

The Creation of National Treasures and Monuments: The 1916 Japanese Laws on the Preservation of Korean Remains and Relics and Their Colonial Legacies

Hyung Il Pai

This article surveys the history of Korea's heritage management laws and administration beginning with the current divisions of the Office of Cultural Properties and tracing its structure back to the 1916 Japanese Preservations Laws governing Korean remains and relics. It focuses on the eighty-year-old bureaucratic process that has led to the creation of a distinct Korean patrimony, now codified and ranked in the nationally designated registry of cultural properties (*Chijöng munhwajae*). Due to the long-standing perceived "authentic" status of this sanctified list of widely recognized "Korean" national treasures, they have been preserved, reconstructed, and exhibited as tangible symbols of Korean identity and antiquity since the early colonial era.

The Office of Cultural Properties and the Creation of Korean Civilization

The Office of Cultural Properties (Munhwajae Kwalliguk, hereafter referred to as the OCP) since its foundation in 1961 has been the main institution responsible for the legislation, identification, registration, collection, preservation, excavations, reconstruction and exhibitions of national treasures, architectural monuments, and folk resources in the Republic of Korea.¹ This office used to operate under the Ministry of Culture and Sports, but, due to its ever-expanding role, it was awarded independent ministry (*ch'öng*) status in 1998. With a working staff of more than five hundred employees, it also oversees a vast administrative structure including the following prominent cultural institutions: the Research Institute of Cultural Properties (Munhwajae Yön'guso) founded in 1975; the two central museums, the National and Folk Museum, which are in charge of an extended network of nine national museums (located in Kyöngju, Kwangju, Chönju, Ch'öngju, Puyö, Kongju, Taegu, Kimhae, and

Chinju); the four Yi dynastic royal palaces in Seoul; the King Sejong Shrine; Chongmyo; and the National Center for Korean Traditional Performing Arts. Thus, in the last four decades, the OCP has been the main institution responsible for the invention of “Korean” culture and tradition.²

National cultural property is currently defined in the Republic of Korea³ as natural and man-made objects that are designated as having important archaeological, prehistorical, historical, literary, artistic, and technological value; they are Korea’s cultural heritage. As of December 1998, the national cultural properties registry included 2,591 items.⁴ Seventy-five percent of the items on this list (1,951) are included in the three most prestigious categories of national treasures, treasures, and historical sites. Korea’s national treasures include prehistoric sites such as shell-mounds and rock reliefs; burial goods of bronze weapons and gold crowns; architecture such as Buddhist cave temple sculptures; Three Kingdoms⁵ (c. third to seventh centuries) tumuli, Yi dynasty royal burials (fourteenth to twentieth centuries), shrines; palaces; and battle sites and fortresses. As national symbols representing the Korean past, they frequently adorn entrances to historical monuments, tourist sites, museum displays, posters, guidebooks, and web sites promoting Korea to the world.

The Cultural Properties Preservation Act (*Munhwajae pohoböp*) was first promulgated in 1962 following the establishment of the OCP and is currently divided into four major categories:

(1) Tangible Cultural Properties (*yuhyöng munhwajae*): architecture, battle sites, old books, paintings, arts and crafts, and objects that have significant historical and artistic value.

(2) Intangible Cultural Properties (*muhyöng munhwajae*): (a) Living artisans who as “possessors of traditional arts and crafts” (*poyuja*) are represented by craftsmen, wine makers, singers, and musicians; (b) religious customs such as Confucian ancestor ceremonies and shaman exorcism rituals; (c) regional theaters, musical and village dances; and (d) folksongs and folktales.

(3) Monuments (*kinyöm-mul*): (a) archaeological sites such as shell-mounds, prehistoric dwellings, ancient burials, excavated artifacts, and architectural remains including palaces, temples, fortresses, and Buddhist sculpture; (b) Korean treasures consisting of art objects such as ceramics, lacquerware, bronzes, fine jewelry, and paintings; (c) scenic places (*myöngsüng*) such as famous historical sites and the locations of especially beautiful natural monuments; (d) natural monuments (*chönnnyön kinnyöm-mul*) including indigenous plants, animals, or unusual geological formations such as underground caves; and mountains that are protected as part of a network of national parks and wildlife sanctuaries.

(4) Folk Resources (*minsok charyo*), including subsistence strategies such as food preparation techniques, cooking recipes, local agricultural festivals, rituals (for example, sixtieth birthday party or ancestral worship, shaman rit-

uals), local customs, games (kites, wrestling, and the like), religious customs (shaman paintings), and costumes.

The selection, investigations, and recommendations for classifications necessary prior to the awarding of a final certificate of authenticity (*munhwajae taejang*) by the minister of culture and tourism is a complex, time-consuming, and intertwined bureaucratic process. This is because the outcome of its “nationally recognized” status not only determines the eventual amount of government funding granted for its preservation, study, and promotion but also affects its monetary value in today’s thriving international antiquities market. The estimated market prices of archaeological/art objects such as bronze-age swords, paintings, and ceramics are recorded in its computer database catalogue in the case of acquired National Museums’ pieces either unearthed, purchased, or donated.

The OCP’s cultural properties committees (*munhwajae wiwŏnhoe*) are currently organized into eight divisions (*punkwawiwŏnhoe*) mirroring the government’s classification of “national cultural properties”: (1) Tangible Cultural Properties/Architecture; (2) Portable Cultural Properties; (3) Historical Remains; (4) Intangible Cultural Properties; (5) Scenic Places and Natural Monuments; (6) Buried Cultural Properties; (7) Museums; and (8) National Treasures Registration. For example, in 1997, a total of sixty-six members (each division ranges from seven to eleven members) decided on 910 different items (Table 1), including the designation of additional national treasures, the recognition of nineteen new museums, and issuance of permits for the excavation of buried remains. The cultural properties committees meet monthly and are chaired by bureaucrats who were appointed after many years of dedicated government service as heads of national museums or national university museums or directors/consultants of OCP’s excavation projects. Consequently, core memberships have mostly been reserved for a few selected “nationally” prominent academics who are professors, scholars, museum curators, and specialists in the fields of archaeology, anthropology, ancient history, ethnology, botany, zoology, and geology; that is, their expertise has qualified them to be the designated spokesmen for Korean art and culture. Due to the prestige and power associated with these positions, this coveted OCP membership remains one of the most prestigious affiliations an academic in Korea can hope to attain.⁶ Some of the more prominent figures have gone on to serve as directors of the National Museum: Kim Chae-wŏn (1945–1970), Kim Wŏl-lyong (1970–1971), Hwang Su-yŏng (1972–1974), Ch’oe Sun-wu (1974–1984), Han Byŏng-sam (1985–1992), Chŏng Yang-mo (1993–1999), and Chi Kŏn-gil (2000–).

The immense pride that the earliest OCP authorities have had in their roles as guardians of the national heritage is documented in the official journal of the OCP, *Munhwajae*, first launched in 1965.⁷ The inaugural issue was prefaced with many laudatory essays complimenting the establishment of the

Table 1. Cultural Committees of the Office of Cultural Properties, 1997

Committees Divisions	Number of Members	Number of Meetings	Articles Discussed	Articles Investigated	Articles Reported	Total Numbers Decided
Division 1 (Architecture)	7	10	98	24	22	144
Division 2 (Portable Cultural Properties)	11	9	72	11	13	96
Division 3 (Historical Remains)	9	12	141	82	32	255
Division 4 (Intangible Cultural Properties)	10	5	17	17	10	44
Division 5 (Scenic Places, Natural Monuments)	10	13	118	45	11	174
Division 6 (Buried Cultural Properties)	8 (2)	9	142	16	11	169
Museum Division (Registration of new museums/galleries)	11 (9)	6	19	0	0	19
National Treasures Registration Division	*includes all members	1	9	0	0	9
Totals	66 (11)	65	616	195	99	910

OCP and its goal of uncovering Korea's most precious treasures and preserving them for posterity.⁸ The prefaces written by OCP directors were followed by featured articles covering the brief history of the OCP, its administrative structure, and definitions of the categories of cultural properties. The OCP's journals dating from the 1960s are also full of investigative field research that led to the designation of items now widely regarded as uniquely "Korean" such as the Pongsan mask dance (Designated Intangible Cultural Property no. 17), the official "Korean dog," called Chindo-gae (Natural Monument no. 53), and the ginkgo tree at Yongmun-sa (Natural Monument no. 30). Thus, the OCP directors and committee members were keenly aware of their own importance and frequently referred to their collective mission as "the creation of Korean civilization" (*minjok munhwa ch'angjo*).⁹

Such congratulatory statements crediting the OCP for rediscovering Korea's national heritage and remains were also frequently accompanied by condemnations of the Japanese colonial government (Chōsen Sōtūkufu, hereafter CSTF) for indiscriminately plundering Korean cultural relics as part of an elaborate conspiracy to deprive Koreans of their national heritage and, thus, racial identity.¹⁰ Japanese archaeologists and art historians were especially targeted as *ōyong hakcha* (that is, CSTF-employed scholars and therefore tainted) for using their expertise to provide CSTF bureaucrats and soldiers with key information that enabled unscrupulous looters and smugglers to identify unknown remote sites and burial mounds.¹¹

Similar anti-Japanese rhetoric depicting the avaricious nature of all Japanese is widespread in many historical works that generally attempt to portray Koreans as unwitting victims of superpower politics so as to absolve them from any hint of collaboration in the contentious issue of "who is to blame for the plunder of Korea."¹² In reality, the actual looting, digging, delivery of items, and even theft from CSTF museums were carried out by locals, including peasants, smugglers, and merchants connected to the many antiquity dealers that had set up shop in the commercial districts of Seoul and Pusan. Not only were rich and powerful Japanese such as Itō Hirobumi and Yanagi Sōetsu avid customers, but by the late colonial period, there arose a class of rich and urbane Korean colonial elite who accumulated their own antiquity collections, patronizing the same shops and competing with the Japanese for the best deals and bargains.¹³ Recognized authorities in this field, including Hwang Su-yōng, Yi Ku-yōl, and numerous contemporary archaeologists, however, still continue to advocate the patriotic stance of the OCP that the Korean independent spirit (*Chuch'e/Chosŏn Chōngsin*) was solely responsible for the preservation of the Korean national heritage.¹⁴

As I have pointed out in my earlier works, this hackneyed "Japanese plunder" theory does not hold up in view of historical facts and hard data regarding the colonial era's archaeological/art historical scholarship and

museum-building activities since these disciplines, art collections, and institutions did not even exist before the Japanese arrived.¹⁵ In the case of heritage management, the OCP's denunciations especially ring false since the basic structure and administration of the OCP and the collections of national museums today not only continue to reflect colonial-era preferences in their ranking of cultural properties, but also remain avid promoters of *kobun* (tumulus) artifacts and Three Kingdoms Buddhist art and sculpture over other less "glamorous" cultural pursuits.¹⁶ More significantly, the OCP bureaucracy, as a centralized office that oversees all surveys, permits, excavations, registration, promotion, and funding of national cultural properties just as the CSTF did, has a virtual monopoly over all things "Korean," past and present. Consequently, it is not mere coincidence that the state has been the prime mover in the creation of Korea's national treasures and monuments in the past eighty years. It is my contention that the politics of selection¹⁷ in how authenticity is manufactured and displayed for public consumption¹⁸ has not fundamentally changed since the beginning of the Japanese colonial era despite the dramatic shifts and violent societal upheavals resulting from independence, the Korean War, and the ideological division of the peninsula and succession of military regimes.

Understanding the historical process by which one thing, out of countless remains and relics, is selected and sanctified as a "national treasure" to be reconstructed over the decades is critical to resolving current debates over issues such as preservation versus development. This is because in the post-modern world there is increasing market pressure on the part of governments, developers, and local citizens to invest in ever more commercially viable heritage attractions.¹⁹ The perceived "authentic" status and long-standing mass appeal of a "national tourist destination," be it a famous temple complex or a war memorial, can determine what gets preserved in an outdoor museum, national historical park, or folk village and what is bulldozed to make way for dams, hotels, golf courses, and casinos.²⁰ This article is a preliminary attempt to understand the evolution of the creation and selection process of "national treasures" in Korea. I will begin by introducing the early colonial history of the codification of "Korean relic" or "ancient remain," tracing the eighty-year-old legacy of the power of the state, its preservation laws, and the role of the cultural specialist.

Colonial-Era Heritage Management Laws (1911–1933)

The first historical preservation laws applied to the Korean peninsula can be traced to the early twentieth century. These were the Temple and Shrines Laws, promulgated by the Japanese government-general in 1911, the year following the annexation of Korea. They reflected their origins in Japan's first survey and collections of Buddhist state cultural property (1897). These laws

were the first detailed and organized list of preservation guidelines issued by the Ministry of Interior and encompassed everything from daily temple administration to documentation of ancient Buddhist ruins. They included regulating the appointment of the chief abbots of temples (which had to be approved by the governor-general's office); the range of an abbot's duties and obligations; the reporting of all temple affairs and governance of temple activities aside from daily prayers; the issuance of permits to hold public religious events; and regulations dictating the use of temple estates, including surrounding forests and harvested products.²¹

A survey called the "Chōsen sōtokufu Jisetsu chōsa shiryō" (Records of Temple Investigations by the Chōsen sōtokufu) listed every single item in a temple's possession and documented the descriptions, dimensions, and locations of all temples and their remains, including wooden architecture, pagodas, bells, sculptures, sutras, steles, and paintings.²² Such detailed information was reported directly to the CSTF on special registration forms that included their quantity, measurements, preservation quality, and attached commentaries on the significance of their historical and research value. The final results of this massive CSTF project report was praised for its pioneering role in identifying temple estates as the largest and most important repository of ancient Korean antiquities.²³

As in Japan, the accompanying religious and social consequences of this edict were enormous since the Buddhist clergy were required to relinquish all control over temple assets. They were not permitted to sell, remove, dispose of, or change any registered item without the minister of interior's written permission. These laws and regulations were enforced by the local police and the governor of each province, who answered directly to the governor-general. Following these first laws beginning with religious institutions, the CSTF's preservation efforts widened to embrace other kinds of remains, including prehistoric shell-mounds and burials; scenic places such as mountains and lakes; unique natural monuments such as caves, indigenous plants, and animals.

Japanese heritage management laws were applied to Korea in three stages. They were characterized by continuing refinement of the categories of architectural monuments and classifications of art and the inclusion of nature conservation. These amendments paralleled the implementation and evolution of the same heritage preservation laws in Japan during the Taishō and Shōwa eras (1919–933). The institutional foundations were established by the promulgation of the 1916 Regulations on the Preservation of Ancient Sites and Relics of Chōsen" (Koseki oyobi ibutsu hōzon kitei). This act was accompanied by the formation of the Committee on the Investigation of Korean Antiquities (Chōsen Koseki Kenyūkai, hereafter CKKK), which was given the charge of overseeing the administration of the 1916 laws, ranging from investigating archaeological

remains, to planning exhibitions, preserving and reconstructing monuments, registering national remains, and publishing the results of their research activities. These laws were a combination of late-Meiji heritage-management laws, including Lost and Stolen Antiquities,²⁴ Temple and Shrine Protection Laws, the Preservation of Stone and Metal (*kinseki*) inscriptions, and Imperial Museum laws.²⁵ The Chōsen Sōtokufu Museum, the predecessor of the National Museum of Korea, opened on December 1, 1915, in a new Western-style building erected on the grounds of the former royal palace, Kyōngbokkung, situated in the heart of Seoul.²⁶ The earliest exhibitions displayed artwork belonging to the Yi Royal Family Museum, founded in 1908 with donated and purchased artifacts, as well as excavated materials.²⁷ In 1917, preservation laws were also put in place governing the management of the ruins of former dynastic capitals and shrines, *kofun* (tumuli) burials, palaces, fortresses, and temples.

The year 1919 marked the second stage of the development of heritage-management laws with the promulgation of the Historic Remains, Famous Places, and Natural Monuments Act (Shiseki Meishō Tennen Kinnenbutsu). The principal addition was the expansion of the definition of national properties to include geological formations and fauna and flora, such as mountains, trees, lakes, caves, and indigenous plants and animals.²⁸

The third stage began in 1933 with the Treasures, Ancient Sites, Famous Places, and Natural Monuments Act (Hōmotsu Koseki Meishō Kinnenbutsu). It was noted in the preface to the 1933 laws that the rapid development of transportation and infrastructure construction since the 1931 founding of Manchukuo had contributed to the rise in tourism and commerce.²⁹ As a result, the CSTF felt it had to pay more attention to the continuing destruction of the past.³⁰ This measure expanded preservation laws in order to monitor private institutions and individuals who possessed national treasures, in addition to public institutions such as museums, art galleries, and provincial offices. The criteria for classifying the most prestigious treasures (*hōmotsu*) were clearly stipulated: “architecture and artwork that included books, sutras, calligraphy and paintings, crafts and documents” that demonstrated (1) ancient origins; (2) superior execution or rare find; (3) a famous figure’s work or writing; or (4) artifacts or remains that serve as historical evidence.³¹ It should be noted here that these four definitions for designating a national treasure (*kukpo*) have continued in the postwar era with the exception of the third criterion, which has been re-labeled with the amorphous concept of “properties reflecting the Korean spirit (*Chosŏn Chōngsin*) or the spirit of independence.”

By the end of colonial period in 1943 (the last year the registry was updated), the CSTF’s registry totaled 591 items divided into five categories: (1) 340 treasures (*hōmotsu*); (2) 101 ancient remains (*koseki*); (3) three ancient remains/famous places (*koseki/meishō*); (4) one famous place (*meishō*); (5) 146 natural monuments (*tennen kinnenbutsu*).³²

Locating Authority and Authenticity: The Committee on the Investigation of Korean Antiquities (1916–1924)

The Committee on the Investigation of Korean Antiquities (CKKK) was responsible for the administration, preservation, budgeting, and reconstruction of all relics and remains on the Korean peninsula. Officially launched in July 1916 with the promulgation of the historical remains preservation laws, the core members consisted of high officials belonging to the CSTF bureaucracy (including directors of the bureaus and departments of public works, construction, treasury, secretariat, archives, education, forestry, and district sections) and Central Council (Chushūen) members who had either academic backgrounds or teaching experience, such as prominent professors from Tokyo University and, later on, Kyoto University and Keijō Imperial University.³³

By 1937, the CKKK, renamed the Chōsen Sōtokufu Committee for the Preservation of Korean Treasures, Ancient Remains, Famous Places, and Natural Monuments (Chōsen Sōtokufu Hōmotsu Koseki Meishō Tennen Kinnen Butsu Hōzonkai I in), consisted of fifty representatives. They included high-ranking bureaucrats of the CSTF government branches as well as the Central Council who also happened to be prominent archaeologists and historians such as Fujita Ryōsaku (Keijō Imperial University professor), Ikeuchi Hiroshi and Harada Yoshito of Tokyo Imperial University, Umehara Sueji and Hamada Kōsaku of Kyoto Imperial University, as well as Kuroita Katsumi, Oda Fujio, and Koizumi Akio. The only two Korean members of that committee were Ch'oe Nam-sŏn and Yi Nūng-hwa.³⁴

Annual committee meetings were chaired by the vice-council general. Attendance of at least half the membership was required to constitute a quorum in order to make the final decision to register a monument. Decisions were based on the recommendations of a committee-designated specialist, who was sent out beforehand to investigate the authenticity of the reported monument. Thus, this committee was ultimately responsible for the first evaluation, codification, and ranking of “Korean” art and architecture.

The duties of the committee can be described in order of importance. To begin with, it was the first centrally appointed investigating body responsible for the launching of systematic surveys and excavations of Korean ancient remains and relics. The first five-year excavation plans (1916–1921) resulting from its formation led to the discovery, study, and eventual registration of the remains of prehistoric shell-mounds and settlements, royal burial sites, and remains of temples, palaces, and fortresses.³⁵ Its investigations uncovered for the first time the archeological existence of the Koguryō, Paekche, Silla, and Han dynasty Nangnang sites centered at Kangsŏ, Kyōngju, Puyŏ, and P'yōngyang, respectively.³⁶ Second, it drew up plans for the administrative policies and the building of facilities affecting the preservation of these sites and monuments,

such as the erection of fences, walls, installation of plumbing and drainage systems, and posting of guards to ensure the preservation. Third, it conducted systematic collection of old books and rare documents to complement archeological research on Korea's ancient remains. Fourth, it was responsible for the overall annual planning and budgeting for the above-mentioned heritage-management activities. All these plans had to be documented in formal applications submitted to the Sōtokufu on forms that included information such as the categories and locations of the monuments targeted for investigation or reconstruction and the proposed preservation methods and anticipated construction time.

Finally, its most important mission was to dispatch specialists to the field in order to conduct the initial investigations leading to the authentication of all reported discoveries. Upon their arrival at these sites, all personnel involved in on-site investigations were required to meet with the *kempeitai* or local police chief, to whom they reported their daily activities and findings for their records. The member put in charge of the investigations was also responsible for writing a detailed site report and submitting copies to the committee head as well as the CSTF. The artifacts collected from the site were catalogued and documented and their custody turned over to the local police with the exception of artifacts that were considered likely to be damaged during transportation.³⁷

Defining Ancient Remains (*Koseki*) in Korea

The 1916 laws were also instrumental in identifying which Korean remains were to be considered for preservation, registration, and research.³⁸ The first article defined ancient remains (*koseki*) as prehistoric sites containing shell mounds, implements made of stone, bone, and horn, as well as subterranean dwellings, ancient tombs, town fortresses, palaces, barricades, barrier-gates, station posts, stages for setting signal fires (beacons), sites of government offices, sites of shrines, mausolea, temples, ruins of ceramic industry (kilns), old battlefields, and other ruins, together with sites associated with historical facts. The category of relics (*ibutsu*) encompassed old pagodas, stele, bells, stone and metal images of Buddha, flag pole supporters, stone lanterns, and other artifacts that may have historical, artistic, and archeological value.³⁹

The definitions of what qualified as Korean objects and monuments were followed by the second article, which stipulated the mandatory reporting process that an investigator or reporter must observe, such as notifying the local police. The latter then had to put down all required information on forms submitted for police records. The chief of police of the district then had to notify the CSTF immediately as stipulated by the 1912 rules regulating buried objects and lost or stolen antiquities.⁴⁰ His report had to include the relic's name and location; the name and address of its owner or manager; its present

condition; any associated legends and stories; and finally a recommended method for preservation. If any item on the registration form had to be altered, the investigator had to report it to the CSTF and the local police, who were required to have all reports on file at all times.

The third article stipulated mandatory reporting by a person who had to deal with an already registered *koseki*.⁴¹ If one wanted to change, remove, or repair a monument, he or she was required to apply to the CSTF for permission. For example, the regulations governing the preservation of stone and bronze inscriptions stipulated that one needed permission from the CSTF even to get a rubbing.⁴² The reason for this caution was stated thus:

In recent years, the value of stone and bronze inscriptions have increased due to their value for studying Korean ancient history. Therefore, one must report any damage or effacing of steles or inscriptions on stone and bronze to the police. If one wants to make a rubbing, and if the monuments are state-owned property, one must ask permission from the CSTF. If they belong to a Buddhist temple, they must also get permission from the CSTF.⁴³

The application form included the registration number and name, the purpose of removal or repair, the methods or plans for repairing or removal, and an outlined budget.

These rules and forms were also applicable if one needed to export any registered properties or items outside of Chōsen. They had to be inspected by customs officials, who were required to check first whether any of the items were reported as stolen.⁴⁴ If they were, the police were to be notified immediately. If there was any suspicion that any of the above processes were not carried out or if anyone had been found violating *koseki* regulations or temple ordinances, the police were to be notified. Only when the objects were cleared by the CSTF could they pass through customs and leave the country. Finally, there were penal consequences for anyone caught violating any of these rules.

The CSTF had the final authority to issue permits and require exact forms of registration for the reporting, storage, transportation, and trafficking of all antiquities, arts, and crafts throughout the country.⁴⁵ Through this rigorous process of investigation, excavation, authentication, and documentation, the CSTF was able to publish in 1924, only eight years after the promulgation of the first comprehensive heritage-management laws, an impressive registry of 193 items that included all known information as stipulated above.⁴⁶ This initial list recorded ancient remains by number beginning with the monuments located in Keijō (Seoul), followed by remains throughout all thirteen provinces. The characteristics of this 1924 registry are illuminating since the patterns we observe here point to the general direction of Korean heritage management in future decades.

First of all, the distribution pattern of the number of registered remains

in descending order by province were: (1) Kyöngsang Pukdo, 41; (2) Keijō/Kyönggi-do, 38; (3) Kangwön-do, 26; (4) Ch'ungchöng Namdo, 25; (5) Kyöngsang Namdo, 13; (6) Chölla Pukdo, 13; (7) Ch'ungchöng Pukdo, 9; (8) Chölla Pukdo, 8; (9) P'yöngan Namdo, 7; (10) P'yöngan Pukdo, 4; (11) Hwanghae-do, 5; (12) Hamgyöng Namdo, 2; and (13) Hamgyöng Pukdo, 1.

The province that ranked first in the number of ancient remains was Kyöngsang Pukdo,⁴⁷ where abundant Silla (third to seventh century) ruins were located, including the royal tomb marker (*wangnūngbi*) belonging to King Muryö (654–661) as No. 88 (Kukpo No. 25),⁴⁸ and Kyöngju remains of Chömsöngdae as No. 90 (Kukpo No. 31) and Sökping-go as No. 92 (Pomul No. 66). The two monuments most identified with Korea today that are conspicuously absent from this 1924 list are the Silla temple sites of Pulguksa and Sökkuram. They had been discovered earlier but were not included since both were going through years of extensive restoration and so were not included in the 1924 list.⁴⁹ They were subsequently listed in 1934 following their completion, when Pulguksa Tapot'ap was registered as Hömotsu No. 84 (Kukpo No. 20), Pulguksa Samchüngt'ap became Hömotsu No. 85 (Kukpo No. 21), and the two Pulguksa stone bridges of Yönhwa-gyo and Ch'öng'un-gyo became listed as Hömotsu No. 87–88 (Kukpo No. 22, 23), and Sökkuram was listed as No. 89 (Kukpo No. 24). Furthermore, the entire temple grounds of Pulguksa were designated as one of the two famous scenic places or Meishö No. 2 (Sajök/myöngsüng No. 1) in 1936.

The second largest number of remains were located in the city of Seoul and its vicinity in Kyönggi-do, thus reflecting the five-hundred-year history of the city as the capital of the long-lived Yi dynasty. In addition, because Kaesöng had been included in the jurisdiction of Kyönggi province, there was also a concentration of Koryö (936–1388) dynastic ruins. Considering, the area's recent history, it is also not surprising that the colonial investigators would have found many standing and relatively intact remains in this region. Among them, the Wön'gaksaji ten-story pagoda (Kukpo No. 2) built during the tenth year of Sejo's reign (1464) topped the list as Koseki No. 1.⁵⁰ It was registered as South Korea's Kukpo No. 2 on December 20, 1962. The significance of this monument today is that its location has given its name to Pagoda Park, the site of the reading of the Declaration of Independence that sparked the largest anti-Japanese nationalist uprising on March 1, 1919. The most recognizable Yi dynasty relic on this list would be Koseki No. 3 (Pomul No. 2) as the Posin'gak Bell, dated to the thirteenth year of King Sejo's reign (1467). The ringing of this bell by the mayor of Seoul and the accompanying live broadcast usher in the New Year with the excitement of throngs of Seoul citizens reminiscent of the festivities in Times Square on December 31.

In addition, there were numerous Silla and Koryö dynastic Buddhist remains, such as pagodas and steles (Koseki No. 14, 20, 38, 67, 102, 136, 159),

that had been transported to the grounds of the Sōtokufu museum, which had opened in December 1915 inside Kyōngbok palace.⁵¹

The next concentration of remains were from the areas around Puyō, Ch'ungch'ōng Namdo, and Iksan, Chōlla Pukdo, mainly due to their finds at Paekche temple sites such as Iksan Mirūksaji, registered as Koseki No. 69 for Mirūksaji's flagpole and Koseki No. 70 (Kukpo No. 11) for Mirūksaji Stone Pagoda. The records at the time indicate that they had yet to be identified as dating from the Paekche era (third to seventh century).⁵²

The oldest inscriptions found to date came from a Han-dynasty-era stele recorded as Koseki No. 126, which was named Chōmche-hyōn (Chinese: Niantixian) from its identification with one of the twenty-two counties recorded in the Han-dynasty text *Han shu*.⁵³ Dating from the era of the Eastern Han emperor (circa late first century), it was found at Yonggang-gun Haeunmyōn Yongjōngni in 1912. Recognizing the significance of this stele, the CSTF erected a pavilion to protect it from the elements, as was the usual recommendation for a protected monument at that time.⁵⁴ The finding of this stele marked a major turning point in the history of Korean archeology, for its discovery prompted a survey of the surrounding regions that eventually led to the excavation of more than two thousand Han-dynasty sites and burials around the city of Pyōngyang. These spectacular archaeological finds of multichambered wooden burials south of the Taedong river around T'osōngni corroborated the location of the Han commandery site (circa 108 B.C.–A.D. 313) of Nangnang.⁵⁵

Finally, more than 90 percent of the remains documented in the 1924 list were Buddhist-related remains and relics such as temple architecture, pagodas, bells, stone lanterns, and stele inscriptions. The overwhelming proportion of Buddhist items is not surprising when you consider that the first comprehensive heritage-management laws applied to Korea had targeted temple estates and their possessions.⁵⁶ Consequently, there were much more data and research on these remains. Furthermore, it was only forty years earlier that the American scholar Ernest Fenollosa, hired to teach at Tokyo University, was sent by the Ministry of Education to survey the vast number of Buddhist temples in Japan's Kansai region for antiquities.⁵⁷ Sekino Tadashi (1867–1935), the first Japanese art historian and architect sent to Korea in 1902, was already well versed in what constituted “valuable” and “ancient” Buddhist art and architecture from his experience in Japan. He documented the same kinds of architectural remains on the Korean peninsula that reminded him of early Nara remains (sixth to seventh century).⁵⁸ More than half of the current South Korean listings continue to be Buddhist remains, for these relics were incorporated into the 1962 registry in the most prestigious categories of *Kukpo*, *Pomul*, and *Sajōk*. I believe the continuing emphasis on Buddhist remains as representative national properties is undoubtedly a surviving colonial trait, for at the end of the nineteenth century, the *yangban* elite had neglected Buddhist remains, letting them fall into ruin.⁵⁹

To summarize, beginning with the 1916 laws, the trajectory of colonial heritage-management development was fixed on three main goals: (1) Government control over reporting, accounting, storage, and trafficking of registered state cultural properties. Cumbersome and time-consuming bureaucratic procedures were designed to deter and discourage individual ownership.⁶⁰ By the end of the colonial era in 1943, nearly all of the 591 registered treasures, historical remains, and natural monuments were recorded as either state-owned, temple-owned, owned by provincial/quasi-government/corporations, and in rare exceptions individually owned. (2) The preservation of architecture and artifacts in their original location and original form for exhibition and tourism. The revenue from ticket sales went to the maintenance of the site, which is still the practice today. (3) The promotion of archeological investigations for the purpose of discovering more buried cultural properties.⁶¹

Colonial Korea's case is by no means unique, for all over the world in the last two centuries, the major imperial powers, most prominently led by Great Britain and France, pioneered archeological and anthropological surveys from the Middle East to the Pacific islands that resulted in the massive permanent art collections housed at the British Museum and the Louvre.⁶² Thus, the "ethnicity" and "authenticity" of an object or monument representing a nation's antiquity, racial identity, and cultural heritage are not intrinsic properties to be unearthed from the ground but have been invented, re-invented, reconstructed, classified, documented, and exhibited by individuals, imperial museums, learned societies, cultural committees, and nation-states.⁶³

Conclusion: The Colonial Legacies of Japanese Heritage Management in South Korea

THE LEGACY OF COLONIAL CLASSIFICATIONS AND RANKINGS

Japanese excavations, art historical research, museum collections, and preservation laws covering the four decades of colonial rule produced the archeological, aesthetic, and historical knowledge that is the basis upon which to identify and codify "Korean national treasures." More important for South Korea in the postwar period, the 1962 cultural preservation laws retained these colonial classifications and sequential numbering of monuments and relics with the exception of a few minor modifications in rankings. To this day, Japanese colonial divisions are not only replicated in the bureaucratic management of cultural properties, but the OCP has also consciously emulated postwar Japanese cultural legitimacy, especially with the inclusion, beginning in 1967, of the categories of "intangible cultural properties," "national living treasures," and "folk resources." In more recent years, Korean archeologists have even advocated the adoption of Japanese management practices for buried cultural properties,⁶⁴ holding them up as a model of efficiency for carrying out excavations and preservation activities.⁶⁵

The continuing impact of Japanese colonial policies is even more apparent when we survey the current rankings of Korean cultural properties, for the numbered sequence of these remains mirrors the order of colonial registries dating between 1934 and 1941. Consequently, beginning from the first South Korean national properties registry dated 1962 to the present day, newly registered items continue to be appended to the 1943 list.

Therefore, despite the ubiquitous rhetoric in South Korean historiography denouncing Japanese archaeological, historical, and cultural policies, the fact that the divisions remain intact indicates that South Korean scholars and bureaucrats have accepted their Japanese predecessors' criteria for evaluating Korea's artistic, architectural, and historical traditions. There has never been a reevaluation of Japanese heritage management and administration either by scholars or the OCP except for the media attention surrounding the South Gate controversy. In 1996, a series of articles in prominent newspapers such as *Han'guk Ilbo*, *Tong-a Ilbo*, *Chosŏn Ilbo*, *Kyŏngnyang Sinmun*, and *Han'kyŏre* called for the reevaluation of the historical validity of maintaining Seoul's South Gate (Namdaemun) as Korea's Kukpo No. 1, for it did not and could not represent "true Korean values," since it had been preserved and promoted by the Japanese. The OCP responded by setting up an investigative committee that debated for many months the pros and cons of renumbering the *kukpo* registry, but the specialists voted down any major changes.⁶⁶

THE MONOPOLY OF STATE-APPOINTED CULTURAL SPECIALISTS

The CSTF reliance for the creation of national treasures on a central body of government-appointed experts and bureaucrats responsible directly to the governor-general had profound implications for the future direction of cultural-preservation activities in Korea. This is the main reason, I believe, that it has been so difficult to address the issue of inherited colonial cultural properties, for successive authoritarian South Korean regimes, like the CSTF, have dictated all cultural legislation and administration. The most prominent of the many examples we can cite are the monumental reconstructions attributed to the eighteen-year rule of Park Chung-hee (1962–1979). Park is described by all accounts to have been a hands-on president in terms of his interest in Korean cultural properties, frequently making ceremonial visits to observe ongoing archeological excavations in Kyŏngju and having newly excavated treasures personally delivered to the Blue House for appreciation.⁶⁷ Beginning in 1971, he personally directed that the first five-year plan concentrate on the development and reconstruction of Kyŏngju in order to revive it as Korea's greatest, most elegant, dynamic, and leisurely ancient city.⁶⁸ The nationalist rhetoric at that time emphasized that the reconstruction of cultural properties was to promote the three patriotic goals of: (1) restoring Korean racial traditions; (2) reviving the National Spirit; and (3) overcoming national disasters through cultural education.

As a result, the earliest large-scale OCP-initiated projects in the 1960s and 1970s focused on memorializing designated national heroes' birthplaces, battle sites, and residences by dedicating historical parks (*sajök kongwön*) and ancestral shrines. The most popular destinations are the numerous battle sites of the "anti-Japanese/Hideyoshi resistance" (1592–1597), visited by millions of Koreans because of the spectacular nature of their reconstructions dedicated to Admiral Yi Sun-sin and the Uibyöng, such as Hyönch'ungsa (1966–1975), Hansando (1975–1977), Ch'ilbaek Uich'ong (1975–1976), Chinju-söng, and Tongnae-söng.⁶⁹

Needless to say, Park's successors, Chun Doo-hwan and Roh Tae-woo, also adopted Park's political strategy of harping back to Korea's great military heroes and battle sites in order to enhance their own prestige and historical legitimacy.⁷⁰ After more than thirty years of close ties to military dictatorships, it is not surprising that the OCP has evolved into a complex hierarchical organization with an inordinate amount of legislative and executive control over all officially sanctioned cultural preservation activities, from the selection of the kinds of Korean heroes for the dedication of war memorials⁷¹ to the manufacture and marketing of "national living treasure" products such as reproductions of Silla pottery and Kyöngju varieties of rice wine.⁷² Therefore, the government today is micromanaging all facets of "Korean cultural properties" legislation, production, and beautification in an increasing commodification of Korean culture for the tourist trade.⁷³

CONTESTED ANCESTRAL TERRAINS: THE JAPANESE EMPIRE AND ITS CIVILIZING MISSION

At the time of the annexation of Korea, CSTF bureaucrats and Japanese intellectuals were devoted to promoting the hypothetical common racial origins theory of the Koreans and Japanese (*Nissen döSORON*), which became the main pillar supporting *Naisen ittai*, or Japan and Korea as one body and one nation.⁷⁴ As with the South Manchuria Railroad Company's sponsored research into Manchurian geography, peoples, and customs,⁷⁵ the CSTF's main agenda for funding scholarly research in Korea was ultimately tied to the Japanese imperium directed at incorporating the Korean peninsula into their mythical/mystical past as well as justifying their occupation in the colonial present.⁷⁶ Consequently, the application of Japanese classifications in the registration of Korean antiquities was integral to their national historical agenda as demonstrated by the CSTF and CKKK efforts to create a common body of knowledge and imperial cultural heritage, which was then systematically inscribed into tangible materials, archeological monuments, and museum objects targeted for public consumption and tourism. Therefore, we have to acknowledge that a Japan-centered racial ideology practiced on the part of Japanese bureaucrats and scholars who had focused mainly on Korean antiquities has left an indelible legacy in the kinds of art and archaeological remains that are

now preserved and promoted as uniquely Korean.⁷⁷ For example, the CSTF spent a fortune and many years reconstructing Sökkuram and Pulguksa⁷⁸ as well as remains and relics of the Three Kingdoms, for they identified them as the artistic inspirations for the origins of Buddhist art and architecture in Nara. The CKKK-funded archeologists have also been accused of conducting haphazard surveys, destroying many sites and remains because the Korea field had become a training ground for inexperienced novice Japanese archeologists who sharpened their trowels in Korea. Their particular fondness for excavating Koguryō, Paekche, and Silla royal tombs at the expense and neglect of other prehistoric remains is well documented in archeologists' biographies, memoirs, and field notes,⁷⁹ for they were barred from most imperial tomb excavations in Japan due to the many restrictions imposed by the Imperial Office (Kunaichō). Archeologists⁸⁰ who dug for more than two decades at the Han dynasty commandery site of Nangnang, situated outside of P'yōngyang city, have also been denounced for using these excavated remains to prove the stagnation theory (*teitairon*) of Korean civilization, which asserted that Chinese cultural intervention had been required to enable Korean civilization to evolve.⁸¹ Therefore, despite the many colonial-era cultural achievements such as the establishment of the CSTF museum collections and preservation of temple monuments that would otherwise have been looted, taken apart piece by piece, and sold to the highest bidder, we have to conclude that preservation activities

Appendix 1. 1996 Registry of Cultural Properties

Divisions/Regions	Seoul	Pusan	Taegu	Inch'ōn	Kwangju	Taejōn	Kyōnggi	Kangwōn
National Treasures (Kukbo)	132	3	0	1	1		33	7
Treasures (Pomul)	383	12	22	19	7	1	123	48
Historical Remains (Sajōk)	61	6	3	16	2	1	49	5
Historical Remains (Sajōk) +Scenic Places (Myōngsūng)	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
Scenic Places (Myōngsūng)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Natural Monuments (Ch'ōn- nyōn kinnyōmmul)	11	7	1	6	0	0	10	24
Intangible Cultural Properties (Chungyo muhyōng munhwajae)	30	4	0	2	1	0	4	1
Folklore Materials (Minsok charyo)	45	0	4	0	2	0	8	10
TOTAL	662	32	30	44	13	2	227	96

were driven by self-interest in uncovering ancestral remains that could illuminate Japan's "imperial origins."⁸²

In hindsight, the major failings of the CSTF's "civilizing mission" in the areas of heritage management and museum building are evident for their fixation on registering the very "primitive/prehistoric" features of Korean civilization, no doubt resulted in numerous other kinds of remains being lost, looted, or destroyed.⁸³ In this sense, the characteristics of the 1916 preservation laws that were narrowly focused on Korean antiquities are reminiscent of the "pre-modern" and brutal nature of the colonial civil code, which had been designed to raise the low level (*mindō*) of the "backward" Korean citizenry, as seen from a Japanese administrator's perspective.⁸⁴

Finally, I believe that despite critics' denunciations of Japanese preservation laws,⁸⁵ it is still indispensable that we recognize the enduring legacies of state-manufactured authenticity in the bureaucratic origins of heritage-management practices, for there remain undeniable Japanese cultural, aesthetic, and legalistic continuities.⁸⁶ It is about time that South Korean scholars and OCP bureaucrats in particular address this colonial inheritance in a more systematic manner if they are indeed serious about the task of decolonizing⁸⁷ the ethics and aesthetics of collecting state cultural properties,⁸⁸ a Herculean task being faced by many governments, museum administrators, and curators in this era of globalization.⁸⁹

Ch'ungbuk	Ch'ungnam	Chōnbuk	Chōnnam	Kyōngbuk	Kyōngnam	Cheju	Peninsula	Total
8	21	4	15	50	11	0		286
34	71	74	95	242	95	2		1,228
10	34	28	28	92	51	2		388
1	1	0	0	3	1	0		6
0	0	0	4	1	1	0		7
21	12	21	39	45	31	24	30	282
1	5	1	11	5	9	4	14	92
21	17	12	30	57	12	7		225
96	161	140	222	495	211	39	44	2,514

NOTES

1. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 1999 Association of Asian Studies meetings in Boston in a panel titled, "The Politics and Policies of Historic Preservation in Korea and Japan: A Comparative Perspective on Issues of Representation, Repatriation, and Heritage Management." A grant from the Social Science Research Council AAS Committee on Korean Studies enabled me to conduct additional archival work in Seoul and Tokyo. I would also like to express my appreciation to Mr. Ryu of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism Annex library and Professor Kim Su-ta'e at Ch'unghnam University for introducing me to *Munhwajae kwalliguk* periodicals and staff, respectively.

2. See Eric Hobsbawm and Terence Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition*. Canto Edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

3. This article is confined to South Korean data for I have found it difficult to track down reliable published sources pertaining to North Korean heritage management policies and administration.

4. These are the figures according to the most current internally circulated reports by the Office of Cultural Properties at the time of the writing of this article. There are in addition a total of 3,271 provincial and city ordained cultural properties as well as 1,453 "cultural properties' materials" (*munhwajae charyo*), plus twenty-one traditional buildings and two preservation districts. The grand total of all cultural properties came to 7,338 as of December 31, 1997. *Munhwajae Kwalliguk, Munhwajae Kwalli nyönbo* [Annual report of the Office of Cultural Properties] (Seoul: Munhwajae Kwalliguk, 1998), 21. See Appendix 1 for a complete list by province according to the 1996 registry published by the Office of Cultural Properties. *Munhwajae Kwalliguk, 1996 Chijöng munhwajae mongnok* [1996 registry of cultural properties] (Seoul, 1996), 5.

5. Dates in this article adhere to the archaeological chronology worked out by Kim Wöl-lyong and not the traditional historical dates. See Kim Wöl-lyong, *Han'guk kogohak kaesöl* [Introduction to Korean archaeology], 3rd ed. (Seoul: Ilchisa, 1986).

6. *Munhwajae Kwalliguk, Munhwajae Kwalli nyönbo* [Annual report of the Office of Cultural Properties] (Seoul: Munhwajae Kwalliguk, 1998), 1.

7. *Munhwajae*, [Journal of the Office of Cultural Properties] 1, no. 1 (1965).

8. *Munhwajae* 1, no. 1 (1965): 2–4.

9. *Munhwajae* 1, no. 1 (1965): 6.

10. *Munhwajae* 1, no. 1 (1965): 6; Hyung-II Pai, "The Politics of Korea's Past: The Legacy of Japanese Colonial Archaeology in the Korean Peninsula," *East Asian History* 7 (1994): 25–48.

11. Yi Man-yöl, "Ilche kwanhakcha üi Han'guksa sösul" [Japanese colonial historical works on Korea], *Han'guk saron* 6 (1979): 239–61; Hong Ki-mun, "Chosön üi kogohak e taehan ilche öyonghaksöl üi kömt'o" [A review of Japanese colonial theories on Korean archaeology], *Yöksa munje* 13/14 (1949): 53–101; *Munhwajae Kwalliguk*, "Ilcheüi munhwajae chöngch'aek pyöngga semina" [A seminar report on the reevaluation of Japanese colonial cultural policies]. Paper presented at *Ilcheüi munhwajae chöngch'aek pyöngga semina*, Kungnip Minsok Pangmulkwon (The National Folk Museum), 1996.

12. Yi Hong-jik, "Chaeil Han'guk munhwajae pimangnok" [A memo on Korean cultural relics in Japan], *Sahak yön'gu* 8 (1964): 791–808, and Han Yöng-dae, *Chosönmi üi t'amguja dül* [Investigators of Korean beauty], trans. Pak Kyöng-hüi (Seoul: Hakkoje, 1997).

13. Han Yöng-dae, *Chosönmi üi t'amguja dül*.

14. Munhwajae Kwalliguk, “Ilcheüi munhwajae chǒngch’aek pyǒngga semina.”
15. Pai, “The Politics of Korea’s Past”; Hyung-Il Pai, “The Colonial Origins of Korea’s Collected Past,” in *Nationalism and the Construction of Korean Identity*, ed. Hyung-Il Pai and Tim Tangherlini (Berkeley: University of California, Center for Korean Studies; 1998), 13–32; Hyung-Il Pai, “Nationalism and the Preservation of Korea’s Buried Past: The Office of Cultural Properties and Archaeological Heritage Management in South Korea,” *Antiquity* 73, no. 281 (1999): 619–25; Hyung-Il Pai, “Japanese Anthropology and the Discovery of Prehistoric Korea,” *Journal of East Asian Archaeology* 1 (1999): 353–82.
16. Chun Kyung-soo, “Kankoku Hakubutsukanshi ni okeru hyōshō no seiji jinruigaku shokuminchishūgi toshide no gurōbalizumu” [Representing colonialism and nationalism in the Korean Museum], *Bulletin of the National Museum of Ethnology* 24, no. 2 (1999): 247–90.
17. Arjun Appadurai, ed., *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1986); Flora Kaplan, *Museums and the Making of “Ourselves,”* (London: Leicester University Press, 1994).
18. Lee Kyōng-hūi, *World Heritage in Korea* (Seoul: Organizing Committee of the Year of Cultural Heritage 1997 and the Samsung Foundation of Culture, 1997).
19. Han Pōm-su and Kim Tōk-kyu, *Yōksa munhwa kwan’gwang k’osū üi kaebal bangan* [Recommendations for the development of cultural/historical tourism] (Seoul: Kyot’ong Kaebal Yōn’guwōn, 1994).
20. Pai, “Nationalism and the Preservation of Korea’s Buried Past.”
21. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Koseki oyobi ibutsu tōroku taichō shōroku* [Preliminary records of registration documents of ancient sites and relics] (Keijō [Seoul]: Chikazawa Insatsu, 1924), 191–95.
22. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Chōsen sōtokufu jisetsu shiryō* [Historical records of Korean temples compiled by the governor-general of Korea], 2 vols. (Keijō [Seoul], 1911).
23. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Chōsen sōtokufu jisetsu shiryō*, 1.
24. This law originated from Meiji 4 (1871), when the earliest heritage-management edict in Japan, called “Kogigyūbutsu hōzonbō” (Old Vessels and Old Relics Preservation Laws), identified thirty-one kinds of antiquities to be regulated by the government. It was subsequently revised in 1899, 1912, and 1913. See Bunkachō, Bunkazai Hōgobu [Cultural Properties Division of the Ministry of Culture], ed., “Bunkazai hōgo kankei hōryō shū sankō [Reference section of the anthology of preservation laws of cultural properties],” in *Bunkazai hōgo kankei hōryō shū* [Anthology of Cultural Properties Preservations Laws] (Tokyo: Gyōsei, 1997), 195–215.
25. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Koseki oyobi ibutsu tōroku taichō shōroku*, 215–30.
26. Pai, “The Colonial Origins of Korea’s Past”; Chun Kyung-soo, “Kankoku Hakubutsukanshi ni okeru hyōshō no seiji jinruigaku shokuminchishūgi toshide no gurōbalizumu”; Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Hakubutsukan shinretsuhin zukan* [Museum exhibits catalogue] (Keijō [Seoul], 1918–1941).
27. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Koseki oyobi ibutsu tōroku taichō shōroku*, 163–89.
28. Louis Young, *Japan’s Total Empire: Manchuria and the Culture of Wartime Imperialism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 251–68.
29. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Chōsen hōmotsu, koseki, meishō, tennenkinen butsu hozon-tei* [Korean treasures, ancient remains, famous places and natural wonders] (Keijō [Seoul], 1937), 1–6.
30. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Chōsen hōmotsu*, 5–7.
31. Munhwajae Kwalliguk, “Ilche chijōng munhwajae chaepyōngga kyōlkwa

pogo” [Report on the reevaluation of cultural properties designated during the Japanese colonial era] (Seoul: Munhwajae Kwalliguk, 1997).

33. Sekino Tadashi, “Ancient Remains and Relics in Korea: Efforts toward Research and Preservation.” Paper presented at the Fourth Bi-annual Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, Hangzhou, 1931.

34. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Chōsen hōmotsu*, 59–62.

35. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Koseki chōsa hōkoku* [Ancient sites investigations reports], vol. 1–19 (Keijō [Seoul], 1918–1937).

36. Hyung-II Pai, *Constructing “Korean” Origins: A Critical Review of Archaeology, Historiography, and Racial Myth in Korean State-Formation Theories* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 2000); Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Koseki chōsa tokubetsu hōkoku* [Ancient sites investigations special reports] (Tokyo, 1919–1930).

37. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Koseki oyobi ibutsu tōroku taichō shōroku*, 147–49.

38. Pai, “The Colonial Origins of Korea’s Collected Past.”

39. Sekino, “Ancient Remains and Relics in Korea,” 7.

40. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Koseki oyobi ibutsu tōroku taichō shōroku*, 233–42.

41. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Koseki oyobi ibutsu tōroku taichō shōroku*, 151–52.

42. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Chōsenshi kinseki mokuroku* [Catalogue of Korean historical inscriptions] (Keijō: Chōsen Insatsu, 1919).

43. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Koseki oyobi ibutsu tōroku taichō shōroku*, 156–7.

44. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Koseki oyobi ibutsu tōroku taichō shōroku*, 160.

45. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Koseki oyobi ibutsu tōroku taichō shōroku*, 158.

46. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Koseki oyobi ibutsu tōroku taichō shōroku*.

47. The province of Kyōngsang pukdo still has the second largest number of registered national properties (495) next to Seoul (662). See Appendix 1.

48. Notations in parentheses following colonial listings are ranking numbers according to the 1996 Registry of National Properties (1996 *Chijōng munhwajae mongnok*).

49. Hwang Su-yōng, *Sōkkurram* (Seoul: Yōrhwadang, 1989); Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Bukkokuji to Sekkutsuan* [Pulguk Temple and Sōkkuram Cave in Keishū], Chōsen hōmotsu koseki zuroku daiichi [Album of Korean antiquities], vol. 1 (Kyōtō: Bunseidō, 1938).

50. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Koseki oyobi ibutsu tōroku taichō shōroku*, 1.

51. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Koseki oyobi ibutsu tōroku taichō shōroku*, 2–7.

52. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Koseki oyobi ibutsu tōroku taichō shōroku*, 53–6.

53. Pai, *Constructing “Korean” Origins*.

54. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Koseki oyobi ibutsu tōroku taichō shōroku*, 114.

55. Komai Kazuchika, *Rakurōgun chishi* [The site of the seat of local government of Lelang in Korea], vol. 2. Kōkogaku kenkyū (Tokyo: Tokyō Daigaku Kōkogaku Kenkyūshitsu, 1965). See also Pai, *Constructing “Korean” Origins*.

56. Sekino, “Ancient Remains and Relics in Korea,” 4.

57. Yamaguchi Seiichi, *Fenorosa: Nihon bunka no senyō ni sasagetta isshō* [Ernest Fenollosa: A life devoted to the advocacy of Japanese culture], 3 vols. (Tokyo: Sanseido, 1982), 1: 188–206.

58. Sekino Tadashi, *Kankoku kenchiku chōsa hōkoku* [Investigations reports of Korean architecture]. Tokyo teikoku daigaku kōka daigaku gakkujutsu hōkoku, vol. 6 (Tokyo: Tokyo Teikoku Daigaku, 1904).

59. Fujita Ryōsaku, “Chōsen no koseki chōsa to hōzon no enkaku” [The process of the preservation and research of Korean ancient monuments], in *Chōsen sōran* [Korea almanac], (Keijō: Chōsen Sōtokufu, 1933), 1027–1047. See also Pai, “The Politics of Korea’s Past.”

60. O Se-t'ak, "Ilche ūi munhwajae chōngch'aek" [Japanese policies on cultural properties], in *Ilcheūi munhwajae chōngch'aek pyōngga semina* [A seminar report on the reevaluation of Japanese colonial cultural policies], ed. Munhwajae Kwalliguk (Seoul: Munhwajae Kwalliguk, 1996), 15–44.

61. O Se-t'ak, "Ilche ūi munhwajae chōngch'aek," 31.

62. Bruce Trigger, *A History of Archaeological Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989); George W. Stocking, ed., *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Culture* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985); George W. Stocking, *Colonial Situations* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1991); Edward P. Alexander, *Museum Masters: Their Museums and Their Influence* (Nashville, Tenn.: American Association for State and Local History, 1983). See also Nicholas Thomas, *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel, and Government* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994), and John Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum* (London: Routledge, 1995).

63. S. J. Shennan, *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity* (London: Unwin Hyman, 1989); Tom Barringer and Tom Flynn, *Colonialism and the Object* (London: Routledge, 1998); Richard Handler, "On Having a Culture: Nationalism and the Preservation of Quebec's Patrimoine," in *Objects and Others: Essays on Museums and Material Cultures*, 3, ed. George Stocking (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985), 192–217; Hobsbawm and Ranger, *The Invention of Tradition*; Eileen Hooper-Greenhill, *Museums and the Shaping of Knowledge* (London: Routledge, 1992).

64. Han'guk Kogohakhoe, ed., *Maejang munhwajae palgul chōnmun kigwan yuksōng pang'an yōn'gu kyōlkwa pogosō* [A report on the final recommendations for the development organizations specializing in archeological excavations], ed. Korean Archaeological Society (Seoul, 1997).

65. Until recently, only a small number of government institutions, such as the Research Institute of Cultural Properties, and national and university museums were awarded excavation permits by the Office of Cultural Properties. In the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, there was an explosion in archeological discoveries that resulted from the rapid industrialization of Korea with the construction of dams, highways, and apartment complexes. The race to keep up with construction schedules, bulldozers, and dynamite has led to the destruction of an unaccountable number of "heritage" sites and monuments (Yi Sōn-bok, "Maejang munhwajae kwallijedo kaesōnul wihan chean" [A proposal to reform the regulations of buried remains], *Yōngnam kogohak* 12 [1993]: 119–30). Therefore, a typical excavation in Korea today is a salvage project conducted over the summer school vacation, that is, haphazardly carried out with few qualified personnel or adequate budgets (Pai, "Nationalism and the Preservation of Korea's Buried Past").

66. Munhwajae Kwalliguk, "Ilcheūi munhwajae chōngch'aek pyōngga semina"; Munhwajae Kwalliguk, "Ilche chijōng munhwajae chaepyōngga kyōlkwa pogo."

67. Cho Yu-jōn, *Palgul yiyagi* [Excavation stories] (Seoul: Taewōnsa, 1996).

68. Munhwakongbopo, *Munhwa kongbo samshimnyōn* [Thirty-year history of the Ministry of Culture and Information] (Seoul: Koryō Sojōk Publications, 1979), 285.

69. Munhwakongbopo, *Munhwa kongbo samshimnyōn*, 288–9.

70. Gi-Wook Shin, "Nation, History, and Politics: Rhetoric of Minjok in Postwar Korea," in *Nationalism and the Construction of Korean Identity*, ed. Hyung Il Pai and Tim Tangherlini. Korea Research Monograph Series no. 26 (Berkeley: University of California, Center for Korean Studies, 1998), 148–65.

71. Sheila Miyoshi Jager, "Manhood, the State, and the Yongsan War Memorial," *Museum Anthropology* 21, no. 3 (1997): 33–39.

72. Pak Yōng-mu, "Chijōng munhwajae mojop'um saengsan saōp ūi poho yuk-

sōng ūl wihan sogo” [A recommendation for the protection and development of registered cultural properties reproduction industries], *Munhwajae* 5 (1971): 122–26. See also Kungnip Chungang Pangmulkwon, “Kungnip Chungang Pangmulkwon-Munhwa kwan’gwang sangp’um tūppyōl chōn kaech’oe” [The opening of a special exhibition on souvenirs developed by the National Museum for Cultural Tourism], *Museum Newsletter*, (May 1, 1999): 1.

73. For example, the Office of Cultural Properties is responsible for the education of designated craftsmen, who are taught traditional skills such as wood carpentry, *tanch’ōng* painting, flooring, and stone-masonry. They are also involved in the awarding of work permits to those who have passed annual state examinations to be certified specialists in restoring traditional buildings for the maintenance and promotion of national treasures (Munhwajae Kwalliguk, *Munhwajae posu kisul kyojae* [Manual for the restoration of cultural properties] [Seoul: Munhwajae Kwalliguk, 1988]). Last, but not least, the office determines the selection of reproduction (*mojop’um*) companies that specialize in the licensed production of miniature national treasures to be sold in the lucrative souvenir shops established at national museums, cultural monuments, and government sanctioned hotel gift-shops (Pak Yōng-mu, “Chijōng munhwajae mojop’um saengsan saōp ūi poho yuksōng ūl wihan sogo”; Kungnip Chungang Pangmulkwon, “Kungnip Chungang Pangmulkwon-Munhwa kwan’gwang sangp’um tūppyōl chōn kaech’oe”).

74. Ch’oe Sōk-yōng, *Ilche ūi Tonghwa Ideologi ūi ch’angch’ul* [The invention of the Japanese imperial ideology of assimilation] (Seoul: Sōgyōng Munhwa Press, 1997).

75. Young, *Japan’s Total Empire*.

76. Pai, “Japanese Anthropology.”

77. Ch’oe Sōk-yōng, *Ilche ūi Tonghwa Ideologi ūi ch’angch’ul*. See also Mark R. Peattie, “Japanese Attitudes towards Colonialism,” in *The Japanese Colonial Empire*, ed. Ramon H. Myers and Mark R. Peattie (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1984), 8–127.

78. Chōsen Sōtokufu, *Bukkokuji to Sekkutsuan*.

79. Hamada Kosaku and J. G. Andersson, “The Far East,” *Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities* 4 (1932): 9–14. See also Umehara Sueji, “Nikkan heigō no kikan ni okonawaretta hantō no koseki chosa to hōzon jigyō ni tazusawatta ichi kōkogakuto no kaisō-roku” [Remembrances of archeological investigations and preservations of Korean sites during the Japanese colonial period], *Chōsen gakuho* 51 (1969): 95–148.

80. Komai, *Rakurōgun chishi*.

81. Kim Yōng-sōp, “Ilche kwanhakchadurūi Han’guksagwan” [Japanese government-scholars’ view of Korean history], in *Han’guksaūi pansōng* [Reflections on Korean history], ed. Yōksa Hakhoe (Seoul: Sin’gu Munhwasa, 1973), 29–39; Pai, “The Politics of Korea’s Past.”

82. Pai, “Japanese Anthropology.”

83. O Se-t’ak, “Ilche ūi munhwajae chōngch’aek”; Chun Kyung-soo, “Kankoku Hakubutsukanshi ni okeru hyōshō no seiji jinruigaku shokuminchishūgi toshide no gurō-balizumu”; Hwang Su-yōng, *Ilchegi munhwajae p’ihae charyo* [The destruction of cultural relics under Japanese rule], *Kogo misul* [Archaeology and art], vol. 22 (Seoul: Han’guk Misulsa Hakhoe, 1973).

84. Lee Chul-woo, “Modernity, Legality and Power in Korea under Japanese Rule,” in *Colonial Modernity in Korea*, ed. Gi-wook Shin and Michael Robinson (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), 33–35.

85. O Se-t’ak, “Ilche ūi munhwajae chōngch’aek.”

86. Munhwajae Kwalliguk, “Ilcheūi munhwajae chōngch’aek pyōngga semina.”

87. Chun Kyung-soo, “Kankoku Hakubutsukanshi ni okeru hyōshō no seiji jinruigaku shokuminchishūgi toshide no gurōbalizumu.”

88. Phyllis Mauch Messenger, ed. *The Ethics of Collecting Cultural Property* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1989).

89. James Clifford, *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997).