse
of the East" on account of its artistic, cultural, and technological superiority.\textsuperscript{102} The Han commanderies and their influence reached as far as Lpshil in Kyŏngju, hundreds of miles to the south-east, where imitation Han swords, spears, and ritual bells were found.\textsuperscript{103} More significantly, Fujita believed that the "Han Chinese-influenced" metal/stone age was then transplanted to Japan's Yayoi culture.\textsuperscript{104}

Amongst the various 'racial' influences, Fujita emphasized the adoption of Chinese culture by the tribal states of Yemaek, Puyŏ, Koguryŏ, and Okchŏ\textsuperscript{105} as the most important factor in the rise of the later Three Kingdoms and the Japanese Kofun states. He proposed that the close cultural and religious ties of the Korean/Japanese during the Kofun period explained the archaeological and historical similarities in customs, clothes, lifestyle, and patterns of subsistence. Fujita thus used the archaeological data to support the already well-established historical theories of the common racial origins of the 'Tong-i races'.\textsuperscript{106} That Fujita's initial interest in prehistoric Korea, as with other Japanese historians before him, was derived from his concern with Japanese origins\textsuperscript{107} may be understood from his statement that "though Chosŏn culture can be seen as an imitation of Chinese culture, it remained not merely a land-bridge but also a place of cultural ferment and a transmitter of continental cultures to Japan."\textsuperscript{108}

With Fujita and Sekino's comprehensive surveys, archaeological periodization and art historical data were integrated into the colonial racial sequence framework. Colonial scholarship thus attributed artistic, cultural, and technological changes to new arrivals and conquests by a succession of superior races who imposed their lifestyle and rule on the Korean peninsula.

\textbf{The Invasion Hypothesis in Korean Archaeology}

As we have seen, the scholarly contributions of Japanese archaeologists and historians were overshadowed by their 'racially deterministic' interpretative framework. As Hatada Takashi has pointed out, popular Japanese perceptions of Korea, even today, are influenced by the writings of scholars who emphasized that Korean civilization only developed under the external influence of China and was therefore incapable of independent innovation. Though the contribution to Korean historiography of Hatada, as the first historian systematically to expose the ideological and historical background to colonialist archaeology and historiography, is undeniable, he failed to offer any alternative interpretative framework for analyzing early Korean history.\textsuperscript{109} Korean nationalistic archaeologists and historians who have uniformly adopted the position of outright rejection of all past Japanese scholarship on Korea, describe early Korean-Japanese\textsuperscript{110} interaction with the 'influences' travelling in exactly the opposite direction, that is, from Korea to Japan.\textsuperscript{111}

In South Korea, the current ultra-nationalist movement is led by Kim Chŏng-bae and Yun Nae-hyŏn who have rewritten Korean prehistory in an...
archaeological remains from kofun burials. Stories of Silla princes arriving from across the sea with imperial treasures such as the sword, jewel and mirror as recorded in the Nibon sôkî chapters (Aston, Nihonshû are too fraught with chronological problems to serve as reliable historical sources. They still retain their literary value, however, as fascinating accounts of a mythical and legendary nature that hint at channels of diplomatic and ideological exchange that may have existed between the Korean peninsula and Japanese islands. The few uncovered contemporaneous inscriptions are still the subject of too much unresolved debate to allow significant conclusions to be drawn (Murayama Shichirô and Roy Andrew Miller, "Inariyama tumulus sword inscription," Journal of Japanese Studies 5.2 [1979]: 405–38).

112 Kim Chông-hae, "Ehnic Korean nation"; idem, New trends, idem, Ancient state in Korea, Yun Nae-hyeon, Ancient Korean nation.

113 The earliest mention of Kija in connection with the Korean peninsula occurs in the second-century Chinese texts of the Shang-shu Ta-chuan (Imanishi Ryo, Ancient Chosôn history, pp. 152–5) and the Shih-chi (Burton Watson, Records of the grand historian of China (New York & London: Columbia University Press, 1960) and relate the story of a Shang aristocrat who fled east at the end of the fall of the dynasty and was eventually enfeoffed in Chao-hsien by King Wu (c. 1000 bc). To this date, no remains of any Late Shang artifacts—bronzes, pottery or weapons—to substantiate this record have been found south of the Yalu river.

114 The story of Wiman (Wei-man in Chinese) is first mentioned in the Shi-chi and concerns a general named Wei-man of the state of Yen who fled to Korea after a failed coup attempt in 195–194 bc. Ch'oe Mong-nyong interprets this event as the first 'conquest' state to have arisen in the Korean peninsula (Ch'oe Mong-nyong, Yong-san river valley culture). Professor Yi Ki-bae, on the other hand, doubts that Wiman was even of Chinese origin, holding that he was probably a local leader who dressed up as a Chinese to gain more prestige in his efforts at conquest (pers. comm. 1980; Yi Ki-bae and Yi Ki-dong, Han-guk-sa kongju [Lectures in Korean history] [Seoul: Ilchogak, 1983], pt 1, pp. 62–3). His view is more representative of the nationalist historical school of thought that attempts to deny Wei-man's Chosôn the status of an ancient Chinese colonial regime.

Archaeological evidence of Yen artifacts such as ming-tao-chien (knife coins) as well as late Warring States-period weaponry has been found mainly in hoards scattered throughout the peninsula. Without absolute dates or burial contexts, such artifacts cannot serve as proof that such a conquest actually took place.

115 This definition is not mine and I refer the reader to the classic treatise by Grahame Clark deploring the lack of a methodological framework for the interpretation of British prehistory. In this ground-breaking work that was to change the course of British archaeology, he diagnosed an "invasion neurosis" among British archaeologists, who were attempting to trace all British ancient remains to the European continent (Grahame Clark, "The invasion hypothesis in British archaeology," Antiquity 40 [1966]: 172–9. At 172). This situation would seem to persist in present-day Korea and Japan where, in my view, scholars in those countries are still suffering from the trauma and scars left by the last hundred years of political annexation, colonial occupation, cultural oppression, and the division following the Korean War; they continue to interpret the remote and ancient past of two thousand years using the 'imperialist' and 'colonialist' framework, methodology, and terminology belonging to the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

116 Yun Mu-hyong, Korean Bronze Age.

117 Ledyard, "Horse riders.

118 Kim Byông-mo, "Han-guk kôôk munhwâ wollyu e kwanha yôn'gu" [A study on the ori-
objective and analytical study of Korean archaeology and ancient history today. Even the most respected and prolific scholars on both sides of the Straits of Japan, such as Kim Wöl-lyong in archaeology and Yi Ki-baek and Hatada Takashi in Korean ancient history, have not been able to overcome their “invasion neuroses.” Korean archaeologists and historians are still struggling today with their own reconstructions of a “nationalistic history” influenced by the last fifty years of parallel but opposing state ideologies and ‘Korean’ historical narratives in the divided peninsula. The inaccessibility of North Korean data has further complicated issues concerning the “antiquity” and “authenticity” of the origins of the “Korean” race, territory, and state. Thus, in both Koreas and in Japan “identity negotiations” depend on who has the greater political legitimacy and moral claim as the “authentic” speaker for defining racial antiquity, purity, cultural superiority, and state ancestry.

The importance and role of archaeology and archaeologists in defining identity, ethnicity, and national culture has long been recognized. A nationalistic agenda of this kind is a natural reaction to the “colonialist archaeology” of the previous centuries. Archaeology can be used to bolster the pride and morale of nations and ethnic groups, being most often used for this purpose “when people who feel thwarted, threatened or deprived of their collective rights by more powerful nations or in countries where national unity is lacking.” Archaeology can also serve as an important instrument in political education because it emphasizes the cultural achievements of indigenous ancient civilizations. Because the fields of archaeology and ancient history most often provide the cultural sourcebook in the search for heroes, myths, and legends, archaeologists and the results of their finds have been crucial in the building of national regimes and political solidarity.

The study of the Korean peninsula is especially illuminating precisely because it has always been situated at the crossroads of several different civilizations. Korea’s archaeological and art historical remains of the past five thousand years reflect a diversity of origins and developments, making it an ideal region to investigate for the formation of hypotheses concerning cultural contact, conflict, acculturation, adaptation, and ultimately culture change. We need to formulate approaches that emphasize both indigenous origins as well as adaptation to external inspirations from China, the Northern steppes empires and the Japanese islands from the ancient past to more recent times. Such a broad regional framework should allow a better understanding of Japanese-Korean interactions in the past and future, unclouded by individual or collective anti-Japanese or anti-Korean sentiments.


119 The late Professor Kim Wöl-lyong, formerly of Seoul National University, is considered the father of modern Korean archaeology. His major contributions are the several editions of his Introduction to Korean archaeology, which first appeared in 1973 (third edition, 1986). He has also served as the chief editor of Han-gyuk kogobak yon bo (Annual report on Korean archaeology) (Seoul: Department of Archaeology and Anthropology, Seoul National University, 1974–92), which has served to synthesize the major discoveries of the past and present covering all Korean archaeological periods since its first appearance in 1973.

120 Professor Yi Ki-baek, who has taught for many years at Sogang University, is known for his textbook Han nyuksa shimon (A new history of Korea) which first came out in 1976. Translated by Professor Wagner of Harvard University, it was published simultaneously in the U.S. in 1984 by Harvard University Press and as a second edition by Ilchogak in Korea. The Korean and English versions of this book remain the most influential and widely read historical text, explaining Korean history within Yi’s “new framework”—as opposed to previous colonial Japanese interpretations of Korea’s past. Yi Ki-baek has also written extensively on the issues concerning Korean historiography in the post-Korean War period (Yi Ki-baek, Race and history, ideam, A new history of Korea, trans. Edward W. Wagner with Edward Shultz [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984]).

121 Kang Man-gil, “Minjok sakakronui pansong-Kwangbok 30 nyon Kuksalakutui pansong kwa panghyang” [A reflection on thirty years of national historiography], in Pandan-sidaeui yokesinsok (Historiography in a divided peninsula) (Seoul: Ch’anggak kwa Pyo’pyong, 1978).


125 Ibid.


128 Hyun Il-Pai, “Culture contact and culture change.”
## APPENDIX 1

*Table of Korean Archaeological Sites Excavated during the Japanese Colonial Period (1910–1945)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NORTH-WEST</th>
<th>SOUTH-WEST</th>
<th>SOUTH-EAST</th>
<th>HISTORICAL SEQUENCE</th>
<th>ARCHAEOLOGICAL PERIODIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c.100</td>
<td>Kimhae</td>
<td>Kija (?)</td>
<td>Wiman (?)</td>
<td>Neolithic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.100</td>
<td>Ipsilli</td>
<td>LOLANG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>KOGURYÔ</td>
<td></td>
<td>T'osöngni</td>
<td>Mixed Metal/Stone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>T'ung-kou</td>
<td>Sinch'angni</td>
<td>IMNA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kangso</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muyong</td>
<td>Songju</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Changgun</td>
<td>Pannam-myŏn</td>
<td>SILLA</td>
<td>Three Kingdoms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taewang-myŏn</td>
<td>Nungsanni</td>
<td>Kūmkwan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Songsanni</td>
<td>Kūnmyŏng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sŏbong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yangsan Pubu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>668</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unified Silla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kyŏngju Pulguksa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ch'omsŏngdae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sŏkkulam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hwangnyongsajji</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Koryŏ Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pusŏksa Muryangsujŏn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Songkwang temple</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1392</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yi Dynasty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese Annexation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2

_Cronology of Japanese Archaeological Work in the Korean Peninsula (1900–1945)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>First survey of burial mounds and dolmens by Yagi Sōzaburō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Beginning of Japanese archaeology in Korea: First general survey of architectural and stone monuments by Sekino Tadashi in the provinces of North and South Kyŏngsan and Kyŏngi-do; survey of shrines, temples, and burial mounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>First <em>Koguryŏ</em> fortress identified in T'umg-kou, Chi-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>First survey of Kyŏngju tombs by Imanishi Ryū</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td><em>Kimbae</em> shell mound discovered by Imanishi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>First systematic field investigations of old architecture by Sekino, Yatsu Seiichi, and Kuriyama Shun'ichi in all provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Annexation of Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(All archaeological, historical, and publishing works from now on conducted by the <em>Chōsen Sōtokufu</em> [Office of the Governor-General of Korea])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Research studies by Torii Ryūzō of archaeological and historical materials covering all provinces; first discovery of <em>prehistoric</em> stone tools and sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Koguryŏ painted tombs at Kangšo investigated; <em>Taijiang earth fortress</em> and Han inscription bricks found in Hwanghae-do; <em>Lolang earth fortress</em> and <em>Nien-ti hsten</em> stele identified in Pyŏngan-namdo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Collection of historical documents started by Imanishi; first Koguryŏ excavations begin; reconstruction of Sŏkkulam begins, lasting sixteen years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1915</td>
<td>The Chōsen Sōtokufu Museum established in the grounds of Kyŏngbok Palace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Commission for the Investigation of Historic Remains (Chōsen Koseki Chōsa Linkai) established; regulations for the implementation of the system for the conservation of ruins and remains (<em>Koseki oyobi tbutsu bozon kontei</em>) promulgated; system for the official designation of ancient monuments (<em>koseki</em>) and national treasures (<em>kokubo</em>) implemented; Kyŏngju <em>Hwangyongsan</em> temple remains, <em>Sach'o'nuwangsa</em> temple and Chŏlla-namdo <em>Songkwangsa</em> temple measured; Koguryŏ tombs in Chi-an investigated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Paekche <em>Nŭngsannim</em> royal burials investigated; first Lolang excavations and dating of Han artifacts; Seoul <em>Sŏkh'on-dong</em> mound no.1 excavated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td>Excavations of Silla burials in Kyŏngju begin; Imna burials in Koryŏng, Ch'angnyong, and Kimhae excavated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>Reconstruction of <em>Pulguksa</em> begins, taking six years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td><em>Yangsan Pubu-c'b'ong</em> excavations; Kimhae shell mound excavations;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dates for this chronology were taken from Fujita Ryōsaku, "Chōsen no koseki chōsa to hozon no enkaku" [The process of researching and preserving ancient Korean monuments], _Chōsen sōkan [Korea almanac]_ (Keijō: Chōsen Sōtokufu, 1933), pp.1027–47, and the chart published by the Korean Ministry for the Study of Cultural Remains (Seoul: Munhwajae Yŏn'igu, 1968). The years vary slightly from source to source depending on whether the year recorded was that of the publication report or of the actual fieldwork and excavation season.
1920  *Yangsan Pabu-ch’ong* excavations; Kimhae shell mound excavations; designation of Mixed Usage of Metal/Stone Age; Kyŏngju *Ipsilli* Bronzes discovered

1921  *Kumkwan-ch’ong* (Tomb of the Gold Crown) excavations; Kyŏngju Museum established

1924  Kŭmnyŏng-ch’ŏng (Tomb of the Gold Bells); Lolang *Sŏkkam-dong* burials excavated

1926  *Sŏbongch’ŏng* excavations

1931  Lolang *Ch’aebysŏpch’ŏng* (Tomb of the Painted Basket) excavations

1933  Kongju *Songsanri Paekche* burial excavations

1934  Kimhae excavations of stone cist graves and jar burials leads to designation of Kimhae-style pottery

1938  Naju *Pannam-myŏn* jar burials excavated

1940  Chi’an Koguryŏ *Muyong-ch’ŏng* (Tomb of the Dancers) excavated

---
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