

# **JAPANESE LANGUAGE PLANNING IN KOREA 1905–1945**

**by**

**Ayako Shinomiya Burton**

**B.A. University of Windsor 1973**

**THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
MASTER OF ARTS**

**in the Department  
of  
Linguistics**

**© Ayako Shinomiya Burton 1994**

**SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY**

**November 1994**

**All rights reserved. This work may not be reproduced  
in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means,  
without permission of the author.**

## APPROVAL

NAME: Ayako Shinomiya Burton

DEGREE: Master of Arts

TITLE OF THESIS: Japanese Language Planning In Korea: 1905–1945

Examining Committee:

Chair: P. McFetridge

---

Ross Saunders  
Senior Supervisor  
Professor of Linguistics

---

Zita McRobbie  
Professor of Linguistics

---

Jan Walls  
External Examiner  
School of Communication  
Simon Fraser University

Date Approved:

November 25, 1994

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

Japanese Language Planning in Korea 1905-1945

Author: \_\_\_\_\_  
(signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(name)

25 Nov. 1994

\_\_\_\_\_  
(date)

## ABSTRACT

Japanese language planning in Korea after the conclusion of the Korea-Japan Treaty of 1905 was subordinate to the political aims of Japanese empire. As the specific goals of Japanese empire changed — from an initial concern with general interchange between Korea and Japan to an eventual focus on the needs of a beleaguered Japanese war machine — so too did the aims of language planning change.

Japanese language planning per se moved from a concern with bilingualism, with Japanese as the second language being taught to a small percentage of the Korean populace, to one of monolingual universal education in the “national language” (Japanese) once an all-out assimilationist policy was adopted at the political level.

At the implementation level, Japan’s language planning effort was very comprehensive. It concentrated on the children and involved the introduction of Korea’s first universal schooling system. Utilitarian technical and academic subjects were taught through the Japanese language. Detailed curricula were worked out, teachers trained and textbooks compiled. Meanwhile, Japanese-language newspapers, periodicals, books, radio broadcasts, music and movies were introduced and their Korean counterparts step-by-step suppressed. Reward and punishment systems were used to reinforce the effort.

Japan’s language planning, judged solely in terms of language acquisition, was successful. Large numbers of Koreans learned to speak, read and write Japanese with native or near-native fluency. Indeed, even Korean academics have commented that had the effort continued for another few decades, the entire populace would have been speaking Japanese and the Korean language would have been in danger of dying out.

However, the effort collapsed together with the Japanese Empire. In the backlash of Korean ethnicity and nationalism which occurred in the aftermath of this collapse, the weakness of this kind of externally imposed language planning quickly surfaced — the

Japanese language was rejected together with every other vestige of Japanese control. Just as the Japanese language planners had earlier insisted that the “spirit of Japaneseness” resided in the “national language,” so too did the now free Koreans insist that their national spirit resided in the Korean language. Language planning which does not take ethnicity into full account carries a fatal flaw.

## **DEDICATION**

To all those teachers, students, parents and children  
grappling with the problems of multilingual education  
within a multicultural context.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The initial inspiration for the theme of this paper was kindled when I took a graduate course from Dr. Joshua Fishman on "Language and Ethnicity" and wrote a paper on the naming system imposed on the Korean people as part of Japan's language planning during the colonial period. It was through Dr. Fishman's excellent tutoring and guidance that I became aware of the importance of the interplay between language and ethnicity as it relates to language acquisition by young children in their stage of cognitive development.

Later, Dr. Tai Whan Kim, now deceased, who had himself personally experienced the effects of denied ethnicity under Japanese language planning in his country, while served as an encouraging teacher and senior friend, helped me to deepen my understanding of these issues.

Upon Dr. Kim's unfortunate early death, Dr. Ross Saunders consented to take up the task of thesis adviser, and it is his patience and scholastic advice that has been most instrumental in getting me through the laborious process of thesis writing and revision.

Dr. Jan Walls, whom I first came to know in China, has also proved an understanding and inspirational mentor over the years. A recognized expert in language teaching and communication himself, he has given me much concrete advice on matters discussed here.

Others, too, have given unstintingly of their help. Among them several must be singled out.

Special thanks is due Dr. Yi Sukucha for granting me an interview in Seoul on short notice. Her wonderful written contribution to the subject at hand has been heavily relied upon in the course of my research and writing, as will be readily apparent to anybody sufficiently interested to glance at my footnotes and bibliography.

Then there is Dr. Jay Powell of the University of British Columbia, who gave generously of his time on a number of occasions to help me clarify issues of language and culture, drawing on his deep knowledge of language and ethnicity problems of Western Canada's native peoples.

Thanks, too, to Ms. Emiko Moffat of the East Asian Section of the Hoover Library at Stanford University who went out of her way to help me locate the relevant materials in the course of my two visits to that wonderful collection.

A number of Korean friends have also helped me with details at crucial junctures and, although I shall leave them unnamed here, I trust they know of my deep appreciation.

In a field which is still largely unknown territory, the short paper, in English, of Hanaoka Tamiko on Japanese language planning in Korea is surely a pathbreaker and I must thank Ms. Hanaoka for her kindness in allowing me to read it as well as for her help on materials and her gracious loan of valuable books.

Lastly, I am indebted to my husband and partner, Neil, for his efforts in getting this thesis into final form, and to my daughters, the two lights of my life, whose struggles to grow up in three languages and cultures have provided me with constant revelations and kept me believing in the possibility of human change and progress.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval Page .....	ii
Abstract .....	iii
Dedication .....	v
Acknowledgements .....	vi
List of Tables .....	ix
Foreword .....	x
Introduction .....	1
Chapter I: The Korea-Japan Relationship In Historical Perspective .....	4
Chapter II: Goals and Objectives of Japanese Language Planning with Respect to Korea.....	16
Chapter III: Implementation of Japanese Language Planning in Korea .....	58
Chapter IV: Results of the Language-Planning Effort .....	86
Conclusion .....	94
Appendix I.....	97
A. School Boycotts by Students Following the March First Movement	
B. Analysis of Cases of School Boycott	
C. Police Punishment of School Boycott Students	
Appendix II. Number of Instructional Hours for Subjects Taught In Korean Elementary Schools .....	98
Appendix III. Number of Instructional Hours Per Week In the Korean and Japanese Languages for Koreans (Primary School) .....	100
Korean-Japanese Glossary .....	101
Bibliography .....	108

## **LIST OF TABLES**

I. Numbers of Private (Native Korean or Missionary) Schools .....	33
II. Textbook Content and Weekly Timetables for Futsūgakkō Under the First Korean Education Order .....	68
III. Numbers of Koreans Understanding Spoken Japanese, 1913 - 1943.....	87
IV. Degree of Literacy of Korean Populace, 1930.....	88
V. Comparative Levels of Vocabulary Acquisition Among Japanese and Korean Elementary Pupils .....	89

## **Foreword**

I have been a teacher of Japanese as a second language for over twenty-five years, teaching at various levels — elementary, secondary, adult extension and university — in a variety of settings — Japan, Canada and China — and have had to personally deal with questions of the ethnicity of my students and pupils as well as seek effective methods of imparting language skills. My own family life also has an ethno-linguistic aspect as my two children have had to contend with three languages, at times in conflict with the school systems in which they were enrolled. Thus, for me, these matters are of special relevance and always most real. If with this case study I can contribute even a little bit to the understanding of the issues, emotions and difficulties involved, I will feel my work to have been worthwhile.

Ayako Shinomiya Burton

Yokohama, JAPAN

October 1994

## Introduction

In the Fall of 1992 I made my first short visit to Seoul to see an old Korean friend, a former student of mine in the Japanese language. As I went through Immigration, instead of the usual cursory glance at my entry papers, the Immigration official, a man of perhaps 60 years old or more, carefully examined them and then solemnly sentenced me, in fluent Japanese, to rewrite the documents, saying that “real Japanese” don’t write such clumsy scribble. Embarrassed and a bit indignant inside for being treated like an elementary pupil in front of a strict teacher, I rewrote the paper with more care and precision and he then let me proceed into the enormous arrivals lobby of the newly-built air terminus.

My taxi driver on the way to the hotel was a man in his 40s. To my surprise, he greeted me in Japanese, then carried on a friendly conversation which, while not fluent, was good enough for communication at a daily conversational level. He had apparently learned his Japanese through the radio and practiced it with his Japanese customers.

In the course of my ride to the hotel, I noticed that, unlike in China, Hong Kong and Japan, the streets of Seoul have no signs written in Chinese characters. Such characters, I was later informed by an elderly Korean friend, were banned outright by order of the former president, Pak Chung-hee, in order to demonstrate the national dignity of Korea through the universal adoption of *han’gŭl* characters for all public signs.

Because of my inability to speak or read Korean, I had some trouble in making contact with people I was to meet for interviews, but the manager of the hotel — a man of around 40 — was very kind in helping me track them down. His Japanese was again not in the native-like fluency which I was to find among those who passed their elementary school years during the Japanese colonization period, but had also clearly been learned as

a foreign language useful for his business, although it seemed he had some personal interest in present-day Japan.

Among the younger generation of Koreans with whom I came into contact, I did not see any shadows of the legacy of the past Japanese-language enforcement policy, which lasted nearly 40 years and was feared by some as threatening the existence of the Korean language and culture, and indeed of Korea itself. The Korean language is today clearly flourishing in the peninsula, which exhibits much vitality in all spheres.

Unlike the young people I met on my trip, to my amazement, those Koreans who went through the era of forced Japanese language training all had a native-like fluency and culturally communicative salience, although some seemed to be either hiding, or to have come to terms with, bad memories of humiliation under cultural and linguistic oppression when learning the language.

Mr. and Mrs. Kim, whom I interviewed in 1992, for example, were a typical case. Mr. Kim, born in 1925, and now retired after a successful career running his own business, underwent ten years of enforced Japanese elementary and secondary education, while Mrs. Kim, born in 1928, received seven. Both of them spoke with native-like fluency and accuracy and told me that nowadays, in their 60s, they still read Japanese newspapers and literary magazines.

What was it actually like to be a student of this type of enforced language training, which obviously achieved much in the way of imparting concrete language skills while also leaving behind a widespread legacy of humiliation and indignation? My now deceased teacher and friend, Dr. Ta Whan Kim, a well-known polyglot and linguist, himself went through enforced language training in his early elementary school years. Once, when showing me in writing his obligatory Japanese name — which, like those given to most Koreans, was an undistinguished one like, say, George Smith in English —

he told me with both sadness and pathos that it was a very frightening experience for a young boy to be in elementary school at that time. He felt always watched, he said, while being forced to speak and act the way the Japanese teacher expected — in other words as a Japanese boy should.

It seems clear to me that this language training, enforced by the military government of Imperial Japan, resulted in a certain success as far as language proficiency is concerned, but also created a deep-rooted sadness, anger and even hatred toward the enforcers. These feelings ultimately worked as a major factor in the complete negation of the experience and a general rejection of Japanese culture — and hence of the Japanese language.

This thesis, then, deals with the linguistic dimension of Japan's policies in Korea over the 36 years from 1910 to 1945. Japan's language policies for Korea were an integral part of its assimilation policy toward the peninsula which was itself aimed at serving the political and economic goals of empire. These language policies were comprehensive, involving planning, the drafting of regulations and codes, mobilization of professional linguists, teacher training, curriculum determination and the compiling of textbooks, and the devising of graduated systems of rewards and punishments. They were at every step overseen by governmental leaders and their enforcement was ultimately sanctioned by the powers of a well-trained police and military establishment.

This comprehensive, tightly controlled language planning, which could be said to have been "advanced" for its time as a result of the relatively modern approach to education then followed in Imperial Japan, carried within itself a fatal flaw. That is, it neglected and even actively attempted to crush the ethnic identity of the language learner as a part of the larger attempt to control and then suppress the ethnicity of the Korean people as a whole.

## Chapter I. The Korea-Japan Relationship In Historical Perspective

Japan's aggression in Asia in the first half of the twentieth century, conducted in the name of the "Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere," inevitably led to a contradiction with the avowed goals trumpeted in its tightly controlled propaganda effort, such as "Asian brotherhood against world power." Regardless of the claims, it unfolded in due course that Japan's true intention was to gain hegemony in Asia, an intention spurred by growing ambitions to build up the Japanese Empire at the cost of the resources and manpower of colonized regions.<sup>1</sup>

Just as this scheme required strict ideological controls over the Japanese nation domestically, particularly in educational institutions,<sup>2</sup> Japan's leaders saw a similar need to exercise ideological controls over the overseas areas they brought under Japan's sway.

Although many of the documents and much of the propaganda of the time spoke lavishly of the great cause of helping Japan's "weaker Asian brothers" stave off "the World Powers," the fact that this was a paternalistic subterfuge — perhaps deluding even its authors — is revealed in many ways, including actual planning towards the ultimate goal of completely assimilating Koreans into the Japanese nation through obliterating their language and culture. Korea is not only the prime example of attempted ideological control but can also serve as a symbol of what lay in store for other countries and regions incorporated into the expanding Japanese Empire.

---

<sup>1</sup> The outline given here for background purposes is pieced together from general knowledge of such matters among those, such as myself, educated in Japan, as well as from various Japanese-language sources, in particular Hatada Takashi, ed., *Nyūmon Chōsen no Rekishi* [Primer of Korean History], Tokyo, Sanseido, 1986. English readers may wish to consult Fairbank, John K., Reischauer and Craig, *East Asia: The Modern Transformation* [Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1965] or some similar authority.

<sup>2</sup> Under the emperor's educational rescript [*Kyoikuchokugo*], the entire domestic school system was subjected to strict control through the imperial government's Ministry of Education, nominally in order to foster faithful subjects for the emperor.

Many superficially plausible reasons have been put forward to justify the policy of Korea's assimilation, some of them real, some strictly ideological. For instance, since early times, Korea had, in fact, been a major source and channel for Japan's cultural borrowing from the seemingly more culturally advanced continent.<sup>3</sup> For better or worse, Japan had thus developed strong cultural affinities with Korea. For example, although Korea had developed its own *han'gŭl* writing system in the 15th century, Chinese characters were still widely used in writing there, just as in Japan. Also, as in Japan, Koreans had, or more importantly, were thought to have, a high regard for royalty and aristocracy, a tradition which could be manipulated for control of the populace.<sup>4</sup>

Because of these and other similarities, many Japanese regarded Korea as *uchi*, an insider, one of the family.<sup>5</sup> This was extended in some minds to mean that Korea could be called upon in case of need, and that Japan — taken for granted by Japanese to be the

---

<sup>3</sup> The Korean peninsula is thought to have been connected with what is now the Japanese archipelago as late as Paleolithic times. Japan's Yayoi culture, based on rice cultivation and a bronze technology and gradually displacing the previous hunting and gathering Jōmon culture while spreading from south to north, was almost certainly introduced into southern Japan from Korea in the 3rd Century B.C. Over the subsequent centuries, Japan has absorbed many elements of Korean culture along with those from China, many of which were also filtered through Korea. For example, at least one of the channels for the introduction of the Chinese logographic system of writing, Confucianism and Buddhism into Japan was through Korea. In historical times, Japanese intellectuals were well-versed in scholarly works by Korean authors. During Japan's Edo Period (17th – 19th C.), for example, the work of the Korean philosopher Yi Toe-gye was extremely popular in Japan. (Cf. Morita Yoshio, *Kankoku ni okeru Kokugo Kokushi Kyōiku* [National Language and National History Education in Korea], Tokyo, Harashobo, 1987, p. 42)

<sup>4</sup> This argument was used, for example, to rationalize the murder of the anti-Japanese Korean queen in 1895 at the instigation of a Japanese diplomat, the argument being that this was "saving" the Korean king from mistakenly being influenced against Japanese "help."

<sup>5</sup> The concepts of *uchi* and *soto* are arguably among the most important for the understanding of Japanese culture, whether in its traditional or modern forms. As explained by contemporary socio-anthropologist Nakane Chie, Japanese social structure is characterized by its clear distinction between "insiders" [*uchi*] and "outsiders" [*soto*], with *uchi* encompassing only those bound tightly into a family-like group. The bonds tying such groups together derive from daily contact within a hierarchical framework, as in a family, and include a family-like emotional affinity. Members of the group take care of one another — and expect to be taken care of — as if they were siblings, children or parents in a true family. Conversely, those outside the group are accorded little concern and lateral ties between groups are relatively weak. The main thing tying the society as a whole together was/is the imperial system. (Nakane Chie, *Tate Shakai no Ningen Kankei* [Human Relations in a Vertical Society], Tokyo, Kodansha, 1967, *passim*, but especially pp. 46-47)

“elder brother” in the “family” (Asia) perhaps because of its actual edge in the modernization process or in military power — might call on the “younger brother” when the family was faced with difficulty or crisis. Sacrifice on the part of the younger brother was justified when the interests of the family as a whole were at stake. Another ideological argument was that, due to Korean aspirations for modernization, it was Japan’s “duty,” again as the “elder brother” or “teacher,” to pass on its relatively advanced experience and knowledge in modernizing, and to discipline the “younger brother” or “pupil” — whose “duty” it was to study diligently — as necessary. The point is that such arguments took inequality for granted and always cast Korea in the subordinate role as “younger” and, hence, in the Asian way of thinking, inferior.

Such ideological arguments aside, from a strategic point of view, Korea is well situated as a stepping stone into the continent and especially into China (which the ideologists might wish to consider the now senile “father” of the Asian “family”), and could serve as a strategic rear area for an imperialistic advance on the continent because of its rich agricultural resources and manpower — manpower which might serve as cheap labor or even as military reinforcement at the front in case of need.

### The Meaning of “Modernization”

Only ten years after Japan’s domestic Meiji Restoration, which put Japan on the course of “modernization” within a Western-style framework, the new Meiji government in 1876 forced a treaty — the Treaty of Kanghwa — on neighboring Korea, thereby guaranteeing Japan favorable treatment in terms of access and trade. At the time, Korea, which for centuries had been firmly bound in a tributary relationship with the Chinese empire, was under pressure from various Western powers to end its relative seclusion from the outside world and agree to trade, missionary activity and Western-style diplomatic relations. Meanwhile, within Korean society, there was a fledgling group of

would-be reformers, with a hazy knowledge of developments in the outside world and concerned by Korea's isolation and vulnerability in the face of encroaching outside power, but still relatively weak in comparison to the conservative or traditionalist and generally pro-Chinese forces.

The Korea which these would-be reformers desired to change was arguably the most conservative and orthodoxy-bound society in East Asia at the time. All positions of power and authority in it were monopolized by an aristocracy, the *yangban* class, which jealously protected its own prerogatives, and acted as the guardian and orthodox interpreter of the Confucianism which served as the ideological underpinnings of the regime. Its members' principal aspiration was to achieve and hold onto official office, and the only route to such office was through an examination system similar to that of China, with one key distinction — it was open only to the *yangban* class. Preparation for the exams, in other words "education," involved the learning of the Chinese Confucian classics by rote, either in schools run by local governments (*hyanggyo*) or in one of four academies (*Sahak*) run by the central government in what is now Seoul. With both the ideas and the written script through which the ideas were transmitted being Chinese, not surprisingly the *yangban* class tended to identify very closely with China — its Korean identity being largely defined mainly in terms of its own localized political and economic interests and relationship to the indigenous royal tradition.

As for the common people, already by the middle of the Yi Dynasty (1392–1910) there were spread throughout the country local schools or *sodang* to which young children, generally between the ages of five and sixteen, might go for basic schooling in Chinese characters. It is estimated that at the beginning of the nineteenth century there was one of these *sodang* for every four to five villages throughout Korea. Local teachers would lead their classes of from ten to twenty pupils in reciting both the Chinese and Korean pronunciations of the characters, starting with the Chinese textbook "Thousand

Character” (*Chōnjamoon*). Later they would move on to the Chinese and Korean classics, which they would again be expected to learn by rote. If their parents allowed them to stay the course, this would complete the educational curriculum for commoners, while *yangban* children might move on to the more advanced schools mentioned above.<sup>6</sup> This *sodang* school tradition persisted into the period of Japanese control of Korea, kept alive as part of the Korean people’s ethnic identity. In fact, during the first decade of Japanese colonial control their number more than doubled, from 10,000 in 1908 to 25,486 in 1917, with an enrollment of 259,541 in the latter year.<sup>7</sup>

One of the key sources for information and ideas of the aforementioned group of Korean would-be reformers was Japan, but although it might please Japanese of both that time and later to see Japan as these reformers’ “model,” this was not necessarily the case. For many of the Koreans concerned, Japan was merely a conduit for utilitarian techniques which were seen as having their primary roots in Western countries.<sup>8</sup> Japan could be seen by such people as simply being further advanced in the process of learning and borrowing from the same Western sources. And even when Japan was seen as an originator it could be perceived as only one among several. This is not to deny that there were some Koreans who did see Japan as a model, a forerunner to be emulated, even as an “elder brother.” But such people were almost certainly in the minority.

Objectively speaking, there were certain useful things that could be learned or “borrowed” from Japan. Japan did, after all, share a common means of written

---

<sup>6</sup> Morita, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-11.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 11.

<sup>8</sup> Part of the attraction of Japan as a conduit was undoubtedly simply its proximity and relative familiarity as compared to Western countries. Another was language affinity. As one Korean studying at Keio College at the beginning of the 1880s told a newspaper interviewer, Koreans should first study Japanese so that they could quickly begin reading Japanese translations of books from the West, while preparing for the more difficult task of delving into such books in the original. (From the *Yūbin Hōchi Shimbun* [Postal Report News], as cited in Morita, *op. cit.*, 1987)

communication, the Chinese character. And since it had in fact embarked on the reform or modernization process earlier than its East Asian neighbors, it was already well along in performing certain of the more mundane, if necessary, tasks involved in cultural borrowing from the distinctively different cultures of the West. Among these tasks were the coining of the terminology needed to convey “new” concepts and technologies and the translation of written materials embodying those concepts and technologies into written Japanese — which is to say into a language which was more or less intelligible to other members of the Chinese-script-using community. Thus the sharing with Japan of a written language based on the same logographic characters spelled advantage to those who came later to the reform process.<sup>9</sup>

It is especially important to understand that the first official contacts with Japan which exhibited what might be called a “modernizing” interest were not made out of any desire to draw closer to Japan nor with any view to embarking on some open-ended process of change or, in today’s parlance, “development.” Rather they were spurred by uneasiness and fear raised by concrete challenges to Korea’s sovereignty over its own territory and internal affairs — not least by Japan. It is well to remember, for instance, that the group of Korean government officials that visited Japan in 1876 and which reported back to the Korean royal court what it had learned about Japanese efforts at the importation of foreign technologies, the employment of Western specialists and the

---

<sup>9</sup> It is interesting to see that even such words as “civilization” were problematic for East Asian reformers. Fukuzawa Yukichi, a prominent Japanese educational modernizer, was responsible for coining the word used in Japan today, by borrowing and combining the Chinese characters for “culture” and “enlightenment” to come up with *bunmei*, and those for “opening” and “transformation” to arrive at *kaika*. In his book *Seiyō Jijō* [Things Western], published in 1867, Fukuzawa used the term *bunmei kaika* (“civilizational opening and transformation”) in the sense of opening up and adopting Western civilization in order to develop Japan rapidly.

A partial translation of *Seiyō Jijō* using a mixture of *han’gŭl* and Chinese characters was made by a Korean student of Fukuzawa’s Keiō College and published in 1895 as *Seiyō Kenbun* [Observations of the West], thereby introducing Fukuzawa’s coined terms into Korean. Thus the Japanese word *kaika* became the Korean *kehoa* and was widely used thereafter to mean opening the country to external civilization and making the country strong through Western borrowings, particularly technology. (Morita, *op. cit.*, p. 38)

dispatch of Japanese students abroad, was in Japan primarily to formalize a treaty, the Treaty of Kanghwa, which had been forced upon the Korean rulers by “modern” guns. And to remember also that another group of 58 Korean officials, which visited Japan in 1880 was there for negotiations concerning the opening of the port of Inchon, again forced upon them by a more “modern” Japan. The fact that Korea was as much frightened by Japan as it was impressed by its vaunted modernity is attested by the fact that it quickly moved to conclude what it saw as protective bilateral agreements with quite a number of other powers, a course it had long rejected.<sup>10</sup>

Again, this is not to argue that Korean officials who were initially simply concerned with protecting their country from “modernity” in its more explosive manifestations, were immune to its other attractions. For instance, the group of 58 officials just mentioned went on to carry out various inspection tours and reported to the authorities upon their return that Japan was undergoing dramatic change in many fields. Among the things that had caught their attention was the apparent enthusiasm of both the government and people of Japan for the wide-ranging reform of education, a reform which was turning what had been basically an elite preoccupation, as in Korea, into something of a more truly mass nature.

### **The Korean Language**

In the discussion above it was noted that the intellectual attention of the *yangban* class — not unlike that of the elites of other East Asian countries — was focused on Chinese ideas and the Chinese written language through which these ideas were transmitted. There was, however, a distinctive, historically developed Korean language, used by the common people and, in everyday life, by the *yangban* class as well, even if

---

<sup>10</sup> In the period 1882-1886, Korea concluded treaties with the United States, England, Germany, China [Qing], Russia, Italy and France.

with a certain interlarding of Chinese terminology. While much work has yet to be done to ascertain the origins, filiations and relationships of the Korean language, certain things are relatively clear.<sup>11</sup> Korean's linguistic affiliation is uncertain. There are similarities with Japanese grammatical structures, however, they are typological in nature. In terms of word order, grammar, sentence particles, honorific forms and richness of onomatopoeic expression it is similar to Japanese, although the lexicons of the two languages are quite different.<sup>12</sup> There has, however, been significant borrowing of specific vocabulary items, particularly around the 5th century, as many Koreans technically skilled in such areas as architecture, ceramics, weaving and iron casting came to and settled in Japan. Korean cultural words such as *fude* (writing brush), *tefu* (notebook), and even place names such as *Koma*, *Komae* and *Renbori*, and the most prominent, *Nara* ("country" in Korean), were introduced into Japan around that time, and many other examples of borrowing over the centuries could be listed. Nor, of course, was the borrowing merely one-way. During the Japanese colonial period in Korea, Japanese words such as *sushi*, *tempura* (which was itself a borrowing from Portuguese), *rajiō* (from the English "radio"), and *kutsu* (shoes) became a part of the Korean vocabulary, only to be rooted out again in the anti-Japanese backlash following Imperial Japan's collapse in 1945.

Of particular importance to us in terms of our concern with language planning is the fact that Korea had an indigenous writing script, *han'gŭl*, with which spoken Korean might be represented. Invented in the 15th century by a member of the royal family working with the cooperation of sympathetic scholars of the time, and promoted as a tool useful

---

<sup>11</sup> Crystal, D. 1987. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

<sup>12</sup> A close relationship between the Korean and Japanese languages was posited as early as 1717 by the Japanese intellectual Arai Hakuseki. A more detailed theory of the connection was developed by Kanazawa Shozaburo, who publicized it in 1910. As Japan's language planning for Korea was by then well under way, we will save Kanazawa's theory for treatment in Chapter 2 below.

for the common people by those not blinded by excessive reverence for Chinese characters, this writing system had an elegant simplicity and phonetic congruence which is remarked on even today, the term “scientific” often being used to describe it. In any case, it was protected by the royal family of Korea, used alongside Chinese to render official documents, and employed in letter writing and other aspects of daily life by women of the court. Over the ensuing centuries it was used to translate a wide range of materials, mainly Chinese, into Korean, histories, literature and Buddhist sutras foremost among them. And although it never replaced the Chinese written language as the cultural medium of choice for the *yangban* elite, or in the examination system, it did spread quite widely among the masses and among elite women. By the 17th and 18th centuries, there was a significant Korean literature in *han'gǔl* and by the 19th century this indigenous literature was being published in book form. Western missionaries also made good use of the *han'gǔl* script in producing catechisms, tracts and a translation of the Bible. In the late 19th century, *han'gǔl* played a major role in the initial steps of Korea to undertake self-reform and redefine itself as a modern nation-state.

The combination of *han'gǔl* with a revised concept of education was a major element of the reform process and was also to play a major part in the language planning component of Japan's colonization effort. We have already noted above how the Korean delegation of 58 members which visited Japan in 1880 could not help but notice the changes underway in Japanese education. Other delegations and individuals made similar observations and even began to see in Japan's new mass education some of the keys to Japan's new-found strength, some going so far as to expose themselves to this new education directly.

From April to July of 1881, a further group of 62 Koreans conducted an enquiry tour of Japan upon invitation and was given a warm welcome by the Meiji Government. Among this “Gentlemen’s Tour Group” were members of the family of Queen Min, wife

of the Korean king, which had the upper hand in Korean royal factional politics at the time.<sup>13</sup> (Some of the touring group members were later to become members of the Korean government when it was reorganized in 1882.) In the Japan they visited, nearly every sector of society was infused with a vigorous spirit of change and experimentation, so in order to gain insights into as wide a range of activities as possible, the group was divided into 12 sub-groups to visit government offices, military facilities, factories, mines and cultural institutions. In the latter sphere, the emphasis was put on schools of all kinds and levels, including universities, normal schools, foreign language schools, girls' schools and agricultural schools.<sup>14</sup>

When the delegation returned home to Korea after its brief visit, two of the delegation members remained behind and enrolled as students of Keiō College, later to become Keiō University. The next year, 1882, when Kim Ok-kyun and Pak Yong-hyo, came to Japan as members of a delegation entrusted to conclude what was to become the Chemulpo Treaty, they were befriended by Fukuzawa Yukichi, the founder and president of Keiō College.<sup>15</sup> As a result of their discussions with Fukuzawa, in 1883, another group of 44 students — all *yangban* — arrived in Japan to attend Keiō where, after a period of Japanese language learning, they were given practical knowledge of such things as Western-style post office operation. Meanwhile, Pak, upon his return to Korea, at Fukuzawa's suggestion took some Japanese graduates of Keiō as well as trained printers with him. Given permission by the Korean king to publish a newspaper, Pak imported

---

<sup>13</sup> It should not be supposed that Japan, for its part, was monolithic in its contempt for Korean traditions and concerns nor in its determination to impose its will on its weaker neighbor. At least in the early stages, in parallel with a widespread pride in Japan's achievements through "modernization" there was also a willingness to share the "secrets" behind them.

<sup>14</sup> Morita, *op. cit.*, p. 39

<sup>15</sup> All told, according to one source (Ri Koh Rin, *Kankoku Kaikashi Kenkyū* [Studies on the History of Korea's Opening], Tokyo, Ichōkaku, 1969), in the period from 1881 to 1884, 67 Korean students studied in Japan, most of them staying for a year.

both a printing machine and specially made *han'gūl* lead type for which Fukuzawa himself apparently made the arrangements.<sup>16</sup>

In 1884, spurred by their concern for modernizing their country, both Kim and Pak participated in an abortive coup d'état, and then fled back to Japan upon its failure due to Chinese intervention. Kim was later to be assassinated in Shanghai for his pro-Japanese proclivities while Pak was to play an important role in popularizing *han'gūl* as a medium for spreading an indigenous or native "modern" education. While in political exile in Japan Pak wrote a memorial to the Korean king in 1888 which clearly conveyed the ethnic or nationalistic component of his modernizing philosophy. He argued as follows: "For teaching the people, national history and the national language and national language [*han'gūl*]<sup>17</sup> are vitally important. We are not teaching our own history and writings, but are teaching those of Qing [China]. Therefore our people look up to China as a model and do not know our own ancient practices. This is absurd."

Korean education by this time was already undergoing change, largely as the result of efforts by Western missionaries. In 1884 a Catholic-run private school, had been established in Seoul and in 1885 a second was set up in Kwangju. Following this, Catholic-run schools proliferated rapidly: in 1893 there were 36 of them with 246 pupils and in 1904, 75 with 693 pupils.

In 1894, as a part of a sweeping program of reform inspired by Japan (and which, not incidentally, led indirectly to the Sino-Japanese War), and in which Pak Yong-hyo again played a brief part, the Korean government began the move toward universalizing *han'gūl* when it decreed that *han'gūl* henceforth should be used for the writing of all public documents. A year later, in March 1895, a directive issued by the Office of Civil

---

<sup>16</sup> Fukuzawa Yukichi. *Fukuzawa Yukichi Den* [Autobiography of Fukuzawa Yukichi], Vol. 3, Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1932; cited in Morita, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

<sup>17</sup> Square brackets are used throughout this essay to denote editorial insertions into direct quotations to clarify their meanings.

Affairs stated: “The history of our country and the national writing system [*han’gŭl*] must be taught to the people.”<sup>18</sup> A few months earlier, in a “Rescript on Constructing the Country through Education,” it had been said “It is impossible to build a strong state without educating the people. Looking at the world at large, in every strong, wealthy, independent and heroic nation the people are knowledgeable and enlightened by education. Education is the basis on which to build the country. Students reading books, learning calligraphy, and gathering the hand-me-downs of the ancients, without knowing the circumstances of the present-day are useless even though their writing be superb.”<sup>19</sup> This rescript may be considered the first official acknowledgment by a Korean ruler of the utility of mass education and again bears the stamp of ethnic or nationalistic concerns. In the decade that followed, an education campaign of domestic inspiration flourished throughout the peninsula, spurred both by desires for modernization and by the sense of national crisis in the face of external pressures. By the turn of the century, more than 4,000 private schools were scattered throughout the country, and according to one Korean historian it was “as if Koreans were ashamed of themselves if they could not have their own school even in the most remote village in mountainous areas.”<sup>20</sup>

To sum up, in this brief chapter we have tried to lay the basis for understanding the affinities between Korean and Japanese culture and some of the factors which brought Korea and Japan together in a common process of reform, as well as to hint at some of the considerations which doomed to ultimate failure Japan’s attempt to assimilate Korea into the Japanese Empire.

---

<sup>18</sup> Office of Civil Affairs [Korean Government], “*Jinmin ni wa mazu honkokushi to honkokubun wo oshieru koto*” [Concerning the priority teaching of national history and national language to the people], March 1895; cited in Morita, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

<sup>19</sup> January 2, 1895. (Morita, *op. cit.*, p. 51)

<sup>20</sup> Ozawa Yūsaku, “*Chōsen ni okeru Nihon shokuminchi kyōiku no rekishi*” [History of Japanese colonial education in Korea], in Hatada Takashi, ed., *Nippon wa Chōsen de Nani wo Oshietaka* [What Did Japan Teach in Korea?], Tokyo, Ayumi Shuppan, 1987, p. 56

## **Chapter II. Goals and Objectives of Japanese Language Planning with Respect to Korea**

Japan's policy toward Korea changed over time, eventually becoming one of total cultural assimilation. The nature of this process of change — particularly in the linguistic dimension which is our chief interest — can be clarified through reviewing the specific educational policies pursued by the Japanese government during the period of pre-colonial influence and colonial rule over Korea, as reflected in government decrees, regulations and other documents. Five stages can be identified:

- I. The shift from Korean to Japanese initiative in language planning (1876–1905)
- II. “Protectorate” stage (1905–1910)
- III. First Korean Education Order period (1911–1921)
- IV. Second Korean Education Order period (1922–1937)
- V. Third Korean Education Order period (1938–1945)<sup>1</sup>

Let us now look at these five stages in some detail.

### **I. The Shift To Japanese Initiative in Language Planning (1876-1905)**

As early as the end of the Koryǒ period (1392), there was already a significant interchange going on between Japan and Korea and a significant Japanese ethnic presence in Korea itself. Under a conciliationist policy of the Korean government, Japanese who

---

<sup>1</sup> It will be noticed that the last three of these stages are identified by their connection with three imperial “orders” (also variously translated as “rescripts” or “ordinances”). While these orders can serve as useful signposts for the beginning of a new stage, in themselves they tell us little about the changes occurring. Quite brief, their main purpose was to lend the weight of imperial authority to basic policy decisions already worked out by the political decision-makers. These decisions were always fleshed out in detailed regulations and directives, which are the main subject of our interest.

were engaged in coastal banditry and piracy and feared along the coasts of both China and Korea, were sometimes awarded land or trading rights in return for ceasing their depredations. It is said that in 1466 as many as 17,000 Japanese lived in the three Korean ports open to trade. In Pusan, the main port for trade with Japan, there was a so-called "Japanese House" (*Wae-kwan*) solely devoted to the Japan trade.

Such a relationship required intermediaries with language skills. At least as far back as the latter half of the 14th Century the government of Koryō trained interpreters for both diplomatic and trade purposes in a government interpreters academy. The first Yi Dynasty government inherited this academy and, from 1415 on, Japanese was regularly taught, together with Chinese, Mongolian and, sometimes, Tungusic languages. Entrants to the interpreters courses at this academy were chosen from local schools and from among the children of upper class (*yangban*) families. Academy graduates of significant academic attainments were eligible to take the official examinations and were given elevated official position and well looked after.<sup>2</sup> Official interpreters were selected through the examination system and official records contain 318 names of certified official interpreters so selected in the years 1591–1885. According to other incomplete records, the number of students trained by the interpreters' academy (not including its branch schools, which existed intermittently) was 15 in 1623, 25 in 1699, and 30 in 1741.<sup>3</sup>

Among the Japanese texts used in the early period of this academy, a book titled *Iroha* (meaning the Japanese syllabary), and dated 1492 is the oldest extant — and also the oldest extant Japanese book.<sup>4</sup> Printed from copper plates less than 50 years after the

---

<sup>2</sup> This treatment was documented in 1482. Cf. Morita, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

<sup>3</sup> Ogura Shinpei (with annotation by *Kōno Rokurō*), *Zōtei Hochū Chōsengo Gakushi* [History of the Korean Language, Supplemented and Annotated], Tokyo, Tōkō Shoten, 1964; cited in Morita, p. 34.

<sup>4</sup> This book is highly valued among linguists as a rich source of materials for studying the phonological relationship between Korean and Japanese. [Cf. Morita, p. 34]

invention of *han'gǔl*, this “*Iroha*” uses *han'gǔl* to describe Japanese phonology. After 1678, a book titled *Shōkai Shingo* (Chōphae Shinō; Rapid Understanding of New Vocabulary) was used as the textbook. The writer of this text, Kang Woo-sung, had been taken captive by Japanese, had lived in Japan for ten years and, upon his return to Korea had passed the official examination in Japanese. He became active as an official interpreter for Korea-Japan diplomatic affairs and went on to become an instructor in Japanese studies at the academy. His textbook consists of ten thread-bound fascicles, with the first nine consisting of conversation texts and the tenth a volume of diplomatic letters. The vocabulary gleaned from diplomatic negotiations was arranged in the Japanese *hiragana* syllabary with a pronunciation rendition in *han'gǔl* situated to the right. Japanese texts are written beneath the vocabulary lists and translated into Korean using a mixture of *han'gǔl* and Chinese characters. This textbook underwent several revisions, by official interpreters, notably in 1748, 1781 and 1796, and continued to be relied upon over a long period of time. As far as dictionaries are concerned, Hong Soon-myong compiled an Illustrated Dictionary of the Japanese Language (*Waeō Yuhae*). Hong's dictionary is a collection of Japanese vocabulary items written in Chinese characters and arranged according to their Korean readings, but with their Japanese readings and specific Japanese meanings written in *han'gǔl*.<sup>5</sup>

This official academy for the teaching of interpreting skills was operated until 1895 when a set of new regulations governing the operation of foreign language schools was adopted.

As we briefly noted in the first chapter, two months after the Treaty of Kanghwa

---

<sup>5</sup> Although the Chinese characters in which much of the substantive lexicons of East Asian languages are written are the same, both because of initial misunderstandings at the time of borrowing and the simple passage of time they have acquired variant meanings. The same is true for compound words represented by more than one character which, when written, may give the non-native reader a false sense of understanding. There are numerous anecdotes, both humorous and not so humorous, in East Asia about this problem.

was initially concluded in 1876, a first group of Korean officials visited Japan, then in the throes of reform connected with the Meiji Restoration, to be followed by several other groups over the next several years. Whatever their ostensible missions, members of these groups took back with them to Korea much concrete information about Japan's reforms, and some among them also apparently took with them a conviction — if they hadn't had it previously — that some such course of reform was necessary for Korea. Some even opted to stay on in Japan and acquire concrete skills which could be put to use in pursuing Korea's indigenous reforms. While we can't go into the details here of the political struggles in Korea which ultimately resulted in a clear Korean choice for reform, suffice it to say that while the reformers were struggling to get the upper hand, Japan and Japanese were intimately involved and the idea that Japan was more than just a conduit for things Western gained currency. In any case, cultural interchange grew rapidly and with it problems of language and communications. By 1891, the Korean government was prepared to invite a professional Japanese linguist, Okakura Yoshiro, to set up a specialized Japanese language academy (*Jirō Hakdang*) in Hansungpu (Seoul). This is said to be the first instance of planning by a native Japanese of Japanese language education for Korean students.<sup>6</sup> By 1904 this academy had two Japanese instructors, four Korean teachers and 59 students. In addition to Japanese language classes covering conversation, translation and interpretation, and dictation, other subjects such as mathematics, geography, history, ethics, science, law and economics were also taught.

Later, in his memoirs, Okakura was to write, "I became a Japanese language instructor upon the invitation of the Korean government, and was engaged in the teaching of the language until 1893." He claims to have achieved good results using the teaching methods of Ahrendorf, managing to train some students to be good interpreters in as little

---

<sup>6</sup> Korean history editorial committee, Korean Governor-General's Office, *Chōsen Shi* [A History of Korea], Vol. VI, Part 4, cited in Yi Sukucha, *Kyōkashō ni Egakareta Chōsen to Nippon* [Korea and Japan as Manifested in Textbooks], Tokyo, Horupu Shuppan, 1985, pp. 39-40.

as three months.<sup>7</sup> Based on his teaching experience at the academy, Okakura took it upon himself to write “A New Plan for National Education” for the Korean government. In it he argued that “Whether or not to adopt a national language relates to the cultivation of the independent spirit of the nation. Therefore, in academic studies it is indispensable to teach one’s own national language as a part of national independence.” Ironically, Okakura’s claim that the teaching of the national language — in this case Korean — was necessary for fostering national independence was to be proven by negative example through Japan’s annexation of Korea.

Okakura also argued in his proposal that, while Chinese and English were the most likely candidates to be favored by the Korean rulers for adoption as second languages in the future, “It is not appropriate to adopt Chinese due to its word order, the difficulty of learning it, and the slight benefits to be gained.” As for English, he said that although there might be much benefit after it is grasped, “it is very difficult to learn and thus you may not see results with this language.” He concludes: “Therefore, in terms of Korea’s future, the most profitable to learn will be the Japanese language.”<sup>8</sup>

While, from today’s perspective, such arguments may seem overly simplistic and subjective, even self-serving and prejudiced, there is no real reason to doubt Okakura’s sincerity in putting them forward, and he was clearly assuming that it would be Koreans who would make the final choice as to which languages would in fact be taught. Two decades later the choice was no longer in Korean hands.

---

<sup>7</sup> Japan Friendship Association, *Yuhō Kyōkai Kaihō* [Friendship Association Bulletin], Appendix 2: “*Chōsen kokumin kyōiku shinan*” [A new plan for Korean national education], 1894, p. 4; cited in Yi Sukucha, *ibid.*, p. 39.

<sup>8</sup> Morita, *op. cit.*, p. 40

In 1901, according to a Japanese source, there were nine “Japanese language” schools, founded by Japanese, in Korea.<sup>9</sup> Most of these schools may not, however, have taught the Japanese language *per se*, but rather used it as a medium for teaching other, primarily business, subjects. Among them, Kaesōng School in Pusan was probably the most established. This school had financial backing from Japanese individual supporters and politicians who believed it necessary to “spread the Japanese language and new knowledge” in Korea, and its school regulations state that its purpose was “to enlighten Korean nationals and promote ethical education as well as cultivate talents.” It had elementary, middle and high school divisions, with a 12-year curriculum.<sup>10</sup> While it took the form of a language school, in fact it taught all kinds of modern academic subjects in addition to Japanese, including history, mathematics, geography , chemistry, art, law, economics, as well as the Chinese classics and “foreign languages” — all through the medium of Japanese.

By 1907, there were already 30 such Japanese language schools with at least 100 students each scattered across Korea.<sup>11</sup> According to Watabe Manabu, these schools gradually shifted their focus from teaching various academic and business subjects — their main concern — through Japanese, to teaching the Japanese language as the main subject and the other subjects as secondary concerns.<sup>12</sup> After annexation in 1910, such schools were to be transformed into public schools operated by the Japanese colonial government.

---

<sup>9</sup> Tsuneya Morifuku, *Chōsen Kaikashi Zen* [A Complete History of Korean Development], Toa Dō Bunkan ed., Tokyo, Hakubunkan, 1901, p. 370; cited in Yi Sukucha, *op. cit.*, p. 41.

<sup>10</sup> Pusan City Gov’t., Pusan Kyōiku Kai, eds., *Pusan Kyōiku Gojūnenshi* [Fifty Years of Education in Pusan], Pusan, 1927, p. 66; cited in Yi, *ibid.*, p. 42.

<sup>11</sup> Tokunaga Terumi, *Kankoku Soran* [Korean Conspectus], Tokyo, Hakubunkan, 1907; cited in Yi Sukucha, *ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> Watabe Manabu, “*Chōsen ni okeru Nichigo gakkō*” [Japanese language schools in Korea], in *Gakusō*, published by Tokyo Imperial University], No. 1, 1942; cited in Yi Sukucha, *ibid.*, p. 43

Although the ardent educational endeavors of Korean reformers and scholars led to the establishment of some new-style native Korean schools alongside the new-style schools set up through Christian missionary efforts, the larger political situation in which Korea was engulfed at the turn of the century brought a drastic change in both educational direction and Korean language planning. In short, as Japanese militarism gained the upper hand in the Korean Peninsula, through the exploitation of Korean domestic conflict and Korea's complex external relationships,<sup>13</sup> albeit in the name of "protection," the indigenous struggles for reform and modernization were step by step preempted by a modernization program suited to Japanese strategic concerns. The first step in this process was the shedding, in 1894-95, upon the command of the Korean King Kojong, backed by a group of reformers, of the Chinese calendar,<sup>14</sup> the official examination system based on the Chinese classics and Confucian thought, and various customs inherited from China. This rejection of some of the trappings of Korea's Chinese linkage was accompanied by the establishment of new legal codes supposedly suitable to a "modernized country." On January 7, 1895 King Kojong conducted a pilgrimage with the crown prince to the family's ancestral altars to consecrate a 14-article proclamation which, among other things, stated "The old sentiment of subordination toward Qing [China] will be terminated and a self-reliant and independent foundation for the country established." After mentioning that various legislative, political, economic and other reforms would be undertaken, the proclamation goes on to say "Bright youth from all over the country will be sent abroad to learn academic subjects, technology and the arts," and that "Human resources must be sought out widely regardless of family or clan

---

<sup>13</sup> Among the signposts marking Japan's advance into Korea are the Tonghak rebellion, the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-95 and the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-05.

<sup>14</sup> Use of the Chinese calendar was a primary symbol of the subordinate or "tributary" relationship of East Asian countries to China or, more properly, to the Chinese emperor.

background.”<sup>15</sup> It is significant that this step in the reform process is today still positively evaluated in Korean social studies texts as a “large-scale reform unprecedented in our history. Although somewhat influenced by Japan, it has great significance for the course of modernization in our country.”<sup>16</sup>

In 1895 the Korean government decreed the establishment of normal schools, foreign language schools, governmental college and elementary schools, and in 1899 junior high schools, medical schools and commercial and industrial schools. In 1900 it promulgated regulations governing foreign language schools and in 1904 regulations concerning agricultural, commercial and industrial schools.<sup>17</sup>

The results of these administrative efforts were rather minor, with one senior elementary school and eight basic elementary schools established in Seoul, and 57 basic elementary schools set up in local regions (mainly in Kyōnggi Province) by 1908. A single normal school, the Hansung Normal School, was established in Seoul in April 1895, and one junior high school, the Hansung Middle School, was set up in Seoul in 1900. Aside from their limited numbers, these schools were deficient in other ways. Their organization and operation was said to be the result of “superficial borrowing from foreign laws and regulations and not suitable to the national needs of the time.” Moreover, they were “short of facilities and teachers and in some cases were schools in name only.”<sup>18</sup> Hence the traditional *sōdang* remained the basic educational institutions. In any case the “modern” schools were destined to be short-lived due to the Japanese takeover in 1910.

---

<sup>15</sup> Quoted in Morita, *op. cit.*, p. 51.

<sup>16</sup> Ministry of Education of Korea, eds., *Shakai* [Society], 6th Grade, No. 2, Seoul, Ministry of Education, 1985; cited in Morita, *ibid.*, p. 52.

<sup>17</sup> Morita, *ibid.*

<sup>18</sup> Korean Academic Bureau, *Kankoku Kyōiku* [Korean Education], September 1908; cited in Morita, *ibid.*

As for “foreign language schools,” there were already a few in existence: one Japanese, one English and one Chinese school had been set up in 1891. After the royal proclamation, English, Japanese and French schools were set up in Seoul under government jurisdiction in 1895, to be followed by a Russian school in 1896, another Chinese school in 1897, and a German school in 1898. Provision was made for these central schools to operate branch schools, but only the Japanese school did so — opening one in Inchon and one in Pyongyang — and these were turned into official Japanese-run schools under the Resident-General’s Office in 1906. All these language schools invited foreign language teachers from abroad. That such schools had a high priority with the Korean government is attested by the fact that they accounted for fully 44 percent of the educational budget in 1900.<sup>19</sup>

In his history of Korean education, Oda Shōgo gives his general impression of the education of the time as follows: “In elementary school, most of the study centers on the reading of Chinese books with Korean pronunciation and on calligraphy. Generally, each school has one class with a single teacher and the students never exceed 50, usually numbering around ten. The official normal college has only one class of 25 students. The junior high schools have slightly better conditions than the elementary schools but could never evolve into senior high schools.”<sup>20</sup>

Despite this rather bleak characterization, the Korean government was making efforts to institute educational reform. In 1895, the Academic Bureau published a series of textbooks, the “National Elementary Readers,” the first standardized native texts of their kind. The next year a revised edition was published, and it is significant that in carrying out the revision the Bureau was advised by two Japanese educational officials. Among the changes was the introduction of Japanese historical personalities as central

---

<sup>19</sup> Morita, *ibid.*, p. 54.

<sup>20</sup> Oda Chōgo, *Chōsen Kyōikushi* [A History of Korean Education]; quoted in Morita, *ibid.*, p. 53.

figures. Such changes presaged the outright suppression of Korean “national” textbooks following the country’s annexation in 1910.

To sum up: The period 1876-1905 was one in which the Korean people (under the direction of their ruling elite), for long isolated from most of the rest of the world but now under mounting external pressures from more technologically advanced powers, moved to protect their independence through “modernization” of various kinds, including educational reform and language planning. This effort was influenced from the outset to a substantial degree by Korea’s neighbor Japan, partially because of its role as one of those same more technologically advanced powers with “interests” in Korea, but also because of its proximity and language and cultural affinities, real and supposed. The relationship was an ambiguous one at the start and remained so throughout this period. But as time went on, Japanese influence grew, until what initiative had been possessed by Koreans was largely supplanted by Japanese initiative — in the form first of advice and advisors — all in the name of “modernization.” In the field of language, the movement was from one of very limited bilingualism, with Japanese being promoted as a tool for use by Korean specialists for ends of Korea’s own choosing, in the direction of a universal Japanese bilingualism serving much more ambiguous ends.

## **II. “Protectorate” Stage (1905-1910)**

Although Japan’s victory in the Russo-Japanese War (1904–05) may have played some part in inspiring the independence movements in Asian countries then under the influence of Western colonial powers, it wasn’t long before any illusions of deliverance by the self-styled Asian “champion” were replaced by the reality of attempts at an even tighter control by the military government of Imperial Japan. In Korea’s case, under the first Korean–Japan Protocol of August 22, 1904, Korea’s economic and diplomatic independence was constrained by the supervision of Japanese government “advisors.” In

a second Protocol, signed the next year (1905), Korea, now as a protectorate, completely forfeited its diplomatic independence to a Resident-General sent to Seoul by the Japanese government in place of the former embassy.<sup>21</sup>

One month before this second protocol was signed, in October 1905, at a Japanese government cabinet meeting which dealt mainly with the political, military and financial aspects of control, the cabinet laid out the basic outlines of an assimilation policy including, as a key tool, control of Korean education, the statement being made that “the main objective of education in Korea is to bring Japan’s influence to bear on Koreans”<sup>22</sup>

While this new policy stopped short of calling for the obliteration of Koreans’ ethnicity, it certainly carried no trace of support for Korean people’s aspirations for modernization in behalf of Korea’s own national integrity.

In any case, it was crucial for the Japanese colonial rulers that they suppress indigenous private schools, with their implications for ethnic independence, if their assimilationist policy was to succeed. The rationalization adopted was that such schools were engaged in empty “political” theorizing and propaganda when what Korea needed was a “civilizing education.” The banner of the Japanese educational drive in this period was thus to be “civilizing education for Koreans.”

Two reports by Tawara Magoichi in 1910<sup>23</sup> manifest this blueprint for educational aggression in Korea in the name of “civilizing education.” In these reports, Tawara criticized Korean schools as “backward,” claiming “there is nothing academic but only the cramming of Chinese characters,” and that “Korea needs a new education system

---

<sup>21</sup> Even the native Korean name “Seoul” was to be dropped after Korea’s annexation in 1910 in favor of the Japanese name Keijō or “Capital City.”

<sup>22</sup> Katsura Tarō, *Katsura Tarō Den* [Biography of Katsura Tarō], Vol. 2, Tokyo, n.d., p. 305–8; quoted in Ozawa, *op. cit.*, p. 56.

<sup>23</sup> Tawara Magoichi, *Kankoku Kyōiku no Kiō Oyobi Genzai* [Past and Present of Korean Education], Tokyo, 1910 & Tawara Magoichi, *Kankoku Kyōiku no Genjō*, Tokyo, 1910; both quoted in Ozawa, *ibid.*, p. 61.

mainly based on useful and clear-cut knowledge of daily life.” He repeatedly states that “The Korean populace do not know what education really means,” and justifies the propriety of education of Koreans by Japanese on the basis of the “new civilization” of Japan as opposed to the “backward civilization” of Korea.

The true nature of this theoretical argument for “civilizing education” by a colonial power is revealed through the necessity of military support for its enforcement among Koreans. In fact this “civilizing education” was to be used primarily as a tool to supplant the indigenous education movement for ethnic or national independence of Korea.

Japanese rulers at first adopted a policy of divide and rule to deal with the existing several thousand indigenous schools. At the outset, they divided them into two categories — so-called “political schools” which “debated politics” and “religious schools,” most of which were Christian mission schools established by Western powers and which could not be readily brought under control due to the extraterritorial rights under which they still operated. These religious schools were categorized as “civilized” as “they are wholeheartedly contributing to the promotion of Korean modernization by educating Koreans as well as working for religious goals, just like Japanese government schools in Korea.”<sup>24</sup>

It was said of the so-called “political schools” that “their principal error lies in their understanding of the meaning and process of education and their mixing of politics and education....They are backward and irrational and administered by sham educators.” As proof of their backwardness, Tawara pointed to: 1) their goal-oriented educational theory that promoted education in order to recover national sovereignty and independence by undermining the status quo; 2) their being schools “in name only,” structurally ill-

---

<sup>24</sup> This preferred policy toward “religious schools” did not last long. After the suppression of the “political schools” was accomplished, private religious schools were in turn suppressed by distinguishing them from “purely educational” establishments.

equipped and disorganized; 3) their main subjects being physical education, recreation and “debate” and their lack of academic subjects, their textbooks being filled with indignant words concerning the existing state of affairs and the songs sung in them being filled with dangerous contents aimed at agitating the students.<sup>25</sup>

Japan’s second Resident-General in Korea, Sone Kōsuke was to argue that, “In these Korean schools, they often do irrational things such as mixing political issues into the teaching materials, in vain forcing difficult questions into children’s unsophisticated brains, and don’t realize that they are leaving untaught the most important academic subjects.”<sup>26</sup>

Whatever their actual shortcomings, it is clear from these charges against the indigenous “political schools” that the issue for their Japanese detractors was not in fact the absence of “civilizing education” but their concern for enhancing their students’ sense of Korean identity. This concern was alone sufficient to discredit them in the eyes of Tawara and others like him who saw Korea in terms of its closeness with and utility for Japan.

Ozawa Yūsaku points out that the “civilizing education” argument was also bolstered by contrasting “civilizing education” to “feudal education” — in a bid to make it attractive to those Korean modernizing elements who were prone to see their mission in terms of anti-feudalism, by denying any progressive aspects to the “political schools.” But whatever the banner, the purpose was the same: disarming the opposition of the colonized people to rule and exploitation by the external colonizing power.

This theory of “civilizing education” was closely echoed in Resident-General Itō Hakubun’s ideas. According to Itō, “In countries like Korea, most of the people do not understand what popular education means. Therefore it is necessary to guide them, just

---

<sup>25</sup> Tawara, *op. cit.*, pp. 2-3; quoted in Ozawa, *op. cit.*, p. 58.

<sup>26</sup> Ozawa, *ibid.*, p. 59

like nurses treating their child charges with patience and care. After all, they have a good basic character to be educated towards civilization.”<sup>27</sup> Although Itō’s formulation here may seem paternalistic in the extreme, such comparisons of Koreans to children were not uncommon, and in fact were implied, if not made explicit, in many of the theories and rationalizations of the would-be “civilizing” colonial educators.

The idea of education’s “civilizing” mission was embodied in the “New Education” policies and curriculum worked out for Korea. But while the term “new education,” with its avowedly “practical focus,” implied a large measure of science and technology in Japan proper, it was shorn of these things in its Korean application and reduced to a daily utilitarianism and shallow vocationalism. For example, for the Koreans, “In order to correct traditional negative customs such as empty and superficial arguing over politics,” it was claimed, “there must be moral education based upon the five ethics and five morals of Confucius” to “encourage good habits like the harmonizing of study and labor,” and to foster “good citizens who work diligently and steadily to support their daily life in terms of clothing, food and housing, raising wholesome families and enriching the nation.”<sup>28</sup> Resident-General Sone, quoted earlier, also placed the emphasis on vocationalism: “It is crucial to reduce the students’ empty disputation while fostering large contingents to engage in vocations such as agriculture, industry and commerce.”<sup>29</sup>

One significant element in the “New Education” was to be the teaching of the Japanese language. Mito Chūzō, an official of the Academic Bureau of the Resident-General’s Office, explained the need for Japanese language acquisition as follows:

Today, when interchange between our two countries has become a regular affair and our nations are cooperating in the business and political spheres,

---

<sup>27</sup> Ozawa, *ibid.*

<sup>28</sup> Ozawa, *ibid.*

<sup>29</sup> Sone Arasuke, *Kankōritsu Futsūgakkō Kyōkan ni taisuru Kunji* [Instruction to School Commissioners of Governmental and Public Futsūgakkō], Seoul, 1908; quoted in Ozawa, *ibid.*

the understanding of Japanese is of obvious significance. Whether one is a government official aspiring to work in important positions, a merchant pursuing profit, or somebody seeking employment in the public or private spheres, it is most useful to know Japanese. So many Japanese are now coming over to Korea, and the relationships are steadily increasing and becoming so common, that those Koreans who do not know Japanese and must rely on interpreters may lose out in business negotiations — agricultural, industrial or commercial — as well as in human relationships. Considering the serious implications for the future, it is crucial to teach Korean children the Japanese language for their own well-being.<sup>30</sup>

Tawara held a similar view:

It happens that they are incapable of protecting their interests because of a lack of understanding of the current trends in society due to their lack of training in Japanese....It is therefore very important to make Japanese language a compulsory subject in order to foster people who can work at middle class jobs in the society.<sup>31</sup>

Tawara also claimed that as Korean teachers did not have sufficient educational experience, “it is impossible to operate schools without adopting the Japanese language.”

Ozawa sees this Japanese language enforcement as a secondary aim of Japan’s “civilizing education,” or as but a step in the cultural subjugation of the Korean people for the ultimate purpose of enslaving them economically. As he sees it, it was a way for Japan to close the gate through which Koreans might absorb modern culture on their own terms and in their own self-interest. The goal of “civilizing education” was, after all, to create a non-Korean, apolitical, “practical” populace as a prerequisite to turning them into additional subjects of the Japanese emperor. Rather than a policy pursued out of deep conviction, it was really only a temporary rationalization to promote the assumption of hegemony by Japan over Korea.

---

<sup>30</sup> Mito Chūzō, *Gakka Katei Oyobi Kyōkasho Hensanshishi ni Kansuru Setsumei* [Explanation on the compilation of curriculum and textbooks], June 1908; cited in Ozawa, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

<sup>31</sup> Ozawa, *ibid.*

### III. First Korean Education Order Period (1911-1921)

The annexation of Korea in 1910 ended Korean sovereignty and marked Japan's assumption of complete control over Korean education. Under Terauchi Masatake, the first post-annexation Governor-General, the military police system was implemented throughout the peninsula.<sup>32</sup> At the same time, in Seoul, Korean books on politics, geography, history, literature, biographies of Korean heroes and, indeed, anything of an ethnic or nationalistic nature were removed from bookstores and libraries and destroyed. The printing of Korean-sponsored papers and periodicals and publishing of works of both academic and non-academic types by Korean groups was prohibited. Novels and folk songs which were popular for their ethnic or patriotic content were designated "dangerous" and banned.<sup>33</sup>

Terauchi, who was feared as a militaristic dictator by many Koreans, laid out the general outlines of his approach to nationalistic education in a threatening tone even in his inauguration speech:

"Among the private junior and senior schools there are some which advocate independence through songs and the like, or which give ideas to the students to encourage resistance to the Empire. Such conduct must not be allowed and we must be vigilant. Koreans must reflect upon what kind of result they are inviting by fostering such ideology among their youth. Suppose they do ask for independence and rebel against Japan; this

---

32 "The number of police and intelligence officers serving the Resident-General grew from 7,900 to 13,911." [Yi Sukucha, *op. cit.*, pp. 910-911]

33 The *Maeil Shinbo* [Daily News] was allowed to continue publication under the supervision of the Resident-General's Office as a semi-governmental newspaper. Originally known as the *Taehan Maeil Shinbo* [Korea Daily News], this newspaper had been thought of as "anti-Japanese" during the patriotic enlightenment movement around the turn of the century. The word *Taehan* [Korea] had to be removed from the name to prevent it from stimulating ethnic awareness. Han Gion, *Kankoku Kyōkashoshi* (A History of Korean Textbooks), Pyongyang, n.d., p. 303. See also Hatada Takashi, *Nyūmon Chōsen no Rekishi* [Primer of Korean History], Tokyo, Sanseido, 1986, p. 151.

will never result in happiness for Koreans. Japan would suppress them by force, and there would be no leniency. Koreans themselves would be the losers.”<sup>34</sup>

Terauchi soon increased supervision and control over schools, treating the matter as one of the most important facets of overall social control, in the knowledge that schools had indeed been among the most formative tools of both ideology and action for independence. Subtle intimidation was introduced into the classroom by, among other things, requiring Japanese teachers to wear uniforms complete with swords. Yet even with such innovations and under the tight scrutiny and control by the military police force, some private schools attempted to continue to impart ideas of resistance. For example, the Onchōn private school of Northern Hamgyōng Province, was shut down after being condemned by the Japanese authorities for its independence-fostering activities: “teaching national folk songs, poems praising Ahn Choong-keun<sup>35</sup> and prohibited Korean history and geography; and guiding the writing of an essay entitled ‘Read the Korean Language’ which was found in students’ notebooks.”<sup>36</sup>

In October 1911, a “Regulation Act for Private Schools” was adopted. This Act was aimed at tightly controlling the curriculum, textbooks and teachers and mandated the closing of those schools which contravened its provisions or which were likely to “disturb order” or “corrupt good morals.” Problematic schools were to either appoint principals who would obey the colonial authorities or close their doors. It is telling that between Korea’s annexation (1910) and 1919, the numbers of these private schools was reduced by 70-80 percent.

---

<sup>34</sup> Terauchi Masatake, *Kakudō naichōkan ni taisuru kunji* [Directive to the directors of prefectures], Meiji 43 [1910], November; quoted in Ozawa, *op. cit.*, p. 62.

<sup>35</sup> The assassin of the first Resident-General, Itō Hakubun. Ahn Choong-keun, who, because of his belief in national independence, assassinated Resident-General Itō Hakubun in 1909, has ever since been revered as a national hero of independence.

<sup>36</sup> Kang Dök-sang, ed., *Chōsen* [Korea], Vol. I, n.p., 1908., p. 15; cited in Ozawa, *op. cit.*, p. 63

**Table I. Numbers of Private (Native Korean or Missionary) Schools**

Year	No. of Schools	No. of Students
1910	1,973	80,760
1911	1,671	71,522
1912	1,362	57,377
1913	1,282	58,766
1914	1,244	65,725
1915	1,154	56,793
1916	1,045	54,197
1917	868	49,745
1918	778	44,915
1919	742	38,204

*Source:* Korean Resident-General's Office. *Shiritsu Kakushū Gakkō no Jōkyō* [The Situation Concerning Korean People's Education in Various Kinds of Private Schools]<sup>37</sup>

Even as these private schools were being shut down, Korean people managed to find ways to increase the number of *sǒdang* — tutoring schools nominally focusing on Chinese classical literature — so as to keep education in Korean culture and history alive. But these, too, were subjected to regulation in 1917.<sup>38</sup>

Under such circumstances, by 1919, all legal channels for the conducting of ethnic education among Koreans had been closed and those schools which continued to exist were watched very tightly by the Japanese authorities in the name of national security. Any ethnic or nationalist education that did manage to persist did so “underground” — on remote islands, the frontiers between provinces, in anti-Japanese guerrilla areas, or abroad in such places as Shanghai where a Korean government-in-exile existed.

Although the educational policies of the Japanese colonial authorities in Korea did have a truly educational component, the outright suppression of indigenous Korean

<sup>37</sup> Cited in Hatada, *op.cit.*, p. 151.

<sup>38</sup> By the time of their regulation in 1917, the number of *sǒdang* had increased to 25,486 with 259,531 students (according to the Korean Governor-General's Office), up from roughly 10,000 *sǒdang* in 1908 (Korean Government source).

schools in this period make it even more obvious that the primary policy was to thoroughly purge all ethnically independent thought among Koreans in the name of security. Following Korea's outright annexation, one of the clearest differences in policy from the earlier "advisory" period was the elevation of the Japanese emperor system to a position of political dominance. Korean people were now the subjects of the Japanese Emperor and as such were expected to be obedient in word and thought as well as in deed.

Whereas people like Tawara had earlier rationalized "civilizing education" and Japanese language education for Koreans as necessary for survival and well-being in various concrete fields, persons like Terauchi could be more forthright: "The first aim of education is to make Korea a civilized nation by letting Koreans recognize the special grace bestowed upon them by the Emperor...For this purpose, it is necessary — in an orderly manner and step by step — to develop Korea by introducing Japanese culture...and help them to foster good qualities and a noble spirit in order to be proper subjects of imperial rule."<sup>39</sup>

The first priority of Terauchi's Korean rule was to make Korea subordinate to Imperial Japan and the education of Koreans had to serve this purpose. And as Japanese language was the "essence" of the imperial subject, it was indispensable that it be acquired by the Korean population.

It was in this context that the (First) Korean Education Order was promulgated in August 1911. In its opening article, the Order states that all of Korean education is to be based upon this "imperial" ordinance, while the second article states that "the principal aim of Korean education is to foster good and loyal subjects." From then on, loyalty to

---

<sup>39</sup> Terauchi Masatake. Speech outlining principles of rule after Korea's annexation. December 1910; quoted in Ozawa, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

the Japanese emperor was to be the criterion for judging the success of education among Korean youth — an obvious and absolute negation of Korean ethnicity.

Terauchi emphasized that “this education is especially aimed at the cultivation of ethical qualities and the diffusion of the national language [Japanese] in order to provide the qualities and nobleness [necessary] for being imperial subjects.”<sup>40</sup> The “ethical qualities” referred to boiled down, of course, to the ideology appropriate to the imperial system. Nor were Terauchi and other colonial officials alone in espousing such an education. Prominent academics of the time in mainland Japan came out in support. To take one example, Hozumi Yatsuka, who served as an advisor in the drafting of the Korean Education Order, stated: “Education in Korea can be considered a success if it simply and first of all plants the idea of respect for the Emperor; secondly, fosters the idea of maintaining order and sticking to the rules; and finally, imparts the knowledge and skills necessary in daily life and for the raising of one’s family.” He recommended that the ideology of the emperor system be instilled in Korean children before they realized their own ethnic identity, saying, “Children in elementary school are not yet immersed in politics but are soon to become the backbone of society. Therefore it is important to implant respect for the Imperial Family before they are touched by evil ideologies.”<sup>41</sup>

Another policy which was stressed along with the Japanization policy was starting vocational education from the primary level so as to reform the “bad custom” of wasting time on “empty theory and argument” and “looking down on practical knowledge.”<sup>42</sup> Or as Terauchi put it: “In today’s Korea, lofty scholarship is not yet what is required due to the inadequate state of development. Today’s urgent need in education is to foster human

---

<sup>40</sup> Resident-General of Korea, Korean Education Order, 1911. [Quoted in Ozawa, *ibid.*, p. 65]

<sup>41</sup> Ozawa, *ibid.*

<sup>42</sup> Terauchi Masatake, *Kakudō naimu buchō ni taisuru kunji* [Directive to the heads of prefectural internal affairs departments], July 1911; cited in Ozawa, *ibid.*

being able to engage in useful daily affairs....Above all, the aim of education is to impart the knowledge necessary to act as responsible individuals and serve the nation. There is no necessity to be in a hurry to go beyond this under today's circumstances.”<sup>43</sup>

These two aspects, to instill the qualities appropriate to an imperial subject (de-ethnicization) and foster able workers (utilitarianism), were the two pillars of Japanese colonial education.

In June 1918, this Korean Education Order was annotated for distribution among the Korean populace. In the annotations, it is clearly stated that “the subjects of the Emperor include Koreans, and Koreans must appreciate the general grace [*go-ontaku*] of the Emperor in regarding Koreans as distinct [from Japanese].” Koreans are asked to “honor the Constitution” and, “should emergencies arise.” they “must contribute to the State [Japan] with all your spiritual, physical and financial might.”<sup>44</sup>

The strong measures taken by Terauchi — dubbed “government by bayonet” by his detractors — had their effects despite being devoid of sensitivity and respect toward the ethnicity of Koreans. Shinohara Wataru, who had been an official Japanese advisor on education to the Korean government in 1900, returned to Korea around this time to observe the results of a decade of application of the assimilation policy.<sup>45</sup> He praised “the educational achievements of the new era,” saying, “Today the *kō-on* [Imperial benevolence] of the Emperor is taught everywhere [in Korea] and the ideology of the nation is gradually taking firm hold. It is especially amazing to see [native] Korean teachers explaining *kō-on* to their Korean pupils.” He went on to write that in order to investigate how far the idea of *kō-on* had in fact permeated the Korean pupils’ thinking,

---

<sup>43</sup> Ozawa, *ibid.*

<sup>44</sup> Resident-General’s Office, Korea. *Shisei Sanjūnenshi* [A Thirty Year History of Governance (of Korea)], 1940, p. 372; cited in Ozawa, *ibid.*, p. 66.

<sup>45</sup> Shinohara visited in January 1917 and recorded his impressions in his book *Chōsen Kyōiku Ron* [Theory of Korean Education], published in Tokyo in 1919. [cited in Ozawa, *ibid.*, pp. 67-68]

he conducted some questioning. To his stilted query “Why we can pass our daily lives in peace?”, the answer came back from most of the pupils: “Thanks to the Emperor!” And to his question “What is loyalty?”, the most frequent reply was “To do our best to serve the Emperor and the country.” He thus concluded, “Korean education is now at the turning point from the education of a colonial region to the education of fellow countrymen.”

That ten years of education under the policy of assimilation was not quite the success that Shinohara described was to be proven only two years later with the outbreak of what came to be known as the “March First” or “Samil” movement,<sup>46</sup> a manifestation of Korean ethnicity and nationalist sentiment which had been first forced underground then exacerbated by Japanese colonial policies pursued since the turn of the century. At the end of February 1919, several million Koreans — including people of all ages, even children — took to the streets to demonstrate for freedom and independence.<sup>47</sup> Korean students played the leading role. Starting on March 1, all Korean private schools throughout the country closed their gates, and in the governmental public schools, from elementary through secondary, pupils and students boycotted classes to participate in the demonstrations. Estimates of the total number of demonstrators ranged from the 850,000 of the Government-General to two million according to other sources.<sup>48</sup> The Japanese imperial government dispatched the army to suppress the movement with much violence and bloodshed.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> The Korean term *Samil* means simply 3-1 — or March 1st.

<sup>47</sup> Prior to this outburst at home, Korean students in Japan had gathered on February 8 to issue a statement addressed to the Japanese government on Korean independence, and had subsequently carried out several further demonstrations.

<sup>48</sup> Editorial Committee for a History of Education, *Meiji-kō Kyōikuseido Hattatsushi* [History of the Development of Education Since Meiji], Tokyo, Kyōiku Shiryō Chōsakai, 1964; cited in Yi Sukucha, *op. cit.*, p. 82.

<sup>49</sup> In the months March to May following the outbreak of the movement, casualties among the demonstrators were given as 7,506 dead, 15,961 injured and 46,948 arrested. [History Institute of the

Following the suppression of the March First Movement, the Japanese government modified its assimilation policy while tightening security. Prime Minister Hara Kei issued three major directives: 1) Civilian control was to be substituted for military control of the peninsula; 2) A civil police force was to be substituted for military police; and 3) Education policy was to be unified for Koreans and Japanese. The combined force of these directives was, in effect, to treat Korea as a part of Japan proper and to assimilate it completely.<sup>50</sup> On the other hand, the shift from military to civil forms was also a compensatory reaction to the large-scale and well-organized national mobilization of the March First Movement, with the Japanese government feeling forced to adopt some ameliorating measures. In addition to the replacement of General Terauchi as Governor-General by a civilian official, Saito Minoru, in the name of establishing a “civilian administration,” the salary systems for Korean and Japanese officials — including teachers — were equalized. The employment contracts of Korean school principals were renewed, official uniforms and swords were dropped as mandatory for Japanese teachers, and (in 1924) a Korean was made head of the Academic Bureau of the Government-General of Korea. The First Education Order was partially revised to extend elementary schooling by two years through the addition of new subjects such as Japanese history and geography.<sup>51</sup> These revisions were, of course, far from introducing the Korean ethnic education demanded by the March First demonstrators. The thinking of

---

Democratic People's Republic of Korea, eds., *History of the Modern Korean Revolutionary Movement* (in Korean), Pyongyang, 1964, p. 206; cited in Ozawa, *op. cit.*, p. 69] According to the Governor-General of Korea, up until May 8, 635 Korean elementary and junior high school offenders — 10 percent of the total number said detained — were tried for their roles in the demonstrations. [Kondo Kenichi, ed., *Banzai Sō Jwai Jiken* (Salute the Unrest Incident), Vol. I, Tokyo, 1963, p. 109; cited in Ozawa, *ibid.*]

50 Hara Kei, *Hara Kei Nikki* [Diary of Hara Kei], Tokyo, 1919, entry for April 9, 1919; cited in Ozawa, *ibid.*

51 Two newspapers were even allowed to publish in the Korean language. The *Korean Daily* began publication on March 5, 1920 while the *Eastern Asia Daily* appeared on April 1, 1920. [Yi Sukucha, *op. cit.*, p. 82]

the Japanese government is well conveyed by the words of Yuge Kōtarō, the academic director of the Government-General at the time. Yuge, a proponent of the destruction of Korean ethnicity, is quoted as saying that the chief cause of the March First “uprising” was precisely the Koreans’ desire for independence. Therefore it was, he said, important to reduce the Korean sense of identity and eventually replace it with the idea that they were, after all, “Japanese.” He continued that one approach to this assimilation was “to develop their reason.” As a means to this end, he suggested the following: 1) Helping Koreans to understand the blessings of the Emperor’s rule over Korea; 2) Getting Koreans to accept the “inevitability” of Japanese rule by educating them about Japan and the world situation — the position of Japan in the world; and 3) Teaching students to exercise self-control and not be susceptible to demagoguery.<sup>52</sup>

In this period of the First Korean Education Order and its revision following the March First Movement, the Korean school curriculum was organized to cater to the Japanization of Koreans, while Korean history and culture were excised. At the same time a school structure was built within which to impart this revised curriculum and personnel were trained to do the imparting. All this will be discussed in detail in the chapter on implementation (Ch. 3). The chief point to be made here is that in the period following annexation, the educational goals of the Japanese authorities became quite clear: Korean education was to serve Japanese imperial interests and the ethnic interests of the Koreans themselves were to be sacrificed to that end.

#### **IV. Second Korean Education Order Period (1922–1937)**

The period of the Second Korean Education Order is best characterized by the common slogan of the time, “*Isshi dōjin*” — which meant that the two peoples were to be

---

<sup>52</sup> Yuge Kōtarō, *Chōsen no Kyōiku* [Korean Education], 1923, pp. 242-45; quoted in Ozawa, *op. cit.*, p. 76

“viewed alike under the [Emperor’s] impartial generosity.”<sup>53</sup> In its application to education, this hypothetical “equality” was used to justify a stepped-up assimilation through the adoption of the same schooling for Koreans in Korea as was given to Japanese at home. Mizuno Kentarō, the administrative head of the government-general in Korea, stated on the day of promulgation of the new Education Order, February 4, 1922: “The new education system derives from the sacred intent of the Emperor, ‘*isshī dōjin*.’ That is to say, it does away with discrimination and is based on the system of Japan proper. As a result, unlike the old order which was for Koreans only, under the new order there will be no ethnic discrimination and all will be unified under a single law.”<sup>54</sup>

Despite such pronouncements, however, differentiation unavoidably remained. But now, in place of the general ethnic (“racial”) differentiation of Koreans and Japanese, the dividing line was to be language: those who spoke the “national language” (Japanese) in their daily lives, and those who did not.<sup>55</sup> Those in the first category (initially mostly Japanese residing in Korea) would go to *shōgakkō* (literally “elementary schools”), while those in the second (virtually all Koreans) would attend *futsūgakkō* (literally “common schools”).<sup>56</sup> Nevertheless, the new Educational Order specifies that the educational

---

<sup>53</sup> The slogan was used frequently by the government as part of its pacification campaign in the aftermath of the March First Movement. See Yi Sukcha, *op. cit.*, p. 86

<sup>54</sup> Government-General of Korea, ed., *Shisei no kansuru Yukoku, Kunji Narabini Enjutsu* [Instructions, directives and speeches concerning administration], August 1920 – June 1922, Seoul, 1922. Quoted in *ibid.*

<sup>55</sup> In Japanese, the two categories were “*Kokugo wo jōyō suru mono*” and “*Kokugo wo jōyō shinai mono*.”

<sup>56</sup> In fact, these two types of schools had existed since the annexation, with the government running *shōgakkō* for Japanese children coming to or born in Korea because of their parents’ stationing there. These *shōgakkō* were from the start operated exactly the same way as elementary schools at home, with teaching staff, curriculum and textbooks all brought from Japan.

Under the Second Education Order, although there were certain regulations which had to be complied with depending on one’s region of residence, young people were allowed to attend either type of school regardless of their ethnic background. That the intermixing was, in fact, limited is shown by figures for 1937, the last year of the Second Education Order period: 516 Japanese attended lower-level Korean-language *futsūgakkō* [i.e., grades 1–3], and 175 attended higher-level *futsūgakkō* [grades 4–6], while 2364 Koreans attended Japanese-language *shōgakkō*, 465 Korean boys attended mixed boys’ middle

content is to be the same in both systems and the length of the *futsūgakkō* was to be extended to six years, the same duration as the *shōgakkō* schooling, although it was stipulated that this could be shortened to 4–5 years depending on regional circumstances.

A post-elementary school system in line with that in Japan was also set up by the establishment of secondary and specialized schools and even a university, as well as a normal school for training elementary school teachers (there was as yet no normal school for training secondary school teachers, although special college preparatory classes were set up for the purpose). Those going on from elementary to regular secondary or vocational schools, whether Japanese or Koreans, were not differentiated by language, the assumption being that elementary school graduates would be fluent in Japanese.

Another key difference from the Japanese mainland was that education, whatever the level, was not made compulsory.<sup>57</sup>

Finally, the two systems were to be run by two different administrative hierarchies. The *shōgakkō* were under the jurisdiction of the School Union, a public body comprised of Japanese members, while the *futsūgakkō* were to be run by regional school boards responsible for their finances and with Korean membership.<sup>58</sup> In the long run this administrative division was to have certain negative implications for language planning, as we shall see in a subsequent chapter.

As for curriculum, the Korean language was to be jointly compulsory with Japanese in the *futsūgakkō* although Korean history was to be taught, within the context

---

schools [*chūgakkō*; where the language of instruction was Japanese] and 576 Korean girls attended mixed girls' middle schools [*kōrōjogakkō* — literally “upper girls’ schools” because girls did not go on to university at this time — where the language of instruction was Japanese]. (from Education Section, Academic Bureau, Government-General of Korea, ed., *Chōsen ni okeru Kyōiku no Gaikyo* [The Situation in Korean Education], Seoul, November 1939; cited in Morita, *op. cit.*, p. 101.)

<sup>57</sup> In Japan six years of elementary schooling had become compulsory in March 1907.

<sup>58</sup> Morita, *op. cit.*, p. 100.

of Japanese history. Some of the textbooks were also different in content from those in the *shōgakkō*.

These developments in the assimilation policy were supported by Japanese educators and linguists. For example, Sawayanagi Seitarō, a well-known liberal educator of the Taishō period was invited to Korea in 1921 as an adviser on the revision of the Second Education Order.<sup>59</sup> He praised the new Order as being highly significant “for realizing universal brotherhood [literally, ‘of the four oceans’] and love among mankind, by first ensuring peace and harmony with Koreans, using coeducation with Koreans as a means to that end.” Reflecting the Japanese mood of the times, he went on to say, “Great Britain possesses many colonies encompassing many different ethnic groups, but up until now has not adopted the principle of coeducation in education. Against such a background, for Japan to adopt the idea of coeducation represents very positive progress worthy of pride before the world from the humanistic point of view.”<sup>60</sup>

Unfortunately, like Sawayanagi, most Japanese intellectuals of the time could not or would not see the coeducation policy for what it was, a modified policy of cultural and language invasion and assimilation.<sup>61</sup>

With the promulgation of the Second Education Order, the building of schools was accelerated to accommodate the new policy. Following the founding of a normal school in 1921, a university, Keijō University (“Capital University”), was established in

---

<sup>59</sup> Sawayanagi was invited together with Konishi Shigenao to participate in the Educational Research Committee convened in Seoul in January 1921 to revise the Educational Order. See Ozawa, *op. cit.*, Note 5, p. 76.

<sup>60</sup> Sawayanagi Seitarō, “*Sekai ni hokorubeki Naisen kyōgaku*” [Korea-Japan coeducation stands proud before the world], in *Chōsen* magazine, March 1922; cited in *ibid.*, p. 71.

<sup>61</sup> The poet Ishikawa Takuboku was one of the very few who expressed sympathy for the Koreans and indignancy and criticism toward the Japanese annexation policy in his poems and personal letters. Among his critical poems are 8 *tanka* [short poems] called “Complaints of a September Night.” See *Ishikawa Takuboku Sakuhinshi* [Anthology of Ishikawa Takuboku], Tokyo, Shōwa Shuppansha, 1965. Quoted in Kin Chiei & Yomakawa Chikara, *Nikkan Gappi to Ariran* [The Annexation of Korea by Japan and Ariran], Kokoku Insatsu, December 10, 1992, pp. 140-42.

1923. As for *futsūgakkō*, the number was increased from one per every three administrative districts to one in every district by 1929. Ohno Kenichi, who worked in an administrative position around the time of the Second Korean Education Order, wrote as follows in 1925:

Considering the spread of education since around the revision of the new educational regime, *futsū kyōiku* [common elementary schooling for Koreans] has made a great leap forward — within six years the number of pupils has multiplied three or four times. Among our new fellow nationals [Koreans] those who understand the national language [Japanese] now number one million, or three times the number of 1919.<sup>62</sup>

The 1936 edition of the almanac of the Government-General of Korea reported the diffusion of Japanese language this way:

As for the diffusion of the national language, special attention has been paid to this matter in schools and other institutions since the annexation. In the *futsūgakkō* in particular, 9–12 hours per week of language instruction have been given, and in other subjects, too, the language has been used in instruction, writing and speaking. In the upper-level *futsūgakkō*, vocational and specialized education, besides language classes the national language is also used as the school language [i.e., the principal language of instruction] and its use encouraged. In March 1920 the private school regulations were revised to make training in the national language as well as ethics compulsory so as to strengthen the basis for language diffusion. In the countryside, national language night schools and national language teaching seminars have been conducted...<sup>63</sup>

Despite the optimistic tone of these reports, in fact, when viewed in terms of the entire Korean populace, the enrolment of Korean school-age children was still less than 20 percent in 1929. As for secondary education, in 1928, when the number of *futsūgakkō* was 1581 schools, middle schools numbered 39, specialized schools five and universities one. That is to say, for a Korean population of some 20 million, there were only 39 middle schools while for the 500,000 or so Japanese in Korea there were 34 such

---

<sup>62</sup> Ohno Kenichi, *Chōsen Mondai Kanken* [A Personal View of the Korean Issue], n.p. 1936, p. 153; quoted in Yi Sukucha, *op. cit.*, p. 89.

<sup>63</sup> Government-General of Korea, *Chōsen Sōtokufu Shisei Sanjūnen* [Almanac of the Government-General of Korea, 30th Year], Seoul, Government Printing House, 1936; quoted in Yi Sukucha, *ibid.*, pp. 88-89.

schools. Meanwhile, in Korea's single university only a third of the students were Koreans while most of the researchers and professors were Japanese.

As if in direct rebuttal of the Government-General's and Ohno's reports, fourth Governor-General Yamanashi Yōzō revealed his concerns in 1929 that not everything was well in the field of Korean Education, singling out in particular the slow development of elementary education among the Korean populace and inadequacies in teacher training:

Viewing the current situation of education in the peninsula, while things are now quite well developed in terms of form, there is much to be developed and reformed in terms of content. In the diffusion of elementary education facilities in particular, the numbers and location leave much to be desired. That is to say, half of all the districts in the peninsula are still without *futsūgakkō* and only 18 percent of those eligible to attend school are enrolled.

The actual result of education depends upon the virtue, wisdom and intelligence of the educator, but our teachers' education requires deep consideration. There is much to be reformed in the present teachers' education in the peninsula.<sup>64</sup>

Indeed, the revision of the Second Education Order the same year mainly focused on the reform of teachers' training. As for the spread of *futsūgakkō*, the world economic crisis which also started in 1929, coupled with Japan's unequal economic policies for the peninsula, hit Korea's economy hard and the economic devastation of Korea's rural areas left little leeway for school building. The sixth governor-general, Ugaki Issei, remarked on the situation as follows: "Looking at the trends both internal and external, both psychological and material, confusion and devastation are apparent and a real breakthrough must be made....It is vitally necessary to see the reality in order to harmonize economy and culture for the future; security in both the psychological and material spheres must be pursued."<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> Ohno Kenichi, *op. cit.*, pp. 160-61; quoted in Yi Sukucha, *ibid.*, pp. 92-93.

<sup>65</sup> Police Bureau, Government-General of Korea, *Kankoku Gakusei Kōnichi Tōsōshi* [History of the Anti-Japanese Struggle of Korean Students], Seoul, Government Printing House, 1929, pp. 193-95; quoted in Yi Sukucha, pp. 93-94.

Based on the slogan of pursuing both the psychological and material security of the people, Ugaki did try to promote the recovery of Korean agriculture and the countryside generally, though his reforms were inextricably coupled with the effort to implant the spirit of “subjects of the Emperor” in the minds of the rural inhabitants. More specifically, to solve the problem of low enrolments in the rural schools, a new system of two-year schooling in so-called *kanigakkō* (simplified schools) was introduced in 1934. These *kanigakkō*, which were seen as a part of the existing *futsūgakkō* system and aimed at the universal enrolment of rural Korean children, had as their objectives: 1) the creation of effective Japanese citizens; 2) the imparting of an ability to read, write and speak the “national language” (Japanese); and 3) the teaching of vocational knowledge and skills. *Kanigakkō* were placed under the administration of regular *futsūgakkō* principals, employed full-time teachers and taught ethics, “national language”, Korean, and mathematics as well as the vocational subjects. In order to make them more or less self-supporting, they had their own rice paddies, pigpens, cow barns and chicken coops, and so on.<sup>66</sup>

The *kanigakkō*, like the *futsūgakkō* generally, were a Japanese creation. It will be remembered, however, that there was also a network — “system” is probably not the right word — of “private” Korean-run schools and *sōdang*, and while the Japanese colonial government pursued its efforts to set up its own schooling system designed for Japanese ends, it also worked to bring these other native schools under effective control. The pursuit of such control was not always manifested by a tightening of the rules. For instance, in March 1920, two years prior to the promulgation of the Second Korean Education Order, but following the March First upheaval, the regulations governing private schools underwent a complete revision which included elements of relaxation. Other than “ethics” and “national language” (Japanese), which were compulsory, other

---

<sup>66</sup> Morita, *op. cit.*, pp. 102-103.

subjects to be taught, including religion, were made more open to choice. The qualifications for teachers were also relaxed to some extent. However, ten years later, in 1930, a juridical basis was laid down for the founding of new private schools which placed such schools tightly in Japanese hands.

Meanwhile, in June 1920, the Government-General also issued a law stipulating that all the property and income of the traditional-style *gōkō* (the upper-level schools for training *yangban* following their graduation from the *sōdang*, were to come under the control of the district governments, to be used for the maintenance of the Confucian altars as well as for educational purposes.<sup>67</sup> But in 1929, the establishment of *sōdang*, too, was regulated, with the previous simple registration with local offices being supplanted by the requirement of official permission by district heads. Major textbooks used in teaching in the *sōdang* — “national language” (Japanese), Korean language and mathematics texts — were limited to those compiled by the Government-General.<sup>68</sup> The number of *sōdang* decreased drastically thereafter, until by 1936 their number had been reduced to 6,000. Still and all, the *sōdang* continued to be a major factor in preserving a Korean ethnic and national identity.

Although, from the point of view of the education and language planners, much was achieved under the Second Education Order in terms of the construction of school facilities, the revision of curriculum, and teacher training, a basic blind spot existed: the continuing assimilationist policy. There was simply no fathoming of what it meant for Korean youth to go through a process of “modern education” which utterly neglected their ethnic identity and sense of ethnic self-esteem. This is not to say that there were no signals. The March First Movement was followed by many other school strikes and boycotts over the ensuing years. And despite their varying specific demands, there was a

---

<sup>67</sup> Government-General of Korea, Directive No. 27, June 29, 1920; cited in *ibid.*, p. 101.

<sup>68</sup> Government-General of Korea, Directive No. 55, June 17, 1929; excerpted in *ibid.*, p. 294.

common thread running through their slogans: “Korean control over Korean education!” ; “Make *futsū kyōiku* compulsory!” ; “The language of instruction at *futsūgakkō* must be Korean!” ; “Liberalize junior and post-junior high school student assemblies!” ; “University education must be mainly for Koreans!”<sup>69</sup>

The demand for an indigenous education of ethnic independence culminated in the Kwangju student movement of 1929. Now the slogans included such calls as “Down with Japanese Imperialism!” and “Abolish the colonial slave education!” Supportive strikes were organized in 194 schools throughout the peninsula, and between November 1929 and April of the following year some 60,000 Korean students are said to have become involved in the struggles.<sup>70</sup> The Japanese Government-General responded by arresting and quickly expelling from the schools identified strikers as well as by intensifying the assimilationist education.

And yet it was the assimilation policy itself that was the heart of the problem. In September 1928, Governor-General Yamanashi had issued a directive on “building up noble character” and in October had increased the number of government functionaries responsible for checking up on ideologically deviant education. In August 1928, a major revision of textbooks had been initiated to support the intensified Japanization effort. By 1935, 102 textbooks of 34 kinds had been published under an editorial policy advocating that, “Regardless of subject, there must be no slip-ups in cultivating love of the Emperor

---

<sup>69</sup> According to government records, the number of school strike incidents was 23 in 1921, 52 in 1922, 57 in 1923, 55 in 1924, 48 in 1925, 55 in 1926, 72 in 1927 and 83 in 1928. (*Government-General of Korea, Chōsen ni okeru Dōmei Kyukō no Kōsatsu* [A Study of School Strikes in Korea], 1929; cited in Ozawa, *op. cit.*, p. 73

<sup>70</sup> Historical Research Institute, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, eds., *Chōsen Kindai Kakumei Undōshi* [History of Korea’s Modern Revolutionary Movement], p. 276, cited in Ozawa, *ibid.*

and the nation” and that the materials should be practically arranged so as to foster diligence and labor to activate industry and commerce toward building wealth.<sup>71</sup>

Since six years of assimilationist schooling of Korean youth, even using the most carefully prepared teaching materials and under the most careful supervision, was apparently insufficient to accomplish the desired ends, the period of tutelage was extended through a number of means. A system of “*futsūgakkō* graduate guidance” was set up in 1928 together with a network of youth training centers (also established in 1928), to be followed by the creation of “seminars for mainstay youth” in 1931. These government-sponsored “Korean” youth organizations were seen as especially effective channels of control for rural youth and were gradually connected with the government’s rural development policy of educating young “*Kōkoku nōmin*” (farmers of the Empire), expected to serve as the backbone of the rural village movement started in 1933. From the larger perspective, however, as Miyata Setsuko puts it, this revival movement was the core of Ugaki’s policy, promoted with all the resources at his disposal, “to reorganize Korea as a base for invasion of the continent — one which would not betray the state interests of the motherland.”<sup>72</sup>

To sum up: In this period of the Second Korean Education Order, Japanese educational and language planners gained further direct experience in their difficult task through an extended effort at actual implementation, and introduced certain revisions based on that experience. In particular, in the wake of the March First Movement of 1919, which swept the country with its ethnic revivalist demands as a consequence of the initial heavy-handed Japanese suppression of Korean language and culture, the authorities

---

<sup>71</sup> Government-General of Korea, *Shisei Sanjūnenshi* [History of Thirty Years of Administration], 1940, p. 371; quoted in *ibid.*, p. 74.

<sup>72</sup> Miyata Setsuko, *1930 Nendai Nitteika Chōsen ni okeru Nōson Kōshin Undō no Tenkai* [The Development of the Rural Villages Revival Movement in the 1930s under Japanese Imperial Rule], in *Rekishigaku Kenkyū* [Historical Researches], February 1965; quoted in Ozawa, *ibid.*, p. 74.

felt forced to modify their approach to assimilation, and even to soften it to a certain degree. This is readily seen in the adjustments made in the name of equality and the reduction of ethnic discrimination through the introduction of double-track schooling systems for speakers of Japanese and speakers of Korean. It is also manifested in the reorganization of the school curriculum, in the new laws introduced to regulate private schools, and in the attempt to boost the mass nature of education in the countryside.

To be sure, these moves may be seen from one angle as advances, whether in terms of their contribution to Korea's modernization or the raising of living standards in the Korean countryside, or even as an expression of greater enlightenment on the part of Korea's colonial rulers. Still and all, the inspiration was even tighter assimilation for purposes of preparing for war on the continent and in Southeast Asia, and not the ultimate edification or economic betterment of the Korean people. Thus, no matter what was in the minds of the lower-level planners or educators actually in the field, the effect was tighter control and greater repression of Korean ethnicity — and hence greater resentment and resistance.

## V. Third Korean Education Order Period (1938–1945)

The Third Korean Education Order was promulgated on March 3, 1938 and took effect from April 1. This Order must be seen against the particular background of the aggressive advance of Japanese capital and technology in the Korean peninsula as part of the gearing-up effort for a full-scale military invasion of China. The content of the new Order was summed up in three principles by the governor-general of Korea at the time, Minami Jirō: 1) Clearly manifest the national essence; 2) Japan and Korea as one; and 3) Endure difficulty and undergo steeling.<sup>73</sup> Shiobara Tokizaburō, then head of the

---

<sup>73</sup> In Japanese the three principles read: 1) *Kokutai meichō*; 2) *Naisen ittai*; and 3) *Ninku tanren*. The term *kokutai* — “national essence” — boils down to those things which make Japan superior to all other countries.

Academic Bureau of the Government-General, further explained these three principles as follows: They are the basis of our education; the first two follow naturally from the consciousness of being “subjects of the empire,” while the third refers to the qualities necessary to carry out the obligation to advance the nation by leaps and bounds.<sup>74</sup> These principles were incorporated in an “Oath of Subjects of the Empire” to be ingrained both in school pupils and the general populace through chanted repetition in chorus on every conceivable public occasion — in the Japanese language.<sup>75</sup>

In order to understand how this final negation of Korean ethnicity was rationalized in the minds of the colonial rulers, comments made by Governor-General Minami in September 1938 to the policy examining committee on current affairs may be helpful. Minami claimed that “such candor and benevolent rule [as ours] is unprecedented” in the annals of colonization. “Foreign powers,” he said, “use beautiful excuses to mainly exploit the colonized nations by taking their resources and using their property in order to have a luxurious life at home and enrich their own homeland. However, the ideals and beliefs of our country in Korea, which are based on morality and the sacred intent of *Isshī*

---

<sup>74</sup> Shiobara Tokizaburō, *Jihenka ni okeru Chōsen Kyōiku* [Korean Education in the Wake of the (Manchurian) Incident], in *Bunkyo no Chōsen* [Korean Literature and Schools], Seoul, January 1940; cited in Ozawa, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

<sup>75</sup> This oath — the *Kōkoku shinmin no seishi* — was mandated in October 1937. Koreans who could not recite it smoothly in Japanese were stigmatized as *hikokumin* or anti-national. The children’s version, in standard oral Japanese, ran as follows:

1. We are subjects of the great Japanese Empire;
2. We pledge our heart-and-soul loyalty to the Emperor;
3. We will become fine, strong citizens through tolerating difficulty and undergoing steeling.

The adults’ version was couched in classical literary Japanese:

1. We are subjects of the Empire and through our loyalty will repay the country;
2. As subjects of the Empire we will cooperate and care for each other to create strong unity;
3. As subjects of the Empire we will tolerate difficulty and steel ourselves to enhance the prestige of the Imperial way.

Quoted in Ozawa, *ibid.*

*dōjin*, and our service in the name of this intent, are absolutely different in their starting point.”<sup>76</sup>

This self-righteous rationalization of a blatantly unequal relationship, masked by a formal claim that Koreans were equal citizens of the Empire but used to justify the total negation of Korean language and culture, was quite prevalent among even the most sophisticated Japanese of that era.

One of the main analysts of Japan’s language planning in Korea, Ozawa Yūsaku, characterizes this period as one of “destruction of ethnicity through education” and summarizes the assimilation process as follows:

- 1) teaching and educating only in Japanese;
- 2) intensification of ideological control through:
  - a. stationing of *kyōgakukan* (teaching supervisors) to inspect and control the ideology of teachers and students, teaching content and so on (from 1937);
  - b. setting up in-service training institutes to upgrade teachers as “subjects of the Empire” (from April 1938);
  - c. recompilation of textbooks;
  - d. guiding of extracurricular activities to further inculcate discipline and manners in children;
- 3) conducting of propaganda for participation in the war effort through:
  - a. advancement of education on the flourishing of Asia;
  - b. propagation of the volunteer soldier system among students by teachers;
  - c. all-round supportive activities for the military;
  - d. air raid drills;
- 4) emphasis on discipline:
  - a. military discipline in the schools;
  - b. introduction of the system of school children “repaying the Empire” through voluntary labor (from July 1937);
  - c. rigorous implementation of the “citizens’ calisthenics program” and the holding of regular athletics meets.<sup>77</sup>

The main institutional change introduced during this period was unification of the dual-track schooling system of *shōgakkō* for Japanese-speaking students and *futsūgakkō* for Korean-speaking students into a single-track, basically Japanese-language system. Henceforth, Japanese language was to be the universal “school language” or language of

<sup>76</sup> From the minutes of the Policy Study Committee on Current Affairs, Government-General of Korea, 1938 [in Japanese]; quoted in Ozawa, *ibid.*, p. 85.

<sup>77</sup> Ozawa, *ibid.*, p. 87.

instruction.<sup>78</sup> And, with the exception of the Korean language, which became an elective instead of the compulsory subject it had been in the *futsūgakkō*, all other subjects were to be taught without any distinction as to ethnic background.<sup>79</sup> Normal schools, which had also previously been divided along dual-track lines, were also now unified.<sup>80</sup>

With assimilation now the clear and open policy of Korea's colonial rulers, the discrepancy between the "Japanese life" led by young Koreans at school and the "Korean life" they led at home became a major issue. In order to resolve it, beginning in July 1938, a national movement was created to encompass the entire Korean populace, the aim being to mobilize each and every stratum of society. The movement, initially called the League for Full Mobilization of the National Spirit — *Kokumin Seishin Sōdōin Renmei* — and which supposedly included all the adults in Korea, was given more concrete organizational form in October 1940 as the Korean League for the Mobilization of the National Might — *Kokumin Sōryoku Undō Chōsen Renmei*. In practice, it had no political goals other than to ensure the complete subservience of the people to the needs of empire through binding them into a centralized network extending from cells of ten "patriotic" families each at the grassroots level, upward through the various levels of village, town and prefectural administration, to the central government in Seoul.<sup>81</sup>

The youth, too, were now to be organized outside of school, and in September 1938 the Korean Youth League was inaugurated as the primary organization for this purpose. Up until this time, the government-general had followed a policy of mobilizing young people with primary school education "who have some national sentiment, can

---

<sup>78</sup> From the revised *shogakkō* curriculum, March 15, 1938, Item 8, Article 16; cited in Morita, *op. cit.*, p. 288.

<sup>79</sup> *Ibid.*, Article 13.

<sup>80</sup> *Ibid.*, Article 12.

<sup>81</sup> Government-General of Korea, *Chōsen Jijō* [The Situation in Korea], 1943 ed.; cited in Ozawa, *op. cit.*, p. 82

understand the national language [Japanese], and who have a certain knowledge of science and mathematics.”<sup>82</sup> Such school graduates were thought to be proper “subjects of the Empire” and the backbone or mainstays for guiding other, uneducated Korean youth towards the proper ideology and knowledge. But whereas at the earlier stage the focus of policy had been mainly on the popularization of technologies for agricultural production among the youthful rural population, after 1937 it shifted more towards the fostering of military volunteers. This focus was made explicit after the adoption of a system for military volunteers in April 1938 and thenceforth the entire Korean youth population fell under the direct control of the army.<sup>83</sup>

Whatever the organization, ideological mobilization of the membership was the central task. This mobilization took a wide variety of forms: oral recitation of the “Oath of Subjects of the Empire” mentioned earlier; “patriotic day” events; obeisance in the direction of the Imperial Palace in Tokyo; lunch-time quiet prayers for the well-being of the Emperor; visits to Shinto shrines and the establishment of Shinto altars in every household;<sup>84</sup> attendance at Japanese language seminars, war propaganda meetings, government propaganda paper dramas and movies; suppression of the Korean style of dress in favor of national uniforms; and so on.

There were also controls governing Korean-style religious practices, marriage and even the naming system of Koreans. Buddhism, Confucianism and Christianity were to be guided by Japanese religious leaders and their religious interpretations. Intermarriage

---

<sup>82</sup> Matsuzuki Hideo, “*Chōsen no seishōnen kyōiku*” [The Education of Young People in Korea], in *Kyōiku Shichō Kenkyū* [Studies in Educational Thought], 1937; cited in Ozawa, *ibid.*

<sup>83</sup> See Ozawa, *ibid.*, p. 82.

<sup>84</sup> Following the promulgation in 1915 of regulations governing shrines and temples, the Government-General established a network of Shinto shrines throughout the peninsula as the physical embodiment of the “national essence (*kokutai*) and Emperor system. In 1920 a central *Chōsen Jingū* (Korea Shrine) was set up in Seoul. Such shrines conducted rituals into which Koreans were pressed to take part, and thus were a key part in the assimilation policy. (See Kan Tetsugi, *Nippon no Chōsen Shihai to Shūkyōseisaku* [Japanese Control over Korea and Religious Policy], Tokyo, Miraisha, 1988, pp. 162–63.)

between Koreans and Japanese was encouraged. And Korean names were to be replaced by Japanese names, as will be discussed in the following chapter.

As for the Japanese language, a directive was issued by the Government-General on February 10, 1937 calling on all Korean local assembly members and office workers to use the “national language” all the time. However, even before this directive, there was a good deal of pressure for people within the government itself to use Japanese. For example, in December 1936, Korean office workers in the editorial section of the Academic Bureau of the Government-General reached an agreement “among themselves”: “Whether in official or unofficial dealings, whether inside or outside the office, in business or personal conversation, to use only the national language [Japanese]. Also within each one’s own family, to increase the use of the national language.”<sup>85</sup> Lest it be suspected that office workers in bureaus of the colonial government might be exceptional in their desire to demonstrate loyalty through the use of the foreign language, according to one observer, “Telephone calls to the prefectoral office (i.e., an office of local administration run largely by Koreans themselves), were only accepted if made in the national language [Japanese], regardless whether the speaker knew Japanese or not. All petitions to the office must also be in the national language, otherwise they would be rejected out of hand.”<sup>86</sup>

The Third Korean Education Order went through another revision in March 1941. The main change at this time was reorganization of the school curriculum in the name of “Citizens’ schools” — *Kokumin gakkō* — with the aim being to turn out graduates which, as “subjects of the Empire,” fully reflected the “national essence” (*kokutai*). Japanese language, ethics, Japanese history and geography were now united as a single subject,

---

<sup>85</sup> Isaka Keiichiro, “*Naisen ittai to Kokugo-shōrei*” [Japan-Korea as one and the promotion of the national language], in *Chōsen* [Korea], September 1937; quoted in Ozawa, *ibid.*, p. 84

<sup>86</sup> Hirosei Tsuzuku, “*Kokugo fukyū no shin den kai*” [The new stage of Japanese language popularization], in *Chōsen* [Korea], September 1942; quoted in Ozawa, *ibid.*, pp. 84-85.

*Kokumin Ka*, which might be translated “Citizenship Class” but which was strongly tinged by state nationalism and militarism. In a complementary move, the Korean language was dropped completely, an inevitability inasmuch as the “national essence” could only be imparted through the “national language.”

Another tool for strongly enforcing Japanese-language use in this period, the beginning of which coincided with the outbreak of war in China, was the military. For most of the period a voluntary system of military service for Koreans prevailed, albeit supported by a good deal of propaganda encouraging enrolment. But, not surprisingly, there was only a single language of operation in the military, Japanese, and the Korean volunteers were expected to use it like everybody else.

As for the scale of recruitment, it is known that in fiscal year 1938, 4,500 Korean volunteers were accepted for intensive language training. But the announcement, on May 8, 1942, in the wake of the outbreak of the full-scale Pacific War, that the military draft system would be implemented in Korea from 1944, changed the picture dramatically. As the Japanese military leadership showed no inclination to establish separate formations for Korean soldiers, it was necessary to ensure the “national language” competency of potentially huge numbers of Korean youth. For those Koreans of draft age who did not have *Kokumin gakkō* certificates (which were supposed to reflect Japanese-language competency among other things), special training centers were set up in November 1942 to provide 400–600 hours of language instruction over a one-year period with the aim of achieving the same results as three to four years of training in the *Kokumin Gakkō*. In October 1943 a naval volunteer language training center was also opened. The approach was one of total immersion, monolingual instruction.<sup>87</sup>

In August 1944, the Korean League for the Mobilization of the National Might initiated a language popularization movement known as the “Full-Scale Movement for

---

<sup>87</sup> Morita, *op. cit.*, pp. 124–25.

All-Round Use of the National Language in Keeping With Implementation of the Draft System.” This movement not only conducted general propaganda in offices, schools and neighborhoods, but also promoted Japanese-language seminars by government officials, teachers and police, and rewarded and gave recognition to accomplished speakers of Japanese.<sup>88</sup> This movement was paralleled by a program of cultural activities which encompassed the mobilizing of Korean as well as Japanese artists, writers, poets and theater and movie personalities, and the production of propagandistic movies and plays, songs and records in the Japanese language. A variety of literary awards were presented for outstanding Japanese-language works published in literary magazines. Meanwhile, foreign records from Britain or the United States were banned as “enemy records” and those possessing any were asked to turn them over to the authorities, while Korean-language records were in short supply, their production subject to decreasing quotas, ostensibly because of tight materials supplies due to the war effort.

There were two broadcasting networks in operation at the time, one wholly Japanese language and the other Korean. However, even on the Korean network the names of all public offices, places and persons had to be read in their Japanese readings, while classical Chinese poems in Japanese readings (*shigin*), Japanese folk songs and classical music made up a significant part of the programming. In Autumn 1942 a “Korean” movie production company was established, but all its output — which totaled four movies — was in the “national language,” Japanese, only. The periodical press was similarly subordinated to the assimilation program, with three youth magazines, “Imperial Subjects’ Daily News,” “Self-Cultivation Pictorial” and “Self-Cultivation Friend,” published to support the special youth training centers. For younger children there were the “Children’s National News,” “Children’s National Weekly” and a series of picture

---

<sup>88</sup> The League for the Promotion of the National Might had also worked in cooperation with the Korean Music Association to promote a national song movement, starting 1943.

books. The two extant Korean-language newspapers, *Dong-A Ilbo* and *Chōson Ilbo*, were banned in 1940, to be replaced by the government-run, Korean-language newspaper, *Maeil Shinbo*.

There can be little doubt that this concerted effort “worked.” One Korean scholar has summarized it as follows:

The 22 percent language diffusion claimed by 1943 was actually 30.3 percent if those under the age of ten are excluded, and this increased to 30.3 percent or actually 38 percent by 1945. If Japanese rule had continued for another ten years, the diffusion rate would have reached 85 percent, and after sixty years of Japanese rule [i.e., by 1970], there could have been perfect Japanese language diffusion.<sup>89</sup>

To sum up, this period of the Third Korean Language Education Order was characterized by an all-out assimilation drive supported by comprehensive language planning and backed by various means of socioeconomic and cultural reinforcement. In a sense, the whole of Korea was turned into one vast school of Japanese language and culture. But in another sense, when the nature of the power and sanctions which ultimately backed the assimilation are considered, the comparison with a school may appear less apt than one with a prison camp. Whether we consider the “national language” popularization movement in the cities and villages or the obligatory courses in military training centers, there were strong psychological and even physical pressures promoting compliance. This assimilation movement was not, after all, a product of free choice but rather a component part of an imperial scheme pursued with military efficiency. Fortunately for the Korean people, their language and culture, this essentially fascistic stage of language planning lasted for less than a decade.

---

<sup>89</sup> Kim Shosho, *Historical Background to the Japanese Education and the Demise of Korean Language Departments* [in Korean], in Seoul College of Education Theses Collection, Vols. 1–10 [1967–77], Book 12, p. 79; quoted in Morita, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

### **Chapter III. Implementation of Japanese Language Planning in Korea**

The implementation of the Japanese language planning effort in Korea will be examined here in terms of several elements: 1) general statements of language teaching objectives; 2) curriculum development; 3) textbook compilation and content; 4) teachers, teacher training and pedagogy; and, 5) actual classroom conditions. In examining these elements in turn, we will focus on the primary school level as it was always the principal locus of language teaching and the most influential educational level in terms of numbers of Koreans schooled.

It is important to note at the outset that significant change took place in all these elements over time. As Japan's political relationship with Korea developed from that of "Protector" to that of colonial administrator, to one of direct rule, as described in the previous chapters, so too changed the general educational goals, the narrower language teaching objectives, and hence the concrete curriculum, textbooks, and so on. As an exhaustive treatment here of all five elements for each political period is out of the question, only the most representative will be examined, with concrete examples given.

#### **1. Language Teaching Objectives**

The issue of language came to the fore with the development of general ideas concerning Korean education and its modernization. The first step taken in connection with the indigenous recognition of the need for a system of modern education, namely the 1894 declaration by the Korean king on general goals for popularizing education, foresaw the adoption of the *han'gǔl* script as a teaching medium.

During the "Protectorate" period which followed (1905-1910) the Korean language was spoken of as the "national language" while Japanese was considered a

“foreign language” to be learned primarily as a way of opening a window to modernizing ideas and techniques. With the advent of the First Education Order (1911-1921), Japanese became the “national language” while Korean was simply known as “Korean.” With this progression, the language teaching objectives accordingly changed.

In the wake of issuance of the first Korean Education Order of 1911, “Regulations for *Futsūgakkō* [Common Schools]” were promulgated on October 20th of that same year. Language is first dealt with in Article VII of these Regulations:

The national language [Japanese] is the place where the Japanese spirit resides, and is also indispensable for the learning of knowledge and technology. Therefore, it is expected that it will be used in every subject in the correct way and applied smoothly and skillfully.

Article IX states more explicitly:

As for the national language [Japanese], common speech and writing forms should be taught so that the ability to understand others and freely express one’s own thinking can be attained. It is most important to give basic knowledge and cultivate morals through the national language, starting with the *kana* syllabary, progressing to common speech, then gradually moving to written styles. Teaching materials must include ethics, history, geography, science and business, which are necessary in [daily] life. In the case of girls, homemaking skills must be added.

The teaching of Korean and Chinese are dealt with in rather cursory fashion in the tenth article:

The ordinary speech and writing of Korean and Chinese must be understood in order to cope with daily interactions and activity as well as for cultivating morals. Korean and Chinese must start with *han’gŭl* then progress to a *han’gŭl-kanji* mixture, then easy Chinese. The materials for this must be subordinate to the national language [Japanese], with Chinese materials in particular chosen for the cultivation of morals. Reading, interpretation, recitation, dictation and composition of Korean and Chinese must be taught. They must always be taught in connection with the national language and sometimes interpreted through the national language.

Worthy of note here is the fact that, while the 7th and 9th articles emphasize the cultural and social development of the individual, the 10th places the emphasis on utilitarianism and clearly subordinates Korean and Chinese to Japanese (now the “national language”). As we shall later see when examining the contents of textbooks,

this ranking of the languages is clearly revealed in the Korean language and ethics texts.

The Second Korean Education Order of February 4, 1922 embodied the idea of *isshī dōjin*— the same “benevolent” treatment [by the Emperor] of the two peoples. Hence the schools were no longer to be divided along national lines but rather according to the degree of acquisition of the “national language,” with those speaking Japanese in their daily lives (i.e., with a comfortable fluency) attending *shōgakkō*, and those not doing so attending *futsūgakkō*. Despite the seeming egalitarianism, however, since there was no education beyond the primary level in the Korean language, there were very great pressures on Korean youth while in the *futsūgakkō* to master the “national language.” In other words, the *futsūgakkō*, too, were very definitely oriented towards assimilation.

Another change under the Second Education Order was the encouragement of the use of Japanese to teach non-language subjects in the *futsūgakkō*. Article 8 of the second chapter of the *futsūgakkō* regulations<sup>1</sup> spoke of the importance of giving “deep consideration” to promotion of the national language in all subjects to cultivate the characteristics of “citizens of the state.”

At this stage, as we have already seen, the Korean language was still a compulsory subject alongside other subjects such as Japanese, arithmetic, Japanese history, geography, science, art, music, physical education and sewing (for girls). However, the Korean language class was clearly subordinate to Japanese language classes. The 11th article of chapter two of the aforementioned regulations states: “When Korean language is taught, it has always to be related to the national language, and the national language still regularly spoken,” while “reading, spelling and writing must be taught on the basis of Japanese.”<sup>2</sup> We might well wonder what kind of classes these Korean language lessons were, when the learners were not even encouraged to speak the target language. In any

---

<sup>1</sup> Government-General of Korea, Order No. 8, Feb. 15, 1922, Item 1 of Article 8, Ch. 2.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, Article 11, Ch. 2.

case, the intent of the language planners is clearly revealed in these and other regulations. The Chinese language which, it will be remembered, had played a most important cultural role in Korea, was to be taught in the same way — from the viewpoint of the Japanese language.<sup>3</sup>

Another significant revision under these regulations was the addition of Japanese history and geography to the curriculum. The 13th article of the same chapter two declares: “The teaching of Japanese history is important so as to convey the outlines of the *kokutai* [national essence] — a key objective in cultivating the citizenship ethic.”<sup>4</sup> And Japanese history was to be taught from the origin of the state, through all the important historical facts, down to the main facts of Korea’s historical transition.<sup>5</sup>

One of the prominent demands concerning schooling put forward by student participants in the March First Movement was to have native Korean history courses taught as part of the curriculum. However, Japan’s education planners were well aware that the content of history as taught to young minds is a key element in forming national identity and hence a most touchy subject from the point of view of colonial rule. From the language planners’ point of view its significance was also related to student motivation — whether the learning of the national language would be seen as being of primary importance or not. In the period of the First Education Order, the issue was skirted by simply dropping all history as such from the curriculum. Under the Second Education Order, history was introduced into the curriculum, but it was to be primarily Japanese history, with a rigorously selective Korean history accorded only a minor role. By the time of the Third Education Order, “history” had come to mean the history of

---

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, Article 23, Ch. 2.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, Article 13, Ch. 2.

<sup>5</sup> This addition of history and geography actually took place in 1920 with the revision of the *futsūgakkō* regulations. See Government-General of Korea, Order No. 108, 1920; quoted in Morita, *op. cit.*, p. 281.

Japan, with no recognition at all of Korea's separate and distinct past. As an official guideline for the compilation of Japanese elementary texts put it: "Previously [at the time of the Second Education Order], national history was erroneously seen as a dual system." Therefore, history teaching must be reorganized "to contribute to the concrete recognition of a single unified spirit of *Nai-Sen ittai* [Japan and Korea as one] in a process of historical inevitability."<sup>6</sup> The resultant "history" was focused on the Emperor in a completely unbalanced way, with factual materials selectively woven into a *Teikoku Shikan* (A Historical View of the Japanese Empire), specially devised for Koreans by the Government-General. It differed from the elementary texts prescribed by the Ministry of Education in Japan proper in the following ways, according to the "Prospectus on the Compilation of Elementary National History Texts":

1. The objective was to help Korean pupils "realize concretely the majesty of the *kokutai*" in addition to having them grasp "the historical mission of the Empire" — which was the principal objective in Japan proper;
2. Any examination of Korea's past was to be avoided. As the directive put it, there must be no historical inquiry concerning "the past so-called 'homeland'";
3. The Ministry of Education's previous rendition of the "great enterprise of successive emperors and the achievements of their loyal and wise subjects" was to be replaced by the "sacred virtue of successive emperors and the fidelity of his subjects" in order to make the reader realize "the mission of the Empire in East Asia and the world";
4. Particular emphasis was to be placed on *Nai-Sen ittai* and the related historical "facts."<sup>7</sup>

Under the Third Education Order of March 1939, the *futsūgakkō* lost their special status to become standard *shōgakkō* and a part of the regular Japanese-style school system. The only real difference then existing between the system as practiced in Korea and in Japan proper was that administrative power over education in Korea remained under the Government-General instead of the Education Ministry in Tokyo on the

---

<sup>6</sup> Government-General of Korea, *Shōtō Kokushi Hensan Shuisho* [Prospectus on the Compilation of Elementary National History Texts], Seoul, 1941; quoted in Ozawa, *op. cit.*, p. 97.

<sup>7</sup> Ozawa, *ibid.*, p. 98.

grounds that Korea had its “special circumstances.”<sup>8</sup>

Under the Third Education Order, the process of language substitution moved a step nearer the final goal by changing the Korean language from a compulsory subject to an elective. In the revised *shōgakkō* regulations that gave substance to the new Education Order<sup>9</sup> it was stipulated that even when taught as an elective, Korean must be limited to the realm of daily matters and connected closely with Japanese, as well as taught so as to cultivate the ideology thought proper for “subjects of the Empire.” Another article in the same revised regulations indicates that the language of instruction for all subjects must now be the “national language,” and gives lengthy and detailed directions concerning the teaching of ideological content. Articles 16 and 18 of the regulations give further concrete expression to what is required to prepare “subjects for the Empire”:

In elementary schools, national language teaching is to be enhanced to convey precise usage of the language as well as fluency; the teaching of the language must achieve the cultivation of the qualities of subjects of the Empire....<sup>10</sup>

In teaching the national language, ordinary language and letter writing must be taught so as to enable pupils to express ideas correctly and have clear awareness as subjects of the Empire, as well as to cultivate intelligence and virtue....<sup>11</sup>

The Third Education Order underwent a final revision which was to be issued as the “Citizens’ School Order” [*Kokumingakkō Rei*] on February 28, 1941.<sup>12</sup> In the revised

<sup>8</sup> Under the wartime regime, Korea was considered a special administrative area of the continental war-front against China and the Soviet Union in terms of the mobilization of manpower and material resources. The issue of how best to channel Korean “national spiritual might” was taken into consideration as an important educational target. This is clearly manifested in the minutes of a 1938 speech by Governor-General Minami Jirō to the Current Policy Research Committee. [Cf. Ozawa, p. 78]

<sup>9</sup> Government-General of Korea, Directive No. 24, March 15, 1938, *Shōgakkō Regulations*, 2nd revision, Articles 13 & 29; cited in Morita, *op. cit.*, pp. 287–89.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, Article 16, item 7.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, Article 18.

<sup>12</sup> Imperial Ordinance 148, February 28, 1941; excerpted in Morita, *ibid.*, p. 290.

order, the aim of the schools, henceforth to be called *kokumingakkō*, was “to follow the Emperor’s Way through a common elementary education, the objective being to bestow the basic discipline of the nation.” The school regulations were accordingly revised and reissued by the government-general on March 31 of the same year but, as may be supposed, the monolingual “national language” approach remained, albeit with even more stress on state nationalism. As the second article of the revised regulations put it, “For the acquisition of pure and proper national language, fluency and correct usage, we must carry out thoroughgoing national language education and must work hard to cultivate the qualities [appropriate to] subjects of the Empire.”<sup>13</sup> Now the speaking of “pure” and “proper” Japanese was equated with being a good citizen of Japan.

Elsewhere in the same article it is stipulated that the supposed superiority of Japanese culture is to be conveyed to the pupils: “Clarify the special character of our nation’s culture in the context of East Asia and the world and guide [the pupils] to realize the position and mission of the Empire.”<sup>14</sup> Again, it must be remembered that this schooling is not directed at Japanese but rather at young Koreans. Yet no concessions are made to the feelings of those whose own culture is being negated as they are asked to simply accept as superior the foreign culture into which they are to be assimilated.

The third article of these regulations deals with the *Kokumin Ka* (Citizenship Class), with the subject itself being explained as follows: “*Kokumin Ka* is for acquiring our nation’s ethics, language, history, geography and national trends and for clarifying the glory of the national essence [*kokutai*] so as to cultivate the national spirit; it has as its objectives the fostering of the moral of being loyal to the Emperor and loving the nation

---

<sup>13</sup> *Kokumingakkō Kitei* [*Kokumingakkō* Regulations], Article 2, Item 13, excerpted in Morita, *ibid.*, pp. 290–91.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, Article 2, Item 4.

by realizing the mission of the state.”<sup>15</sup>

Article 5 singles out learning of the Japanese language as a vital element in nationhood: “National Language class is for the acquisition of the daily national language and training in understanding and expression and, through this, the cultivation of the national spirit — a nation-like way of thinking and inspiration.”<sup>16</sup>

Language and culture inextricably ties the individual to the state. Hence all subjects, regardless of content, must now be taught in the “national language” — Japanese.<sup>17</sup>

## 2. Curriculum

Much information on school curriculum development and content in the colonial period is still available. This has been examined with a view to shedding light on the degree of emphasis placed on Japanese language learning as part of the educational process well as on language planning generally. The number of hours devoted to language classes as such was of obvious interest, but the specified content of other subjects was scrutinized as well, as these were often of a supportive nature to language study. For example, the “Ethics” classes played an especially supportive role because of the heavy emphasis on cultural and ethnic matters and the fact that textbooks for the subject were generally written in Japanese (with explanations of the heavily codified Japanese being given orally in Korean, as necessary, in class).<sup>18</sup> History and geography courses also played an important supportive role — a fact well recognized by the

---

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, Article 3.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, Article 5.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, Article 2, Item 14.

<sup>18</sup> For the first two years after annexation, the only textbooks in use were Korean language and ethics texts. However, from 1913 on, the ethics texts were written in Japanese.

Japanese authorities, who saw that such courses were used to steer Koreans away from issues concerning their own distinctiveness and toward a sense of an overlapping past, intertwined present, and common future with Japan.

In the set of education regulations issued by the Korean government in July 1895 at the time of the first sweeping “modernization” reforms, the prescribed Korean language classes accounted for fully 47.6 percent of the entire three-year primary school curriculum. “Ethics” was set at 10.7 percent of the three-year curriculum, and history and geography combined at 3.7 percent. Not surprisingly, since this was a domestically ordained education system, Japanese language was not offered at all in these early grades. In the “higher” school (grades 4–6), Korean language classes were to account for 26.7 percent of the three-year curriculum, Japanese language for 11.1 percent, and ethics 8.9 percent. It should be remembered that only one of the mandated higher schools was ever established — in Seoul. Thus the actual results can be said to have been minimal.

After the establishment of the “Protectorate” relationship in 1905, many Japanese educational officials were brought in to replace the original advisers employed by the Korean government.<sup>19</sup> These officials worked to reform the existing Korean educational structure, introducing what was called at the time the “New Education”<sup>20</sup> or “Model

---

<sup>19</sup> Shinohara Wataru, who had a doctorate in literature, was the first official to be appointed by the Resident-General to take charge of educational matters for a two-year stint. He was succeeded by Tawara Magoichi, who was named to head the newly formed Academic Bureau (*Gakubu*).

<sup>20</sup> As noted in Chapter II, a system of four-year elementary schooling was established for Korean children, with provision for an abbreviated three-year system in rural areas, depending upon actual circumstances. In order to include as many children as possible, the entrance age was set at 6–12 years, with the proviso that youth up to 14 years of age could be enrolled as a temporary measure. According to Morita, by 1910 there were 101 *futsūgakkō* in the country. Among them, 59 were “public,” one was “governmental,” and 41 were subsidized “private” schools, the subsidies usually being provided in the form of teachers’ salaries. Out of deference to Korean custom, the new schools were not intended to be coeducational, and if girls were to be taught at all outside of private schools they were to be taught by women teachers, who were few in number at that time. By 1908 only four of the extant *futsūgakkō* offered separate classes for girls. By 1909, six “public” schools and the one governmental school had each added a single girls’ class. At the time, there were also 24 private schools for girls, 14 of them run by Christian organizations and 10 by other religious and private organizations. [Morita, *op. cit.*, p. 59.]

Education.” Under the *futsūgakkō* set up under the “Common School Order” of 1906,<sup>21</sup> Japanese language became a compulsory part of the curriculum from the first year of elementary school on the grounds of its “importance in daily life,” but against strong opposition from the Korean populace.<sup>22</sup> Instruction in Japanese was to make up 20.7 percent of the four-year curriculum, the same as the Korean language. “Ethics” class accounted for 3.5 percent and, as noted earlier, history and geography were to be dropped due to their sensitive ethnic nature. According to the regulations on implementation of the “Common Schools Order,” the teaching of Japanese was to focus on practical usage, particularly speaking, but including reading and writing for daily use as well.

The Academic Bureau of the Korean Resident-General headquarters was responsible for devising a curriculum to realize the educational objectives of the first Korean Education Act of 1911. The hours allotted to the various subjects at the primary school level are shown in Table II below. Japanese language instruction was increased to 37.7 percent of the overall curriculum compared with 11.1 percent during the “Protectorate” period. In terms of time devoted, surface appearances suggest that Korean language instruction remained roughly the same as the 20.7 percent in the “Protectorate” period at 20.8 percent. However, “Korean” now included instruction in Chinese classics,

---

<sup>21</sup> See Item 3 of Article 9 of the *Futsūgakkō Rei Shikō Kisoku* [Regulations for Implementation of the Common School Order], reprinted in Compilation Committee for Educational History, eds., *Meiji Ikō Kyōiku Seido Hattatsushi* [History of Educational Development Since the Meiji Period], 2nd ed., Vol. 10, Tokyo, Kyōiku Shiryo Chōsakai [Research Committee on Educational Materials], 1964, p. 61; cited in Yi Sukucha, *op. cit.*, pp. 72-73.

<sup>22</sup> Yi Sukucha gives examples of this opposition as expressed in editorials and articles in the Korean press. For example, an editorial in the *Da Han Maeil Shinbo* of June 29, 1906, had this to say: “When we look at the current trends in education, we find that all the teachers are Japanese...all the textbooks are those authorized by the Japanese Ministry of Education. At present, our nation’s ideology is being taken away and surreptitiously replaced by an ideology of worship of Japan in our people’s minds.” (from “A Warning to Korean Education”). A contributed article in the same paper on February 15, 1908, put the matter this way: “So many foreigners have suddenly started to occupy our institutions, paralyzing our children’s brains with the Japanese language, Japanese sentences, Japanese guts, Japanese marrow — every manner of Japanese education, making them as hollow as dayflies.” [quoted in Yi Sukucha, *ibid.*, pp. 74-75.]

and so was in fact significantly less.

**Table II. Textbook Content and Weekly Timetables for Futsūgakkō Under the First Korean Education Order**

Subject	Time	1st Grade	2nd Grade	3rd Grade	4th Grade	Total		
Content	Time	Content	Content	Content	Content			
Ethics	1 hr.	Main points of ethics	1	same	1	same	4	
National Language [Japanese]	10	Reading, interpretation, conversation, recitation, dictation, composition, calligraphy	10	same	10	same	40	
Korean & Chinese	6	Reading, interpretation, recitation, dictation, composition	6	same	5	same	22	
Arithmetic	6	Whole numbers	6	same	6	Whole numbers, decimals, compound numbers, abacus	24	
Science				same	2	Natural phenomena & their utilization	4	
Music	3	Singing	3	same	3	same	12	
Physical Ed (combined)		Dancing, exercising		same		same		
Art		Free drawing		same		same		
Handicrafts		Crafts		same		same		
Sewing & Handwork		Sewing, simple embroidery		Cutting & sewing of simple clothes, simple embroidery		Clothes making		
Introductory Agriculture					Practical cultivation	same		
Introductory Commerce					Commerce basics	same		
<b>Total</b>	<b>26</b>		<b>26</b>		<b>27</b>		<b>27</b>	<b>106</b>

Source: Kyōikushi Hensankai, *Meiji Ikō Kyōiku Seido Hattatsushi* [History of the Development of the Educational System Since Meiji], Vol. 10, Tokyo, Kyōiku Shiryo Chōsakai, 1964, p. 84. [cited in Yi Sukucha, p. 80]

After 1920, the primary school curriculum reverted to six years of schooling, with history and geography added. Japanese language training was boosted to 58 hours — an increase of almost 50 percent, while Korean and Japanese were boosted to 34 percent — an increase of just over 50 percent — a concession perhaps brought on by the nationalistic March First Movement of March 1919.

### 3. Textbook Compilation and Content

Textbooks and their contents are a key element of any educational system, serving as they do as a standardizable medium through which to achieve desired educational objectives. Even a cursory glance at the textbooks used in Korea under Japanese rule reveals that a great deal of care and attention went into their preparation.

One year after the 1894 reform, the Academic Bureau of the Korean government compiled a single-volume Korean language textbook, “National Elementary Reader” (*Kunmin Sohak Dok Bon*). This first product of Korea’s educational modernizers embodied their hopes of achieving national independence through raising the nation’s academic standards. A year later, the same bureau compiled another text in three volumes, entitled “Revised National Elementary Reader.” However, this revised version showed the strong influence of the two Japanese advisers involved in the revision.<sup>23</sup> In addition to these government-sponsored texts, there were several privately compiled ones as well, among them the “Newest Early Elementary” written by Chong In-ho in 1908.

Through comparing these three texts, we can gain some sense of how the Korean and Japanese language planners, overtly or unconsciously, strove to advance their own ethnic values through the writing process. Paek Sun-jae explains the process of compilation of the “National Elementary Reader” as follows:

With the 1894 reform, the new education required a new school

---

<sup>23</sup> Takami Kame and Asakawa Matsujirō.

curriculum and academic content. Until that time, the type of education imparted by the *sōdang* or traditional-style Korean tutoring schools was mainly based upon “worship of the written script,” that is, it was centered on the Chinese classics and Confucianism. Not even a single textbook had existed which expressed our own characteristics for an autonomous national and ethnic education....Therefore, this textbook could be seen as the first supportive material for the basic principle of *Kap-ō sin chang* [the 1894 Reform], that is, the effort to realize autonomy, independence and historical initiative through efforts at education. In other words, it is an expression of hope and the will to accept and diffuse modern knowledge concerning changing world trends, current affairs, science and so on through the collaborative efforts of leading officials and the entire intelligentsia.<sup>24</sup>

This book was written in a mixture of *han'gǔl* and Chinese characters, the sentences are rather lengthy and literary in style, and there was apparently no attempt to avoid the more complex characters. There are no illustrations, the 41 lessons are not arranged according to difficulty or learnability, and it is not clear by its content whether the book was aimed at beginners or advanced classes. Paek suggests that this was due to the technical inexperience of the editors. Yet despite its problems, the textbook undoubtedly represents an epoch-making advance in Korean education. Its importance was given backhanded recognition by the banning of its distribution at the time of Korea's annexation in 1910.

The introduction to the first volume of the “Revised National Elementary Reader” may serve as an explanation of its characteristics:

It is important that students not just worship the Chinese classics and learn from the past, but also grasp the meaning of this present time in history, respect *han'gǔl* and broaden their knowledge. Our Sejong Daewang [Great King Sejong] tried to civilize the people with the national language [Korean] and created the people's correct phonology [*han'gǔl*] to spread among the people, making it easy for even women and children to learn.

Today, in order to accelerate civilization by making friendship treaties with all the nations of the world, the most crucial matter is to promote education. We therefore invited Takami Kame and Asakawa Matsujirō and learned the common rules of textbook compilation and curriculum development. It is helpful to have pictures and illustrations as aids to understanding the national writing, and this also makes it easy for children to understand. Chinese characters will be introduced from the easier to the more difficult. We hope that our children will take note of this sincere concern of

<sup>24</sup> Paek Sun-jae, *Kaidai: Kankoku Kaikaki Kyōkashō Sōsho* [A Bibliographical Introduction to the Collection of Textbooks From the Time of Korean Modernization], Vol. 1, Tokyo, Ajia Bunkasha, 1977; cited in Yi Sukucha, *op. cit.*, p. 134.

the state for their education and work very hard, persevering to foster talented, independent personalities by learning from each nation's trends and characteristics, so that they can become the backbone of our nation.

This textbook has many pictures and illustrations and the sentences are short and simple, based upon facets of daily life, the family and society, and filled with practical knowledge. Thus, from a technical point of view, it was superior to the previous text, something which might be attributable to the participation of the Japanese advisers. But, as Paek puts it, while "it is good" that a technical step forward has been taken, "there is strong evidence that the Japanese political invasion was already under way in the textbook field. For example, some pictures were taken from Japanese texts and depict Japanese culture, lifestyles and clothing, and even exact translations from Japanese texts were included."<sup>25</sup>

The "Newest Early Elementary," comprising eight volumes, was published by Chong In-ho in 1908, and was widely used among private schools. It exhibits a rich ethnic and patriotic flavor, employing many examples of Korean historical heroes, royal figures and patriotic tales. Yi Sukucha's research on the nationality of the heroes and historical figures included in the text shows 88 percent of them (44 persons) to be Korean, 8 percent Chinese (4), 4 percent Western (2), and none Japanese.<sup>26</sup> Among the various references to Japan in the text, all concern Japanese invasions of Korea from the Korean point of view, focusing on Korean heroes who fought to defend their motherland. Five lessons concentrate on the invasions of 1592 and 1597 and are illustrated with pictures of Korean war heroes. Two other lessons deal with the Wae'gu invasion of 13–14 B.C. and the patriotic general, Min Yǒng-hwan, who immolated himself in protest at the time of the Second Japan-Korea Agreement which made Korea into a Japanese protectorate in 1905. Another featured personage was Wang In, who was described as a great

---

<sup>25</sup> Paek Sun-jae, *ibid.*, pp. viii–ix; quoted in Yi Sukucha, *ibid.*, p. 136.

<sup>26</sup> Yi Sukucha, *ibid.*, p. 170.

contributor to Japanese culture and civilization for having taken the Confucian classics, one thousand Chinese characters, and books on astronomy and the calendar to Japan, as well as for having sent Buddhist monks and nuns, temple carpenters, musicians, potters, saddle makers, wine makers, and so on. It concluded that due to Wang In's labors, Japan was eventually able to develop its own technologies, science, art and culture.

Not surprisingly, this series of textbooks was also banned at the time of annexation. In any case, the fact that all references to Japan with the exception of the story of Wang In's contributions deal with aggression or attempts to control Korean identity may well reflect the feelings of Korean intellectuals and masses at this time of national transition.

During the “Protectorate” period, a series of textbooks had also been prepared for the “New Education” system by teams of Korean scholars working with Japanese advisers. These textbooks were also written in Korean (*han'gǔl* and Chinese characters) and were also full of Korean flavor, with positive references to Korean history and heroes, albeit not so obviously and consistently from a Korean nationalist point of view.

With Korea's annexation, the new regime directed that textbooks be inspected and revised to bring them into line with the political change. In December 1910 the Academic Bureau issued a “Teaching Guide and Table of Corrections” revising several curriculum and textbook items. The explanation offered is that because Korea has now become a part of Japan, there are many “improper” parts in the textbooks. Since it is not possible to issue revised textbooks immediately, these new guidelines and correction tables were being distributed to teachers and must be followed, whether in private or public schools. Perhaps the most telling change was that of the titles of the former “National Language Readers” to “Korean Readers” and of the former “Japanese Language Readers” to “National Language Readers.” Japanese was now to be considered the “national” language of Korea.

Among the other changes dealt with in the Table of Corrections were the following:

1. In place of references to the royal family of Korea were to be substituted “Emperor and Empress of Imperial Japan and their royal family.”
2. The previous name for Korea — “Great Han” — was to be replaced by Chōsen.
3. The Korean system of reign-era designations, an essential component of the politically-legitimizing East Asian calendar system, was to be replaced by that of Japan, with the era of the time being the Meiji era.<sup>27</sup>
4. Korean national holidays were to be replaced by those of Japan, including the birthday of the Emperor.
5. References to the old central government of Korea should be dropped.
6. Existing history and geography texts have some historical descriptions of past Japanese invasions of Korea; these must be taught with extreme care so they do not stir up any unrest among students.

Under Article 23 of the “Regulations for Common Schools” of October 1911, all textbooks henceforth used in Korean schools must be those compiled by, or sanctioned by, the Governor-General of Korea.

Eight new Japanese language textbooks were issued by the Academic Bureau in 1911, on the grounds that “Since Japanese is now the national language, the textbooks must be immediately changed.” Two textbooks were prepared for each of the four primary school grades, 631 pages in all. In keeping with the “Teaching Guide and Table of Corrections,” these textbooks incorporated various changes in content. For example,

---

<sup>27</sup> It may seem strange to the Western reader that a calendar system should have anything to do with political legitimacy but the fact is that the system of East Asian system of recording dates was a key element of politics in the region, where the use or non-use of new dynastic or reign-era names could be used to easily distinguish between loyalists and die-hard supporters of a defeated or rival regime.

in Lesson 16 of Book 5, the annexation of Korea is explained as “inevitable”:

Japan proper [*naichi*] and Chōsen are the same race and have had interchange since time immemorial. Therefore their relationship is one like lips and teeth. Chōsen has always been bullied by the West and North and has had little peace as it was weak and subject to many wars.

The Meiji Emperor has been very concerned with establishing peace in the East and hoped to make Chōsen as safe as Japan proper. Therefore, as we learned in the previous lesson, our country fought against China and Russia two times, many people lost their lives and much money was spent. However, due to this, not only Chōsen but also Manchuria has become peaceful. And this is due to nothing other than the grace of the Meiji Emperor.

After that, for a while, Chōsen, under the protection of Japan, was given a chance to reform its politics. Japan sent a Resident-General to reside in and guide Chōsen. However, Chōsen has been politically loose for several hundred years and there was not much hope for a patient sick so long. There was no easy prospect to create a basis for unbroken peace in the East if Chōsen stayed as it was. The last Korean [*Kankoku*] Emperor soon grasped this and, for the peace of all the people, realized that there was no other way but to annex Chōsen to the Great Imperial Japan so that perpetual security could be maintained and the peace of the East consolidated. He asked this of the Meiji Emperor and the Emperor consented to his plea and Chōsen became a part of the Great Imperial Japan in August of the 36th year of Meiji. At the same time, the name Kankoku was changed to Chōsen and the Governor-General received the order of the Emperor to govern the peninsula.”<sup>28</sup>

To take another example, in Lesson 3 of Book 7, the map which previously showed Korea as a separate country was changed to show it as an integral part of the Japanese Empire and the accompanying text which previously had said “Korea is an independent country and does not belong to Qing [China]; however Qing willfully sent soldiers to Korea, so Japan also sent soldiers in order to protect Japanese in Korea; that was the beginning of the Japan-Qing War” — was revised to eliminate the reference to Korea’s independence.

As yet another example, in Lesson 16 of Book 8, the Korean scholar-hero Wan Jun is replaced by the Meiji Emperor.

---

<sup>28</sup> Quoted in Yi Sukucha, *ibid.*, p. 253–55.

#### 4. Teachers and pedagogy

Other than a handful of books devoted to the ideological dimension of teaching, written by policy-supporting linguists and educators, and a few subjective observations or sketchy impressions included in personal memoirs, there appears to be little material in the accessible documentation concerning how teachers actually engaged in teaching the “national language” to their Korean pupils.<sup>29</sup> There are undoubtedly still people alive in both Korea and Japan who actually engaged in the teaching and linguistic work, at least during the latter part of the Japanese occupation, and who might be encouraged to share their memories in a more systematic way, but the opportunity to learn from their direct experience is rapidly drawing to a close. Those memoirs which do exist are characterized by a monolingual, submersion-oriented view of language teaching, coupled with a sense of Japanese cultural and linguistic superiority. Virtually none are concerned with teaching Japanese as a “second language.”

One book, titled “The Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere and National Language Policy,” was published in 1943 by experienced linguists and language professionals, summed up Japanese language policy as implemented up until then in Taiwan, the Chinese mainland, Korea and Southeast Asia, and made suggestions for the future.<sup>30</sup> The well-known national language scholar and linguist Hoshina Kōichi, who had been commissioned as an adviser to the language planning effort for Korea, edited

---

<sup>29</sup> In Spring 1994, a TV documentary film was aired by Japan’s National Broadcasting Service [“NHK”] which sought to tell the story of a Japanese who had taught elementary school in Korea in the 1930s and ‘40s. The documentary portrayed the woman as ambivalent, with fond memories but repentant for having forced her pupils to submit to the education of the time. It showed her traveling to Korea to seek them out, both to apologize and see how they were now doing. The ironic and thought-provoking outcome was that, although she managed to meet some of her former pupils, the one she wanted to see most, her “best student,” refused to see her, but instead sent her a lengthy letter to tell her that if she really felt sorry for what she had done she should put her remaining energies into working in Japan to clarify the wrongdoings that Imperial Japan had perpetrated on the Korean people.

<sup>30</sup> *Daitō A Kyōeiken to Kokugo Seisaku* [The Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere and National Language Policy], Tokyo, Nippon Shuppan Haikyū Kabushiki Gaisha, 1943.

and coauthored the book with five language teachers. Interspersed among the highly ideological declarations of success, claimed both to have been already achieved and certain to continue, can be found certain concerns and even hints of problems. Hoshina argues that the Japanese language can be a useful tool for fashioning a Greater East Asian Bloc centered on Japan, not only because it can serve as a medium of communication but also because of its attractions as a “binding force.” He believes that the reason Japan is “united” is due to this binding force of the language and attributes to its “flexibility” Japan’s successful “modernization” without losing its ethnic identity. From this assumption he jumps to the conclusion that the success of the Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere — peace and happiness for Asian nations through Japanese initiative — will similarly be assured by the adoption of the Japanese language as the binding force. Japanese language planning is thus as desirable as it is inevitable. Hoshina dreams of a day to come when all the East Asian nations will unite in the name of Confucius and the Greater East Asian Coprosperity Sphere, and the language spoken will be Japanese.

He says:

Among these nations of the Greater East Asian Coprosperity Sphere, education in Japanese-ness [Nipponteki kyōiku] must be conducted and, through the national language, the unique spirit of Japan — the pure, unique spirit — must be well understood. To learn about Japanese culture and Japanese history is crucial for the unity of the Greater East Asian peoples.

Through the acquisition of the national language, the Japanese spirit will be grasped, then, if they naturally assimilate to this spirit, it will be a matter of course that they can cooperate and harmonize with us and, eventually, become strongly united with us.<sup>31</sup>

After this flight of fancy, Hoshina delves into the need for monolingual unification of the Empire for military unity, citing as a negative example the difficulty of securing unity in the Philippines “with its 80 different languages” so as to achieve the betterment of Filipinos’ life through sophisticated education to attain sophisticated culture and language

---

<sup>31</sup> Hoshina Kōichi, “*Daitō A kyōtsugo toshite no kokugo*” [National language as the common language of Greater East Asia], in *ibid.*, pp. 12–13.

(as in Japan). Given such views it comes as no surprise that the colonial rulers of Korea found him an attractive candidate for the post of language planning adviser.

In another chapter in the same book, Koshimizu Minoru sees Japanese language teaching as the edification of other “races,” a most valuable and “entirely unique” contribution to the establishment of the Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere. He suggests the compilation of entirely new teaching materials and the adoption of new approaches based on the “uniqueness” of Japan and the Japanese language, materials and methods which would turn away from the so-called “speaking approach” and methods derived from the teaching of English. Koshimizu’s ideas would soon be mirrored in the spiritual teaching of *kokutai* (the national essence) — which was used as the symbol of Japanese ethnic superiority based upon a self-deceptive view of history and used to rationalize Japanese cultural and linguistic aggression through colonial control over other Asian states.<sup>32</sup>

Another of the coauthors of this book, Matsumiya Yahei, presents a somewhat more dispassionate view than the two advocates of “state language” just mentioned, who, it is important to note, represented the main trend among linguists and educators at the time. From his 35 years of Japanese language teaching, mainly of Westerners, Matsumiya suggests the necessity of correct teaching methods based on concrete language analysis, and points to an urgent need to work out teacher training methods and establish the necessary facilities. He claims that if Japanese language teachers are to be responsible for inculcating the lofty Japanese spirit and profound Japanese thought and ideology, then they must, above all, be ready to submit themselves to rigorous training in the best techniques for the teaching of pronunciation, grammar, actual usage, and so on. In fact, Matsumiya’s voice stands out among those of his colleagues who were more

---

<sup>32</sup> Koshimizu Minoru, “*Daiitō A Kyōsugo toshite no Nihongo*” [Japanese language as the common language for the Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere], in *ibid.*, pp. 17–24.

likely to put state nationalism before professionalism, precisely because he lists things which are still today major concerns for the improvement of the teaching of Japanese as a second language in a non-coercive setting.<sup>33</sup>

Just as Korean students, as the objects of the assimilation policy, were tightly regimented and closely watched by the Government-General, so too were the teachers subject to careful scrutiny as the purveyors of the assimilationist education.<sup>34</sup> As early as the “Protectorate” period, the office of the Resident-General had appointed what might be called “commissars” (*kyōkan*), nominally to assist the school principals (most of whom were initially Korean) but in fact to watch over the ideological aspect of the teaching. Only Japanese were appointed to this position.<sup>35</sup> As was noted in Chapter II, from the annexation until 1919, all Japanese teachers had been required to wear uniforms complete with swords in the classroom. They were also expected to maintain liaison with the local police forces to assure “security.” Thus, in a way, these teachers were more than mere pedagogues, and an incarnation of Japanese state power. From 1916, they were expected to conduct themselves according to a manual known as the “Teachers’ Spiritual Guide” (*Kyōin Kokoroe*), which provided a summary of the Imperial Ordinance on Education.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> Matsumiya Yahei, “*Nihongo to Nihongo kyōshi*” [The Japanese language and the Japanese language teacher], in *ibid.*, pp. 25–33. (Matsumiya makes reference in his chapter to a Japanese Language Teaching Research Center under the Japan Cultural Society in Tokyo as a language-teacher training center existing at the time.)

<sup>34</sup> The educational administrative organs, under the direction of the Academic Bureau of the Government-General of Korea, functioned to control the entire Korean school system, and all of the official positions in these organs and this bureau were monopolized by Japanese. In addition, all the administrative positions in the modern *shōgakkō* school system set up the government-general, as well as in the *futsūgakkō* and specialized schools, were occupied by Japanese teachers; cited in Ozawa, *op.cit.*, p. 67.

<sup>35</sup> Three batches of teachers were invited from Japan, in 1906, 1907 and 1908, to serve in this capacity in 58 *futsūgakkō* and the various middle schools. They numbered 90 in September 1908.

<sup>36</sup> This “Spiritual Guide” laid out three principles and nine items for attention. The three principles were as follows: 1) The morality of the students must be cultivated based on the fundamental principle of loyalty to the Emperor; 2) Knowledge and skills must be oriented toward practical use; 3) The bodies of the students must be made strong and healthy. [Ozawa, *ibid.*]

Aside from these more abstract and formalistic concerns, guidance was also given on more concrete matters. For example, in the early period of Japanese education in Korea, language teachers were instructed to place the emphasis on speaking and the creation of conversational settings in the classroom so as to prepare, as quickly as possible, for the future teaching of all subjects in Japanese. Also, in accordance with the results of research into which Japanese phonemes were difficult for Koreans to pronounce, teachers were instructed to start with easy words and gradually move toward more difficult ones. Phonetic transcription was to be in the syllabary known as *hyō-on* which was pronunciation-oriented, rather than in the historical syllabary, to facilitate the teaching of Japanese by Korean teachers.<sup>37</sup> This early policy underwent changes, however, in accordance with the step-by-step development of the assimilationist policy, until in 1942 the historical syllabary was universalized in the *shōgakkō* textbooks.

The pace of teaching was also regulated. For example, some 1,500 to 1,600 *kanji* (Chinese characters) were to be taught through the eight *futsūgakkō* national language texts. This was considerably more than the number taught in the same classroom contact time in Japan proper, but was not necessarily especially difficult for Korean students, who were also acquiring *kanji* through their Korean and Chinese classes. Meanwhile, pupils were expected to learn the *katakana* syllabary in the first grade, then move on to *hiragana* in the second. And since there was no history or geography in the curriculum at this time, the rudiments of both subjects were to be included in the “national language” (Japanese) classes.

Actual teaching, as we might guess from these guidelines, was the direct method, suited to the teaching of Korean children who, at the outset, didn’t know a word of

---

<sup>37</sup> This approach was in fact initiated with the support of Hoshina Kyōichi, the national language scholar and linguist mentioned earlier. The decision was a purely practical one since, in the early years, among the thousand or so public schools, except for the principal, most of the teachers were Korean and it was difficult for them to work with the historical syllabary.

Japanese, by teachers who were incapable of explaining even basic concepts in their pupils' native language. One teacher, Iida Akira, reported his direct classroom approach in vivid terms:

After much pondering, I drew three pictures of a child, respectively washing the face, eating, and sleeping. I would ask, "Today, after getting up, what did you do?"... "I washed my face." I made as if going to a basin and washing my face, then said "Teacher washed his face." ... Did you wash your face today?" "Yes," "Yes!" the children exclaimed, becoming quite noisy. Here and there a child would start to pretend to wash his face. Everyone watched me attentively. "We eat lunch at lunchtime." I took the children during lunchtime to the next room where other children were already eating lunch. "This is lunch." ... "And we go to bed at night." Teaching "I go to bed" was easy; I just lay down and snored. The children began to laugh. "I go to bed!" "I go to bed!", they shouted uproariously. They became very happy now that they could demonstrate their grasp of the national language.

"Tomorrow, we'll get up and wash our faces." Tomorrow... day after tomorrow.... I pointed to the next picture with the rod and acted out the series [of actions]. Then I showed the series of pictures in the context of tomorrow [future tense]. Within a week it seemed that all the concepts were perfectly grasped.<sup>38</sup>

Here we have an obviously happy scene, with a highly motivated teacher and happy and interested pupils. Nevertheless, any teacher who has tried such absolutely direct oral methods knows the stumbling blocks to such an approach. Regardless of the labors of the teacher, the results are inevitably limited in terms of accuracy of both meaning and usage. Such problems are not, of course, limited to enforced-learning contexts. For example, among the thousands of foreign English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) teachers in Japan, no more than a tiny handful are capable of explaining English concepts and usage in Japanese, and thus must often fall back on a direct learning approach. But within the forced-learning context that prevailed in Korea the problem was exacerbated because the teacher of beginning pupils had to carry the full load, conceiving and preparing all the "situations" within a rigid, externally imposed, political framework.

There was no problem here from the point of view of the language planners. As

---

<sup>38</sup> Iida Akira, *Hantō no Kora* [Children of the Peninsula], Tokyo, 1942, pp. 29–31; quoted in Ozawa, *ibid.*, p. 102.

Shiobara Tokisaburō, head of the Academic Bureau, put it in a speech in 1937, the aim in hiring native Japanese speakers as teachers was, firstly, “to have the students become accustomed to hearing the beautiful national language.” In Shiobara’s mind, there was no doubt that “the national language as spoken by native Korean teachers is far behind that of native Japanese teachers in terms of both elegance and correctness.” And in any case, Shiobara felt, “If the teacher does not understand or speak to the pupils in the Korean language, they will display a strong zeal, out of necessity, for learning the national language, and thus their acquisition of the language will be enhanced.”<sup>39</sup>

The words of Shiobara quoted here were directed to the Korean Education Association (*Chōsen Kyōikukai*), which itself served as one of the principal channels of control over teachers by the authorities. The Governor-General of Korea served as ex officio chairman of the Association, while the head of the government’s Academic Bureau — at this time Shiobara — served as vice-chairman of what was ostensibly a semi-private organization. Nominally a collective professional body to assist teachers in carrying out educational policy, it in fact increasingly became an outright instrument of ideological and political control, as can be seen through its bulletin *Culture and Education in Korea [Bunkyō no Chōsen]*. Prior to the Third Education Order it played a very active role in the moves toward a completely assimilationist education by helping to devise and then popularize educational methods and technologies to support the policy of ethnic obliteration.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> Shiobara Tokizaburō, *Chōsen Kyōikukai kakitaikai de no aisatsu* [Congratulatory speech to the autumn assembly of the Korean Education Association], October 1937; quoted in Ozawa, *ibid.*, p. 94. (It should, perhaps, be noted here that from the point of view of language teaching concepts prevalent today, such an elitist, ethnocentric view of language is the complete antithesis of student motivation.)

<sup>40</sup> *Chōsen Kyōikukai* [Korean Education Association], eds., *Bunkyō no Chōsen* [Culture and Education in Korea]; this journal was published in Seoul during the 1930s and early 1940s.

## 5. Actual school and classroom conditions

Various records from the occupation period allow us to reconstruct a composite picture of actual school life.<sup>41</sup> Although this picture is not necessarily accurate in all its details, and conflates aspects of both time and place, it is not a mere caricature and is included here to help the Western reader grasp some of the ethnic, cultural and psychological implications of the Japanese-Korean relationship in its educational-language planning dimension.

Korean children passing in the morning through the schoolyard gate of a *futsūgakkō* with their schoolmates would switch their conversation to Japanese as well as to a somewhat more formal and guarded style as might children entering a school everywhere. They would pass the flagpole from which the Japanese flag fluttered and might notice the huge signboard reading “School is a sacred place, filled with the Emperor’s glory!” which was situated just before a small shrine where the school’s copy of the “sacred” Imperial Education Order was enshrined. Effecting a solemn manner while passing by the shrine, the children might think back to the day the Order arrived at the school in its special lacquered box bearing the imperial chrysanthemum seal, carried by a local official in full dress uniform complete with sword, and the Japanese principal, dressed in a formal morning coat and seemingly moved to tears, giving a lengthy hortatory speech filled with words and phrases of great gravity — “*isshidōjin*,” “*Nai-Sen ittai*,” “*Daitō-A Kyōei Ken*.” While the children might still not be entirely sure what these words really meant, they would have been repeated incessantly ever since, at

---

<sup>41</sup> The reconstruction draws on the following sources: Kamatsuka Yasuo, *Daitōa kyōeiken no ikkan toshite no Chōsen ni okeru Kōminka Undō ni tsuite — kyōkusha toshite no tachiba yori taiken wo kataru* [An educator’s experience of the Greater East Asian Coprosperity Sphere Kōminka movement], in *Nippon Shogaku Shinkō Iinkai Kenkyū Hōkoku* [Report on the Research Findings of the Academic Development Committee on Japanese Scholarships], Tokyo, Vol. 10, 1941 (cited in Ozawa, *op. cit.*, p. 100); compositions of elementary school pupils on the Kokumin schools in *Bunkyō no Chōsen*, *ibid.*, August 1938 and June 1940 issues (cited in Ozawa, *op. cit.*, p. 91); and the *futsūgakkō* ethics text of 1923 (Seoul, Government of Korea Printing House).

morning assemblies and in ethics, history and “national language” classes. What was clear was that every time these magic words were spoken, all “subjects of the Empire”—teachers and students alike—would act, or were expected to act, differently than they normally would.

Entering the home classroom, the children would be confronted with a large banner: “We are all Japanese; Speak the National Language!” and framed pictures of Japanese heroes like General Nogi and Ninomiya Sontoku on the walls. There were also pictures depicting victories on the war fronts, large pictures of the imperial palace in Tokyo and the sacred imperial shrine at Ise, as well as another Japanese *hinomaru* flag.

Every morning started with the children making obeisance toward the imperial palace in far-off Tokyo and reciting in unison the oath of fealty to the Emperor, to be followed by the teacher recounting the day’s news of the exploits of the imperial army in China and Southeast Asia in pursuit of consolidation of the Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere.

Other assembly activities varied according to the day of the week. On Mondays and Saturdays, the entire school would sit cross-legged on the ground in front of the shrine holding the Imperial Order, to enhance their spirit of devotion to the Empire. They were asked to meditate briefly, listen to a short Shinto service, recite the oath of loyalty, and then listen to an admonitory speech by the principal. On Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays, they just made obeisance toward the imperial palace, recited the oath, listened to a short lecture, and performed the standard calisthenic exercises (*Shinmin taisō*—“exercises for subjects of the Empire”). Wednesday assemblies were devoted to military instruction, which consisted mainly of training in the military regulations and the cultivation of obedience and courage.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> Information on the morning assemblies may be found in *Bunkyō no Chōsen*, August 1938 issue; cited in Ozawa, *ibid*.

Then it was time for classes. On any given day in history class the pupils might be tested on the imperial lineage: asked to recite from memory the names of all 124 emperors of Japan since the dawn of history, which they had been practicing since the beginning of the year. The teacher might then use the time left to teach the class that “The history of Japan-Korea relations has been one of constant support by Japan of Korea, which has been a tributary of Japan. The two countries have always had a relationship of harmony and friendship....Annexation of Korea was inevitable for the development and prosperity of the country as a part of the Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere.”<sup>43</sup>

In geography class the lesson might focus on a large wall map of the world. The Japanese Empire — which included Korea — was at the center of the map and there was a concentric circle around it marking out the rough limits of the Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere. The discussion might focus on the resources of the various regions within the circle and on how they could be exploited for the welfare of the whole.

Music class might rehearse again the singing of the (Japanese) national anthem, and then move on to some stirring new marches and militaristic odes.

And so it went. For those to whom it might prove emotionally satisfying to identify with the larger unit of empire and the transcendental aims which it claimed to represent — and children were undoubtedly particularly susceptible to such emotions — the propagandistic content of the formalities and lessons may have been tolerable. For anybody with even the slightest doubt about the Japan-Korea relationship — and it is difficult to imagine that such people, even among young pupils (who after all, generally went home to their families at the end of the school day) were few — the experience must have had its trying moments. In any case, we do know that it took relatively little effort to whip up sufficient anti-Japanese sentiment after the collapse of imperial Japan to

---

<sup>43</sup> Kamatsuka Yasuo, as cited in Ozawa, *ibid.*

dismantle the entire schooling structure.

But before laying out any overall conclusions we must first look at the actual results of language training as it was carried out in the atmosphere we have described above.

## Chapter IV. Results of the Language-Planning Effort

Various approaches might be taken in assessing the “success” of Japan’s language planning for Korea. For example, one might review the subjective impressions of language capabilities gleaned by Japanese travelers and observers who have left accounts of their experiences in prewar and wartime Korea. Such impressions concerning language per se seem relatively scarce, however, and were generally recorded by those with a direct interest in the language planning effort. We have already taken note of some such impressions. Alternatively, one might hold up the numbers of those Koreans said to have gained a native-like fluency in the speaking and reading of Japanese against Japan’s avowed aim of turning the entire Korean populace into ordinary Japanese citizens. Finally, one might consider the numbers of Korean attaining some particular level of proficiency in Japanese as a second language in the light of second-language learning achievements in other environments and contexts. Given the limited availability of data, a combination of the latter two approaches is used for the purpose here.

Firstly, we have the data of the Korean Government-General itself. Morita Yoshio has compiled its figures on those “understanding” spoken Japanese for the thirty-year period 1913-43, shown in Table III below. Although the expression “understanding basic Japanese” is open to interpretation and the data series under this head is not entirely consistent, it is notable that the overall ratio to population grows smoothly over the period from just over .6 percentage points to 22.1 percent in 1943.

Morita has also pulled together the government figures on literacy for the year 1930, or about half way through the language planning effort (Table IV. below). By that time, approximately 7 percent of the entire Korean populace was capable of reading and writing the Japanese syllabaries as well as *han’gǔl*. Here, incidentally, we also have an interesting gender breakdown showing males literate in Japanese outnumbering Japanese-

literate females by nearly six to one, while in the category of *han'gǔl*-only literacy the ratio is more like four to one.

Table III. Numbers of Koreans Understanding Spoken Japanese, 1913 - 1943

End of Year:	Numbers understanding basic Japanese [a]	Numbers having no difficulty with daily conversation [b]	Total [a + b]	Ratio per 1,000 population
1913	63,092	29,171	92,261	6.08
1919	200,195	102,712	302,907	---
20	244,643	122,722	367,365	21.7
21	290,707	150,517	441,224	25.9
22	386,158	178,871	565,092	33.0
23	485,260	227,007	712,267	40.8
24	549,137	268,860	817,997	46.4
25	615,033	332,113	947,146	51.08
26	690,448	374,998	1,065,446	57.23
27	755,643	426,372	1,182,015	63.23
28	817,776	472,465	1,290,241	68.11
29	900,157	540,446	1,440,623	76.69
30	997,423	629,713	1,627,136	83.09
31	1,026,498	716,937	1,724,209	87.48
32	825,506	760,137	1,542,443	74.88
33	817,984	760,137	1,578,121	---
34	857,268	833,612	1,690,880	---
35	962,982	915,722	1,878,704	---
36	1,052,903	1,051,059	2,290,241	69.1
37	1,201,048	1,196,350	2,578,121	78.1
38	1,326,269	1,391,538	2,717,807	123.81
39	1,491,120	1,577,912	3,069,032	138.88
40	1,730,758	1,842,580	3,573,338	155.70
41	1,884,733	2,087,361	3,972,094	166.10
42	2,353,843	2,735,371	5,089,214	199.40
43	-----	-----	5,722,448	221.5

- Sources: 1. 1913 - 1942: excerpted from Government General of Korea, eds., *Chōsen Sōtokufu Shisei Nenpō* [Government-General of Korea Policy Almanac] 1921 - 41 ed., Seoul, 1941; *Chōsen Jijō* [The Situation of Korea], 1940-44 ed.
2. 1943: "Materials from the budgetary meeting of the 85th Japan Imperial Diet," July, 1944 (in Japanese), in *Taiheiyo Senka no Chōsen oyobi Taiwan* [Korea and Taiwan During The Pacific War], Tokyo, Yuhōkyo Kai, February, 1968.  
(Taken from Morita, *op. cit.*, p. 128)

Although these figures may at first glance seem rather limited, it is important to recognize the trends which they reveal. For example, if the ratios of language "understanding" were to continue to increase at the same uniform rate, one might well

expect the majority of the population to have Japanese language capabilities within a rather short period of time.

**Table IV. Degree of Literacy of Korean Populace, 1930**

Item	Total Number		Males		Females	
	Actual No.	Per 1,000	Actual No.	Per 1,000	Actual No.	Per 1,000
Total Number	20,438,108	1,000	10,398,889	1,000	10,039,219	1,000
Capable of reading and writing both Japanese syllabaries & han'gǔl	1,387,276	67.88	1,195,461	114.96	191,815	19.11
Capable of reading and writing only Japanese syllabaries	6,297	0.31	5,070	0.49	1,227	0.12
Capable of writing and reading han'gǔl only	3,156,408	154.44	2,551,077	245.32	605,331	60.30
Illiterate	15,888,127	777.37	6,647,281	639.23	9,240,846	920.47

Source: Government-General of Korea, *Shōwa Go-nen Chōsen Kokusei Chōsa Hōkoku* [Report on the 1930 Korean National Census], All-Korea Edition, Annotated, Vol. 2, 1935.

(Taken from Morita, p. 129)

It is also important to understand that the literacy and comprehension indicated by these figures were a product almost solely of primary education and hence the numbers represent the younger part of the populace. Moreover as pointed out by the Korean scholar Kim Min Soo, if the calculations of ratios were based on only the portion of the population over 10 years of age (that is, excluding those who were not yet likely to have completed their language education) then the total figure for comprehension comes to 30.3 percent rather than the 22 percent figure given by the Government-General. By extrapolation, he calculates that by 1945 the ratio must have risen to 38 percent, and that if Japanese rule had continued for a total of sixty years, the ratio would have climbed to 85 percent.<sup>1</sup>

Other government-provided data are available which allow us to make a limited comparison between the relative levels of "national language" (Japanese) vocabulary

<sup>1</sup> Kim Min Soo, "Nittei no taikan shinryaku to gengo seisaku" [The invasion of Korea by Japanese imperialism and language policy], in *Han* [Korea], No. 17, 1973 (translated by Yutani Sachitoshi); quoted in Morita, *op. cit.*, pp. 129-30.

acquisition of Korean and Japanese children. Research conducted in January 1938, that is, about two thirds of the way through the language planning period, compared vocabulary acquisition of elementary pupils having completed the first grade in a provincial Japanese city to that of pupils at a similar stage in a *futsūgakkō* in Seoul.<sup>2</sup>

**Table V. Comparative Levels of Vocabulary Acquisition Among Japanese and Korean Elementary Pupils**

	Highest	Lowest	Average
A	6,906 (100%)	3,338 (100%)	5,230 (100%)
B	1,485 (21.5% of "A")	587 (17.58%)	940 (18%)

Key: A: *Shōgakkō* (elementary school) attached to Okayama University, Okayama, Japan

B: *Futsūgakkō* (elementary school for Koreans) attached to Seoul Women's Normal College, Korea

While the showings of the Korean pupils may at first glance appear unremarkable, it must be remembered that the comparison is between native speakers and second-language learners having had only a single year of exposure to the Japanese language. What might be expected after several years of formal study? In fact, we have contemporary information which explicitly reveals the expectations of the Government-General of Korea: three years of schooling was to transform Korean children into fluent speakers of Japanese. As the head of the Academic Bureau's textbook editorial section put it in 1939, only a year after the data in the foregoing table were collected:

There there are two hours more of Japanese language class [compared to elementary schools in Japan], and within these three years of elementary school, they will catch up [in the language]. Then, in the fourth year, the policy is to use the [regular] textbooks of the [Japanese] Ministry of Education. That is to say, the objective in compiling the early national language [Japanese] textbooks is to impart fluency in the language within three years so that the switch will be no problem.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Government-General of Korea, "Kokugo fukū narabini kokugo kyōiku ni kansuru shiryō" [Materials on national language diffusion and national language education], in *Bunkyō no Chōsen* [Culture and Education in Korea], No. 5, 1941; cited in Ozawa, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

<sup>3</sup> Speech of the head of the editorial section of the Academic Bureau, Government-General of Korea, in Monbushō [Ministry of Education], *Kokugo Taisaku Kyōgikai Gijiroku* [Minutes of the Conference on National Language Policy], Tokyo, 1939, p. 9; cited in Ozawa, *ibid.*, p. 93.

In the light of current language-teaching practices and techniques, such an expectation is not unreasonable. In “international schools” (in which the language of instruction is usually English), pupils from different language backgrounds are generally expected to make the transition and become capable of functioning in the school language within three to five years. Immigrant language programs for children in North America are based upon similar expectations.

All in all, the limited evidence suggests that Japan’s language planning policy per se was “successful” in a strictly utilitarian sense. Given the aims and objectives of the language planning effort, great strides were made and large numbers of young Koreans were given the skills necessary to communicate in Japanese. Moreover, it does indeed seem plausible that had the effort continued, there might have come a time when Japanese would be intelligible to virtually the entire Korean populace.

Nevertheless, to discuss “success” in terms of utilitarian achievements alone is surely to miss a most important point. The fact is, of course, that the effort did not continue, but was interrupted by Japan’s defeat and expulsion from Korea. More importantly, the defeat was to be followed by a wholesale rejection of things Japanese — including the language — as part of a general resurrgence in Korean nationalism and ethnicity. Looked at from the perspective of this reaction the results of Japan’s language planning take on quite a different appearance.

Here, we can only briefly trace the events following Japan’s collapse. Within a month after the surrender of Japan, the reopening of public schools for Korean children was ordered by the United States military authorities in Korea. The fourth article of the military order stated that the language of instruction in the schools was henceforth to be Korean, although until appropriate Korean-language teaching materials could be prepared it was all right to use “foreign-language” materials. The fifth article stipulated that

"Subjects which are detrimental to Korean interests must not be taught or advocated."<sup>4</sup>

This interim American military order was later supplanted by an educational clause in the new Constitution of the Republic of Korea securing free primary education in the Korean language for all Korean children.

The Korean Language Academy, which had been repressed during the period of Japanese control, acted swiftly to compile a series of national textbooks — a set of primary language textbooks in six volumes, a two-volume set of middle school texts and a beginners' text in *han'gǔl* — which were issued in December 1945. In 1946, the academy also resumed the compilation of a Korean-language "Great Dictionary," which had been discontinued with the wartime confiscation by the Japanese military police of the results of the original effort.<sup>5</sup>

A "language purification" campaign committee was set up in June 1946 by the new Korean Ministry of Education. This committee in 1948 issued a booklet entitled "Retrieve Our Language" which, among other things, included a list of native substitutes for 938 Japanese words which had come into use in daily life under Japanese rule. The introduction of the booklet, which we shall quote here at length, expresses the strong feelings of Koreans toward their own language in terms evoking ethnic sentiment and pride:

For the past 36 years we have been under the violent and vicious Japanese rule, suppressed by the absurd ethnic assimilationist policy. Hence the glorious achievements of our more than 5,000 years of culture were jeopardized and often polluted by the bigoted and vulgar Japanese culture and customs and almost lost their original shape. The damage was particularly great to our language and writing system....

---

<sup>4</sup> Sixth order of the U.S. Military Government in Korea [originally issued in both Korean and English], September 29, 1945; quoted in Morita, *op. cit.*, p. 370.

<sup>5</sup> The original compilation had begun in April 1936 but ceased with the seizure of the manuscript and the arrest of 33 members of the academy by the police in South Hamgyōng in October 1942. Fourteen of the 33 arrested were charged with breaching the Act on Maintenance of Public Order for having engaged in the compilation of the dictionary with the aim of pursuing national independence. The six-volume dictionary was ultimately completed in 1957.

At this time, when we are establishing our glorious and new nation by cleaning up the filthy remnants of Japanese rule, we must start with purifying our language by all means....

[Here follows an explanation of how Korea's case is unlike that of European countries which voluntarily learned from Greek and Latin culture in pursuing their own autonomous development.]

We were deprived of our country, ethnicity and culture, had Japanese forced upon us, and were pressed to give up our own language under the wicked assimilationist policy. This was the submissive retreat of the vanquished and not comparable to the case of European countries.

Today, two years after liberation, in every corner of our lives, we still find remnants of Japanese culture and custom — particularly in our language, which is the manifestation of our spirit.

As long as a single word of Japanese remains in our language, we must understand that we are still tainted by the Japanese spirit.

Liberation's true meaning is liberation of the spirit rather than of any outer forms observable on the surface. Today we still hear fluent Japanese spoken on the street and at people's gatherings. How amazing!

We must not just sigh and passively accept the status quo, because this situation is, in fact, intolerable. We must completely wash Japanese out of ourselves and retrieve our own language. We must reawaken our ethnic soul and express our clear and pure spirit in our own pure language and must show to the world, "This is us!"

[An explanation follows here as to how even negative customs become tolerable after long practice; then the process of formulation of the language retrieval plan is recounted and the concrete plan itself laid out.]

Today we may feel hesitant to use our mother tongue since we are not yet good at it even though it is our own language, the one for which we have so much longed. But we must reflect upon this deeply in our hearts. What is the correct thing to do? To continue to use Japanese, a language of enslavement forced upon us, even though we are now liberated from the Japanese bandits? Or to endure the inconvenience while patiently relearning and using our own language?

In the past we learned Japanese, the language of another race, which is entirely alien in pronunciation and meaning, and did not call that difficult, but learned it sufficiently well to be able to employ it with ease. Now we are using our own language, the one which we had been used to — that cannot be so difficult. It is only up to the strength of our national spirit.

Now that we are reflecting upon our past mistakes and looking to a positive future, we must correct our thinking.

We have been through all kinds of difficulty, exploited by others. We all know very well the sad and bitter life of a nation which has no freedom of its own, as well as the cause of such a disastrous situation. The mistakes of the past, when we trusted others, led us to this plight.

Now we are liberated from oppression, possess the same freedom as possessed by others, and can assert ourselves in living our own lives. We must therefore be truly vigilant against repeating past mistakes. We must cleanse and purify the remains of things enforced upon us, seek our own way, follow that way and live our own lives. This is real freedom and independence. Let us retrieve our own language and use it now. Let us display our steadfast national spirit. This we can concretize only through strong decisions and daring practice.

February 15, 4281 [by the traditional Korean calendar; 1948].<sup>6</sup>

This document shows most clearly the linkage in the minds of the writers between language and ethnic identity. A few months after it was published, on October 9th, a law was promulgated concerning the use of *han'gŭl* and the enrichment of the national language (Korean), with *han'gŭl* stipulated as the sole national writing system.<sup>7</sup>

Other efforts by Koreans to obliterate the Japanese legacy also carried linguistic implications. Among these was the reversion to the old name Seoul for the country's capital, which had been renamed Keijō by the Japanese colonial authorities.

---

<sup>6</sup> Quoted in Morita, *op. cit.*, pp. 376–80

<sup>7</sup> The provision of this law laying down *han'gŭl* as the only legitimate writing system has been challenged since 1981 on grounds that it leads to a confusion over homophones which could be avoided by the partial usage of Chinese characters. See Korean Language Education Research Committee, eds., *Request for the Reinstitution of Education in Chinese Characters and the Compilation of Texts Combining Han'gŭl with Chinese Characters for State Schools* [in Korean], cited in Morita, *ibid.*, p. 398.

## Conclusion

There is nothing more central than language in the life of any ethnic collectivity; (1) neither individual nor collective creativity is possible if the authentic ethnic language is lost; (2) learning from other peoples and languages poses no problem if one does it without forgetting or dishonoring one's own; (3) early and consistent education in the mother tongue is a necessity regardless of whatever else one learns.

— Herder

The history of Japan's language planning for Korea proves once again the close connection between language and ethnicity, as well as the pitfalls inherent in ignoring ethnicity in any international endeavor. Although technically superior and institutionally well-organized, and initially successful, the enormous effort to impart Japanese-language skills to the entire Korean populace ultimately failed. This failure was not for lack of professional understanding or for negligence in matters pedagogical. Rather, it was due to blindness and insensitivity about ethnic and cultural factors. Such blindness and insensitivity is not, it should be emphasized, a thing of the past nor limited to the Japanese alone. It can be found in every time and place, although it can also be said that there has been progress toward understanding in recent times.

In the case which we have been studying here, Korean children learned their Japanese through relatively well-designed immersion courses in what, during school hours, was a more or less monolingual environment backed by a type of sociocultural reinforcement. On the other hand, at the end of the school day, these same children would return to a Korean environment where their own culture and language was relatively protected. Hence it is not surprising that they learned the Japanese language rather readily and well.

Nevertheless, it should not surprise us to find that these children also suffered

from what today might be called “cognitive dissonance” or “mild schizophrenia.” While, as we said earlier, some might find emotional satisfaction in identifying with the transcendental aims of Japan’s imperialism — and children were undoubtedly particularly susceptible to such propaganda — for anybody with even the slightest Korean ethnic pride the contradictions must have raised numerous emotional dilemmas. Such emotional dilemmas could manifest themselves in such private ways as conflicts with parents over traditional values or publicly in such mass outbursts as the March First Movement of 1919.

What was really happening in the minds of the Korean language learners? The question apparently never even occurred to the language planners, much less to those Japanese leaders making overall policy for Korea. The reality was that Korean children were forced to deal with a dual value system and, worse, in school had to tolerate a demeaning process of denial of their own ethnic pride and identity. Their pain and anger, when self-suppressed, led either to temporary guilt-ridden submission or rank cynicism, as can be sensed from the memoirs of some Koreans. This pain and anger resurfaced in various expressions of ethnic revival, some of which to the outsider might seem difficult to fathom.

The responsibility for this blindness should not be laid at the feet of the teachers themselves, although they were at least partially willing participants in the ethnic repression. The fact is that the ultimate aim of the education process, defined by political leaders in Tokyo, was to reduce all Koreans to second-class pseudo-Japanese citizens who would be subservient to the aims and needs of Japanese imperialism, alongside a similarly subservient native citizenry.<sup>1</sup>

Japanese linguists and language planning professionals, as we have seen, must bear a certain amount of responsibility for the language policies implemented in Korea. After all, they tolerated — or in some cases even advocated — harsh measures to

suppress the Korean mother tongue. Part of this could be laid to the simple ethnocentrism which still plays a large part in the world in which we live. But Japanese are especially prone to see their language and culture as “unique” and project onto others their own cultural assumptions.

Today, in the field of second-language teaching , we are beginning to break with ethnocentric, monolingual approaches and are gradually coming to realize the importance of encouraging and supporting ethnic identity. Students of second languages may have implicitly known this all along. Once, at a conference I attended on Amerindian language maintenance, a claim by native language planners that “language is the soul of culture” seemed to have the unanimous support of all the native people present. Whether or not this is ultimately true, the very fact that language is perceived to be a key factor in the ethnic identity and self-esteem of a people means that suppression of a language or a denial of its “worth” is almost certain to precipitate antagonism towards those involved in the suppression or denial.

---

<sup>1</sup> As C.B. Paulston put it: language planning decisions “are primarily made on political and economic grounds and reflect the values of those in political power. Linguistic issues per se are of minor concern.” [C.B. Paulston, “Language planning,” in Kennedy, Chris, *Language Planning and Language Education*, London, George Allen & Unwin, 1984, p. 55]

## Appendix I

### A. School Boycotts by Students Following the March First Movement

Fiscal Year	No. of Incidents	Fiscal Year	No. of Incidents	Fiscal Year	No. of Incidents
1920	20	1925	48	1930	107
1921	23	1926	55	1931	103
1922	52	1927	72	1932	33
1923	57	1928	83	1933	36
1924	24	1929	78	1934	39

Source: Yi Sukucha, *Kyōkashō ni Egakareta Chōsen to Nippon* [Korea and Japan as Manifested in Textbooks], Tokyo, Horupu Shuppan, 1985, p. 94

### B. Analysis of Cases of School Boycott Punishment by Police      Punishment by the School

Year	a	b	c	d	e	f	g	h	i	j	k	l
1921	3	1	—	52	156	70	477	—	—	—	547	703
1922	8	—	—	70	78	130	376	64	—	—	570	648
1923	—	—	—	—	—	64	336	200	—	—	600	600
1924	—	—	—	5	5	52	470	37	—	1	560	565
1925	—	—	—	12	12	159	343	—	—	—	502	514
1926	18	—	7	—	25	136	35	12	2	1	186	211
1927	22	—	132	88	242	409	1,304	82	2	—	1,797	2,039
1928	121	46	180	—	347	540	1,417	90	—	—	2,047	2,394
TOTAL	172	47	319	327	865	1,560	4,758	485	4	2	6,809	7,674

KEY: a. sent to police for questioning;  
police record kept  
b. reproach by police and release  
c. arrest  
d. reproach  
e. subtotal of police punishment  
numbers

f. expelled from school  
g. suspension  
h. detention  
i. reproachment  
j. closed down the school  
k. subtotal of school  
punishment numbers  
l. Total of all numbers

Source: Yi Sukucha, *ibid.*

### C. Police Punishment of School Boycott Students

Year	1922	1926	1927	1928	Totals
Imprisonment under one year	1 (1)	9 (9)	11 (11)	51 (12)	72 (33)
Punishment with a fine	10	—	—	—	10
Total	11	9	11	51	82

Notes: 1. Only the 1927 cases were all private middle school students, the others were public junior high school students  
2. parentheses means suspended sentence.

Source: Yi Sukucha, *ibid.*

## Appendix II

### Number of Instructional Hours for Subjects Taught In Korean Elementary Schools (Futsūgakkō, Shōgakkō, Kokumingakkō) %

Period	Subjects		
	Korean Language	Japanese Language	Other
"New Educational System" 1894-1905 Senior Elementary	47.6	---	Ethics.....10.7 Math .....21.0 History & Science.....3.5 PE.....17.8
			Ethics.....8.9 Math.....16.7 Science.....11.0 National (Korean) History Foreign Geography .....12.0 Korean Geography PE.....6.7 Drawing.....6.7
Protectorate Period 1905-10	20.7	20.7	Chinese - (Korean interpretation).....13.8 Ethics.....3.5 Math.....20.7 Science.....3.5 Art (drawing).....6.9 PE.....10.3
			Ethics.....3.8 Science.....3.8 Math.....3.5 Japanese History.....2.3 Japanese Geography.....2.3
First Korean Education Order 1911-22	20.8 (incl. Chinese)	37.7	Ethics.....3.5 Science.....3.5 Art drawing).....3.5 Math.....17.8 PE.....12.9 Japanese History.....2.4 Japanese Geography.....2.4 Sewing.....4.7
			Ethics.....3.5 Science.....3.5 Art (drawing).....3.5 Math.....17.8 Singing & PE.....12.9 Japanese History.....2.4 Japanese Geography.....2.4 Sewing.....4.7
Second Korean Education Order 1922-38	11.8	16.6	Ethics.....3.5 Science.....3.5 Art (drawing).....3.5 Math.....17.8 Singing & PE.....12.9 Japanese History.....2.4 Japanese Geography.....2.4 Sewing.....4.7
			Ethics.....3.3 Science.....3.3 Art (drawing).....3.3 Math.....17.0 Singing & PE.....12.2 National History.....2.2 Geography.....2.2 Cooking.....5.6 Vocational.....4.4

**Appendix II (cont'd.)**

Period	Subjects		
	Korean Language	Japanese Language	Other
Third Korean Education Order 1938-45	8.3	33.2	Ethics.....6.2 Science.....3.1 Art (drawing).....3.1 Math.....15.5 Singing & PE.....13.4 National History.....2.2 Geography.....2.1 Cooking.....6.0 Vocational.....4.1 Handicraft.....3.1
Revised Third Korean Education Order 1941-45	0.0	28.9	Ethics.....4.2 Math/Science.....19.5 Art (drawing).....7.9 PE.....5.3 National History.....2.1 Geography.....2.6 Cooking.....5.8 Vocational.....6.3 Marshal Arts & Music.....15.3 Brush writing.....2.1
Korean Military Government 1945	37.06 26.06 27.66	—	
Recovery Period 1953	21-23	—	
Present	21.65	—	

*Source:* Yi Sukucha, *ibid.*, p. 127

### Appendix III

**Number of Instructional Hours Per Week In the Korean and Japanese Languages for Koreans (Primary School)**

Period	Subject	Grades							Totals
		C-E	1	2	3	4	5	6	
"New School System" 1894-1905	National Language (Korean)	C	0	6	6	4	4	4	24
	Reading		9	3	3	2	2	2	21
	Composition		5	5	3	2	2	2	19
	Brush Writing		-	-	-	3	4	3	10
	Foreign Language (Japanese)	E	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Protectorate period 1905-10	National Language (Korean) + Chinese	C	6	6	6	6			24
	Japanese Language	E	6	6	6	6			24
First Korean Educational Order 1911-22	Korean + Chinese		6	6	5	5			22
	National Language (Japanese)	C	10	10	10	10			40
Revised First Korean Educational Order 1920-	Korean + Chinese	C	10	6	5	5	4	4	34
	National Language (Japanese)	C	10	10	10	10	9	9	58
Second Korean Educational Order 1922-38	Korean	C	4	4	3	3	3	3	20
	National Language (Japanese)	C	10	12	12	12	9	9	64
Revised Second Korean Educ. Order 1929-	Korean	C	5	5	3	3	2	2	20
	National Language (Japanese)	C	10	12	12	12	9	9	64
Third Korean Educational Order 1938-45	Korean(additional)	E	4	3	3	2	2	2	16
	National Language (Japanese)	C	10	12	12	12	9	9	64
Revised Third Korean Educational Order 1941-45	Korean(additional)	E	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	National Language (Japanese)	C	11	12	9	8	8	7	55
Korean Military Government 1945-48	National Language (Korean)	C	8	8	8	7	6	6	43
		C	8	8	8	7	6	6	43
		C	9	9	9	9	8	8	52
Recovery Period 1953	National Language (Korean)	C	25 - 30%	25 - 30%	27 - 20%	20 - 23%	20 - 18%	20 - 18%	21 - 23%
Present	National Language (Korean)	C	6	6	6	6	6	6	36

Key: C = Compulsory    E = Elective

Source: Yi Sukucha, *ibid.*, p. 127

## Korean-hanja Glossary

Ahn Chong-song	安宗宋
Ahn Choong-keun	安重根
Ansōng	安城
Chemulpo	濟物浦
Chi Sök-yong	池錫永
Chindan Hakpo	震檀學報
Chinjoo	晉州
Chinnampo	鎮南浦
Choi Hyun-bae	崔鉉培
Chong In-ho	鄭寅琥
Chongno	鍾路
Chōphae Shinčō	捷解新語
Chosōn Ilbo	朝鮮日報
chulhak	哲學
chultae	絕對
Chōnjamoon	千字文
Chōnjoo	全州
Daitō-A Kyōei Ken	大東亞共榮圈
Dong-A Ilbo	東亞日報
fude	筆
Fukuzawa Yukichi	福澤諭吉
futsūgakkō	普通學校
go-ontaku	御恩澤
Haejoo	海州

Hamkyong Bookto	咸鏡北道
Han Chul-ui	韓哲曦
Hansung(pu)	漢城府
hiragana	平假名
Hong Soon-myong	洪舜明
Hong Yong-shik	洪英植
hyanggyo	鄉校
hyō-on	表音
Ilche in Taehan Chimnyak Kwa Onǒ Chungchek	日帝對韓侵略言語政策
Inchon	仁川
Inchǒn	仁川
Irō	日語
Iroha	伊路波
Irō Hakdang	日語學堂
Isshi dōjin	一視同仁
Jōmon	繩文
Kaesōng Hakyo	開成學校
kana	假名
Kang Dǒk-sang	姜德相
Kang Jae-ǒn	姜在彦
Kang Woo-sung	康遇聖
Kanghwā	江華
Kangkyong	江景
kanigakkō	簡易學校
kanji	漢字
Kap-ǒ sin chang	甲午申張

katakana	片假名
Keijō	京城
Keiō (College, University)	慶應
Kim Yang-han	金亮漢
Kim Chi-yong	金智榮
Kim Hon-jip	金弘集
Kim Ki-soo	金綺秀
Kim Kyoo-chang	金奎昌
Kim Min-soo	金敏洙
Kohjong, King	高宗王
Kōkoku nōmin	皇國農民
Kokumin gakkō	國民學校
Kokumingakkō Rei	國民學校令
Kokumin Ka	國民課
Kokumin Seishin Sōdōin Renmei	國民精神總動員連盟
Kokumin Sōryoku Undō Chōsen Renmei	國民總力運動朝鮮連盟
kokutai	國體
Kongjoo	公州
kō-on	皇恩
Koonsan	群山
Koryō	高麗
<i>Kunmin Sohak Dok Bon</i>	國民小學讀本
kutsu	鞋
Kwangju (Kwangjoo)	光州
kyōgakukan	教學官
<i>Kyōin Kokoroe</i>	教員心得

kyōkan	教監
Kyongnam	慶南
Kyongsōng	京城
Kyongsōng	鏡城
Kyu Jang-kak	奎章閣
Lee Kwang-lin	李光麟
Lee Pyong-keun	李秉根
Lee Sang-jae	李商在
Lee Sook-ja	李淑子
Lee Toe-gye	李退溪
Lee Wan-eung	李完應
Maeil Shinbo	每日新報
Masan	馬山
Meiji	明治
Min Bee	閔妃
Min Yǒng-hwan	閔泳煥
Miryang	密陽
misool	美術
Mokpo	木浦
Moon Se-yong	文世榮
moonmyong kaewha	文明開化
naichi	內地
Nai-Sen ittai	內鮮一體
Najoo	羅州
Nara	奈良
Nongchǒng Shinpyǒn	農政新編

Nonsan	論山
O Yoon-joong	魚允中
Ohsan	五山
Onchǒn Hakyo	溫川學校
Oop hoe	邑會
Paek Sun-jae	白淳在
Pak Chǒng-yang	朴定陽
Pak Chung-hee	朴正熙
Pak Yong-hyo	朴泳孝
Pak Yong-son	朴永善
Pongnae	蓬來
Pusan Kaesǒng Hakyo	釜山開成學校
Pusan	釜山
Pyongyang	平壤
Sahak	四學
sahoe	社會
Samil (Woondong)	三一運動
Sejong Daewang	世宗大王
shigin	詩吟
Shinmin taisō	臣民體操
sǒdang	書堂
Soonchang	淳昌
Soosong	壽松
Soowǎn	水原
Sǒng Kyoon-kwan	成均館
Sǒngjin	城津

soto	外
Sōyang Kyōnmoon	西洋見聞
sushi	壽司
Taegoo	大邱
Taehan Maeil	大漢毎日
Tamyang	潭陽
Teikoku Shikan	帝國史觀
tempura	天扶羅
To hoe	道會
tongshinsa	通信使
Tongyong	統營
Tosan Hakyo	戶山學校
uchi	內
Wae Kwan	倭館
Waeo Yuhae	倭語類解
Waeō	倭語
Wakō	倭冠
Wang In	王仁
Wonsan	元山
yangban	兩班
Yangsan Sohakyo	良山小學校
Yayoi	彌生
yeonsul	演說
Yi [Dynasty] also Li	李
Yi Toe-gye	李退溪
Yong Chi-ho	龍巖浦

Yoo Chöng-soo	柳定秀
Yoo Kil-choon	俞吉溶
Yoon Chi-ho	伊致昊

## Bibliography

### Bibliographic note:

Many of the original materials on which this study is ultimately based are not readily accessible, for various reasons including, not least, their physical destruction by war. Several Japanese-language compilations of documents in book form are, however, available in Japan due to the careful work of advanced researchers, and these have been heavily relied upon here. While virtually nothing is available in the English language on the subject, one of the best and most accessible repositories of documents is the Hoover Institution of War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University, and the present author has had the good fortune of being able to mine that source. Unfortunately, even a simple presentation of the materials there must await another occasion — not to mention their extensive translation. It seemed useful, nonetheless, to present a listing of as many as possible of the available materials in the bibliography that follows in hopes that it will aid other researchers in the future. The reader should not assume that all the documents listed below have been personally scrutinized by the author in their original form.

Because Japanese researchers and writers tend not to give the same sort of detail in bibliographic citations as is common in English — place of publication and name of publisher often being omitted — items referred to in collections may not be readily found outside those collections. The collections themselves are thus identified in the parentheses following each citation below. For precise page references in those collections, refer to the textual footnotes.

Particularly useful items for initial research purposes are starred (\*).

Chōsen Kyōikukai [Korean Education Association], eds., *Bunkyō no Chōsen* [Culture and Education in Korea], a journal published in Korea in the 1930s and 1940s (cited and/or quoted in Ozawa Yūsaku, "Chōsen ni okeru Nihon shokuminchi kyōiku no rekishi" [History of Japanese colonial education in Korea], in Hatada Takashi, ed., *Nippon wa Chōsen de Nani wo Oshietaka* [What Did Japan Teach in Korea?], Tokyo, Ayumi Shuppan, 1987, 53–109; hereinafter Ozawa)

Compilation Committee for Educational History, eds., *Meiji Ikō Kyōikuseido Hattatsushi* [History of Educational Development Since the Meiji Period], 2nd ed., Vol. 10, Tokyo, Kyōiku Shiryo Chōsakai [Research Committee on Educational Materials], 1964 (cited and/or quoted in Yi Sukucha, *Kyōkasho ni Egakareta Chōsen to Nippon — Chōsen ni okeru shotō kyōkasho no sūi, 1895–1979* [Korea and Japan as Depicted in Textbooks — The change in primary school texts in Korea, 1895–1979], Tokyo, Horuppu Shuppan, 1985; hereinafter Yi)

Crystal, D. 1987. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

*Daitō A Kyōeiken to Kokugo Seisaku* [The Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere and National Language Policy], Tokyo, Nippon Shuppan Haikyū Kabushiki Gaisha, 1943.

Editorial Committee for a History of Education, *Meiji-ikō Kyōikuseido Hattatsushi* [History of the Development of Education Since Meiji], Tokyo, Kyōiku Shiryō Chōsakai, 1964. (Yi)

Education Section, Academic Bureau, Government-General of Korea, ed., *Chōsen ni okeru Kyōiku no Gaikyō* [The Situation in Korean Education], Seoul, November 1939 (cited and/or quoted in Morita Yoshio, *Kankoku ni okeru Kokugo Kokushi Kyōiku* [National Language and National History Education in Korea], Tokyo, Harashobo, 1987; hereinafter Morita)

Fairbank, John K., Reischauer and Craig, *East Asia: The Modern Transformation*, Boston, Houghton Mifflin, 1965.

Fukuzawa Yukichi, *Seiyō Jijō* [Things Western], various editions].

Fukuzawa Yukichi, *Seiyō Kenbun* [Observations of the West], [various editions].

Fukuzawa Yukichi. *Fukuzawa Yukichi Den* [Autobiography of Fukuzawa Yukichi], Vol. 3, Tokyo, Iwanami Shoten, 1932.

Government-General of Korea, *Chōsen Jijō* [The Situation in Korea], 1943 ed. (Ozawa)

Government-General of Korea, *Chōsen ni okeru Dōmei Kyukō no Kōsatsu* [A Study of School Strikes in Korea], 1929. (Ozawa)

Government-General of Korea, *Chōsen no Hogo oyobi Heigō* [The Protection and Annexation of Korea], (reprinted internal documents of the Government-General of Korea), Tokyo, Chuō Nikkan Kyōkai & Yūhō Kyōkai, 1956.

Government-General of Korea, *Chōsen Sōtokufu Shisei Nenpō, Meiji Yonjūsannendo* [Annual Administrative Report of the Government-General of Korea, for 1910], Seoul, 1912.

Government-General of Korea, *Chōsen Shisei no Hōshin oyobi Jisseki* [Policy and Achievement under the Korean Administration], Seoul, n.d.

Government-General of Korea, *Chōsen Sōtokufu Shisei Nenpō, Taishō Shichi—Kyūnendo* [Annual Administrative Report of the Government-General of Korea, for 1918–1920], Seoul, n.d.

Government-General of Korea, *Chōsen Sōtokufu Shisei Nenpō, Taishō Jūnendo* [Annual Administrative Report of the Government-General of Korea, for 1921], Seoul, n.d.

Government-General of Korea, *Chōsen Sōtokufu Shisei Sanjūnen* [Annual Administrative Report of the Government-General of Korea, 30th Year], Seoul, Government Printing House, 1936. (Yi)

Government-General of Korea, *Chōsen Tōchi Sannenkan Seiseki* [Results of Three Years of Rule in Korea], Seoul, 1908.

Government-General of Korea, Directive No. 24, March 15, 1938, Shogakko Regulations, 2nd revision, Articles 13 & 29. (Morita)

Government-General of Korea, Directive No. 27, June 29, 1920. (Yi)

Government-General of Korea, Directive No. 55, June 17, 1929. (Yi)

Government-General of Korea, ed., *Shisei ni kansuru Yukoku, Kunji Narabini Enjutsu* [Instructions, directives and speeches concerning administration], August 1920 – June 1922, Seoul, 1922. (Ozawa)

Government-General of Korea, Order No. 8, Feb. 15, 1922. (Morita)

Government-General of Korea, Order No. 108, 1920. (Morita)

Government-General of Korea, *Shisei Sanjūnenshi* [History of Thirty Years of Administration], 1940. (Ozawa)

Government-General of Korea, *Shotō Kokushi Hensan Shuisho* [Prospectus on the Compilation of Elementary National History Texts], Seoul, 1941. (Ozawa)

Hanaoka Tamiko, "The Japanese Language Policies in Korea from 1906 to 1945." [unpublished essay in English, provided through the courtesy of the author who resides in Tokyo, Japan]

Han Gion. *Kankoku Kyōkashoshi* (A History of Korean Textbooks), Pyongyang, n.d.

Hara Kei, *Hara Kei Nikki* [Diary of Hara Kei], Tokyo, 1919, entry for April 9, 1919. (Ozawa)

\*Hatada Takashi, ed., *Nyūmon Chōsen no Rekishi* [Primer of Korean History], Tokyo, Sanseido, 1986.

\*Hatada Takashi, ed., *Nippon wa Chōsen de Nani wo Oshietaka* [What Did Japan Teach in Korea?], Tokyo, Ayumi Shuppan, 1987.

Herder , J.G., *Sammliche Werke*. 33 vols. B. Suphan, E. Redlich et al., eds., Berlin, n.p., 1877–1913.

Hirose Tsuzuku, "Kokugo fukyū no shin dan kai" [The new stage of Japanese language popularization], in *Chōsen* [Korea], September 1942. (Ozawa)

Historical Research Institute, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, eds., *Chōsen Kindai Kakumei Undōshi* [History of Korea's Modern Revolutionary Movement]. (Ozawa)

History Institute of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, eds., *History of the Modern Korean Revolutionary Movement* (in Korean), Pyongyang, 1964. (Ozawa)

Hoshina Kōichi, "Daitō A kyōtsūgo toshite no kokugo" [National language as the common language of Greater East Asia], in *Daitō A Kyōeiken to Kokugo Seisaku* [The Greater East Asia CoProsperity Sphere and National Language Policy], Tokyo, Nippon Shuppan Haikyū Kabushiki Gaisha, 1943.

Iida Akira, *Hantō no Kora* [Children of the Peninsula], Tokyo, 1942. (Ozawa)

Imperial Ordinance 148, February 28, 1941. (Morita)

Isaka Keiichirō, “*Naisen ittai to Kokugo-shōrei*” [Japan-Korea as one and the promotion of the national language], in *Chōsen* [Korea], September 1937. (Ozawa)

*Ishikawa Takuboku Sakuhinshū* [Anthology of Ishikawa Takuboku], Tokyo, Shōwa Shuppansha, 1965.

Japan Friendship Association, *Yuhō Kyōkai Kaihō* [Friendship Association Bulletin], Appendix 2: “*Chōsen kokumin kyōiku shinan*” [A new plan for Korean national education], n.p., 1894. (Yi)

Kang Dök-sang, ed., *Chōsen* [Korea], Vol. I, n.p., 1908. (Ozawa)

Kamatsuka Yasuo, *Daitōa kyōeiken no ikkan toshite no Chōsen ni okeru Kōminka Undō ni tsuite — kyōikusha toshite no tachiba yori taiken wo kataru* [An educator's experience of the Greater East Asian Coprosperity Sphere Kōminka movement], in *Nippon Shogaku Shinkō Iinkai Kenkyū Hōkoku* [Report on the Research Findings of the Academic Development Committee on Japanese Scholarships], Tokyo, Vol. 10, 1941. (Ozawa)

\*Kan Tetsugi, *Nippon no Chōsen Shihai to Shūkyōseisaku* [Japanese Control over Korea and Religious Policy], Tokyo, Miraisha, 1988.

Katsura Tarō, *Katsura Tarō Den* [Biography of Katsura Tarō], Vol. 2, Tokyo, n.d. (Ozawa)

Kim Shosho, Historical Background to the Japanese Education and the Demise of Korean Language Departments [in Korean], in Seoul College of Education Theses Collection, Vols. 1–10 [1967–77], Book 12. (Morita)

Kin Chiei & Yomakawa Chikara, *Nikkan Gappei to Ariran* [The Annexation of Korea by Japan and Ariran], Kokoku Insatsu, December 10, 1992.

*Kokumingakkō Kitei* [Kokumingakkō Regulations], Article 2, Item 13. (Morita)

Kondo Kenichi, ed., *Banzai Sōwai Jiken* (Salute the Unrest Incident), Vol. I, Tokyo, 1963. (Ozawa)

Korean Academic Bureau, *Kankoku Kyōiku* [Korean Education], September 1908. (Morita)

Korean history editorial committee, Korean Governor-General's Office, *Chōsen Shi* [A History of Korea], Vol. VI, Part 4, cited in Yi Sukucha, *Kyōkashō ni Egakareta*

*Chōsen to Nippon* [Korea and Japan as Manifested in Textbooks], Tokyo, Horupu Shuppan, 1985.

Korean Resident-General's Office. Shiritsu Kakushu Gakkō no Jōkyō [The Situation Concerning Korean People's Education in Various Kinds of Private Schools]; (cited in Hatada Takashi, ed., *Nippon wa Chōsen de Nani wo Oshiet ka* [What Did Japan Teach in Korea?], Tokyo, Ayumi Shuppan, 1987)

Koshimizu Minoru, “*Daitō A Kyōsugo toshite no Nihongo*” [Japanese language as the common language for the Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere], in *Daitō A*

*Kyōeiken to Kokugo Seisaku* [The Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere and National Language Policy], Tokyo, Nippon Shuppan Haikyū Kabushiki Gaisha, 1943.

Matsumiya Yahei, “*Nihongo to Nihongo kyōshi*” [The Japanese language and the Japanese language teacher], in *Daiō A Kyōeiken to Kokugo Seisaku* [The Greater East Asia Coprosperity Sphere and National Language Policy], Tokyo, Nippon Shuppan Haikyū Kabushiki Gaisha, 1943.

Matsuzaki Hideo, “*Chōsen no seishōnen kyōiku*” [The Education of Young People in Korea], in *Kyōiku Shichō Kenkyū* [Studies in Educational Thought], 1937. (Ozawa)

Miller, Roy Andrew, *The Japanese Language*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1967.

Ministry of Education of Korea, *eds.*, *Shakai* [Society], 6th Grade, No. 2, Seoul, Ministry of Education, 1985. (Morita)

Mito Chūzō, *Gakka Katei Oyobi Kyōkasho Hensanshishi ni Kansuru Setsumei* [Explanation on the compilation of curriculum and textbooks], June 1908. (Ozawa)

Miyata Setsuko, *1930 Nendai Nitteika Chōsen ni okeru Nōson Kōshin Undō no Tenkai* [The Development of the Rural Villages Revival Movement in the 1930s under Japanese Imperial Rule], in *Rekishigaku Kenkyū* [Historical Researches], February 1965. (Ozawa)

\*Morita Yoshio, *Kankoku ni okeru Kokugo Kokushi Kyōiku* [National Language and National History Education in Korea], Tokyo, Harashobo, 1987.

Nakane Chie, *Tate Shakai no Ningen Kankei* [Human Relations in a Vertical Society], Tokyo, Kodansha, 1967.

Oda Chōgo, *Chōsen Kyōikushi* [A History of Korean Education]. (Morita)

Office of Civil Affairs [Korean Government], “*Jinmin ni wa mazu honkokushi to honkokubun wo oshieru koto*” [Concerning the priority teaching of national history and national language to the people], March 1895. (Morita)

Ogura Shinpei (with annotation by Kōno Rokurō), *Zōtei Hochū Chōsengo Gakushi* [History of the Korean Language, Supplemented and Annotated], Tokyo, Tōkō Shoten, 1964. (Morita)

Ohno Kenichi, *Chōsen Mondai Kanken* [A Personal View of the Korean Issue], n.p., n.p., 1936. (Yi)

\*Ozawa Yūsaku, “*Shokuminchi Chōsen no kyōiku to kyōkasho*” [Education and textbooks in colonial Korea], in Hatada Takashi, *ed.*, *Nippon wa Chōsen de Nani wo Oshietaka* [What Did Japan Teach in Korea?], Tokyo, Ayumi Shuppan, 1987, pp. 50–52.

\*Ozawa Yūsaku, “*Chōsen ni okeru Nihon shokuminchi kyōiku no rekishi*” [History of Japanese colonial education in Korea], in Hatada Takashi, *ed.*, *Nippon wa Chōsen de Nani wo Oshietaka* [What Did Japan Teach in Korea?], Tokyo, Ayumi Shuppan, 1987, 53–109.

Paek Sun-jae, *Kaidai: Kankoku Kaikaki Kyōkashō Sōsho* [A Bibliographical Introduction to the Collection of Textbooks From the Time of Korean Modernization], Vol. 1, Tokyo, Ajia Bunkasha, 1977. (Yi)

Paulston, C.B. "Language planning," in Kennedy, Chris, *Language Planning and Language Education*, London, George Allen & Unwin, 1984.

Police Bureau, Government-General of Korea, *Kankoku Gakusei Kōnichi Tōsōshi* [History of the Anti-Japanese Struggle of Korean Students], Seoul, Government Printing House, 1929. (Yi)

Policy Study Committee on Current Affairs, Government-General of Korea, Minutes of, 1938 [in Japanese];. (Ozawa)

Pusan City Gov't., Pusan Kyōiku Kai, eds., *Pusan Kyōiku Gojūnenishi* [Fifty Years of Education in Pusan], Pusan, 1927, p. 66. (Yi)

Resident-General of Korea, Korean Education Order, 1911. (Ozawa)

Resident-General's Office, Korea. *Shisei Sanjūnenishi* [A Thirty Year History of Governance (of Korea)], 1940. (Ozawa)

Ri Koh Rin, *Kankoku Kaikashi Kenkyū* [Studies on the History of Korea's Opening], Tokyo, Ichōkaku, 1969.

Sano Michio, *Kindai Nihon no Kyōiku to Chōsen* [Modern Japanese Education and Korea], Tokyo, Shakai Hyōronsha, 1993.

Sasahara Kazuo and Yasuda Motohisa, *Nihonshi Shōnenpyō* [Simplified Timeline of Japanese History], Tokyo, Yamakawa Shuppan, 1973.

Sawayanagi Seitarō, "Sekai ni hokorubeki Naisen kyōgaku" [Korea-Japan coeducation stands proud before the world], in *Chōsen* magazine, March 1922. (Morita)

Shinohara , *Chōsen Kyōiku Ron* [Theory of Korean Education], Tokyo, 1919. (Ozawa)

Shiobara Tokizaburō, *Chōsen Kyōikukai kakitaikai de no aisatsu* [Congratulatory speech to the autumn assembly of the Korean Education Association], October 1937. (Ozawa)

Shiobara Tokizaburō, *Jihenka ni okeru Chōsen Kyōiku* [Korean Education in the Wake of the (Manchurian) Incident], in *Bunkyo no Chōsen* [Korean Literature and Schools], Seoul, January 1940. (Ozawa)

Tawara Magoichi, *Kankoku Kyōiku no Genjō*, Tokyo, n.p., 1910.

Tawara Magoichi, *Kankoku Kyōiku no Kiō Oyobi Genzai* [Past and Present of Korean Education], Tokyo, n.p., 1910.

Terauchi Masatake, *Kaku Dōnai chōkan ni taisuru kunji* [Directive to the directors of prefectures], Meiji 43 [1910], November. (Ozawa)

Terauchi Masatake, *Kaku Dōnai mubuchō ni taisuru kunji* [Directive to the heads of prefectural internal affairs departments], July 1911. (Ozawa)

Terauchi Masatake. Speech outlining principles of rule after Korea's annexation.  
December 1910. (Ozawa)

Tokunaga Terumi, *Kankoku Sōran* [Korean Conspectus], Tokyo, Hakubunkan, 1907. (Yi)

Tsuneya Morifuku, *Chōsen Kaikashi Zen* [A Complete History of Korean Development],  
Toa Dō Bunkan ed., Tokyo, Hakubunkan, 1901. (Yi)

Watabe Manabu, "Chōsen ni okeru Nichigo gakkō" [Japanese language schools in  
Korea], in *Gakusō*, published by Tokyo Imperial University], No. 1, 1942. (Yi)

\*Yi Sukucha, *Kyōkasho ni Egakareta Chōsen to Nippon — Chōsen ni okeru shotō  
kyōkasho no suii, 1895–1979* [Korea and Japan as Depicted in Textbooks — The  
change in primary school texts in Korea, 1895–1979], Tokyo, Horuppu Shuppan, 1985

Yuge Kōtarō, *Chōsen no Kyōiku* [Korean Education], 1923. (Ozawa)

*Yubin Hochi Shimbun* [Postal Report News]. (Morita)