

Korea through Japanese Eyes: An Analysis of Late Meiji Travelogues on Korea

Seung-Mi Han

This paper examines how the Japanese popular imaginings of Korea were constructed in conjunction with the imperial transformation of the Meiji state. How did the Meiji Japanese try to resolve what Benedict Anderson (1983: 93) has termed “the inner incompatibility of empire and nation” as they won wars against China (1894–1895) and Russia (1904–1905) and expanded spheres of influence over neighboring Asian countries? How were the cultural boundaries of the Japanese nation re-drawn, and how in the process were the Japanese self and Asian Others re-figured in new relationship to each other? Or, more concretely, how and what sorts of perceptions of Korea and the Korean people were produced and consumed during the late Meiji period when the “new lands” (*shinryōdo*) were placed under firm control?

To answer these questions, I will analyze several Japanese travelogues to Korea written around the time of the Russo-Japanese War, as it was this victory that finally consolidated Japan’s domination in Korea. Korea became the Protectorate of Japan, and finally was annexed to Japan in 1910, although expansionist dreams were already in circulation as early as the time before and after the Meiji Restoration of 1868 (Calman 1993). The acquisition of exclusive rights over the South Manchuria Railway Company from Russia also accelerated the processes whereby Korea and Manchuria loomed large in the Japanese scheme of expansion. According to Mark Peattie (1984: 86), between 1905 and 1920 a growing body of knowledge and informed opinion on colonial issues emerged in Japan, shaped largely by publicists which included former government administrators, scholars, politicians, and journalists. The *Mansen rekishi chiri chošabu* (Bureau of Historical and Geographical Studies on Manchuria and Korea) was established within the Tokyo branch office of the South Manchuria Railway Company in 1907.¹⁾ And the prestigious Tokyo Imperial University created a chair in colonial studies in 1908.

Not only did systematic studies of colonialism produced in these academic centers begin to place the Japanese empire on a par with other European counterparts, in part through comparisons of the relative merits and demerits of the colonial policies of different countries, in addition many people outside of academia also traveled to the newly acquired lands for various purposes. Travelogues published either as books or as articles in newspapers were an important source of information about the newly acquired worlds. Many of these texts included technical and detached descriptions of forestry, fishery, agriculture, finance, and political circumstances of the places adven-

tured. However, as Michael de Certeau (1986: 67–68) commented on Montaigne’s “Of Cannibals,” a travelogue is doubly revealing because it simultaneously produces both images of the other and of the place of the text/traveler itself as witness of the other. Japanese travelogues to Korea (and to China) also contained a highly significant body of self-representations, as well as representations of the Other. However, unlike the European travelogues to America, Africa, and some parts of Asia which were newly discovered as separate and putatively ahistorical lands, Japanese travelogues inevitably involved a re-ordering and re-interpretation of a whole range of history of which Japan herself had been a participant for centuries.²⁾

In this paper, therefore, I will concentrate on the narrative aspects and ideological underpinnings of Japanese travelogues to Korea to see what kinds of tropological strategies were used to re-invent and re-formulate Japan’s place vis-a-vis other Asian countries. This is not to neglect the “factual” aspects of what Japan’s place was really like, but to emphasize the selective nature and the transformative power of “how it was said.” This paper is also an attempt to complement the growing body of anthropological literatures on colonialism which are based on a dichotomy of “the West versus the rest of the world.” As long as discursive constructions of Other presuppose relations of power and domination, what Said (1978) has termed Orientalism can also happen *among* oriental countries, and the place of the West as well as Western paradigms of explaining history can be differently deployed in such a project.

I. Romanticism Reconsidered

One of the striking characteristics in the Japanese scheme of expansion is the degree to which expansion was associated with the Malthusian fears of population growth (Iriye 1972). The early Meiji popular imaginings of the Micronesian islands (*Nanyo*) as tropical utopia arose more from the romantic hopes of finding some unclaimed islands which could help solve the nation’s problems of land and population than from any kind of political or naval strategies (Peattie 1984b: 177). As the expansionist scheme grew more political and affixed to matters of national security around the turn of the nineteenth century,³⁾ north Asia — Korea, Manchuria, and China — gained weight in the Japanese mapping of the world as *the* direction to go. This growing concern for security, however, intensified themes such as romantic adventure and the promotion of outmigration.

The so-called “continental adventurers” (*tairiku roñin*), unattached ex-samurai who made it their full-time profession to adventure and plot in the name of enhancing the Japanese nation’s prestige (Jansen 1954: 32–58), formed one important strand of the political romanticism in the Meiji period. Organized in the form of patriotic societies such as *Kokuryūkai* (Black Dragon Society, 1901–1946),⁴⁾ these adventurers worked anonymously as interpreters and secret agents of the Japanese army, and served as intermediaries between several levels of government, business, and the lower fringes of society.⁵⁾ They were romantic in that they regarded themselves as the last upholders of true chivalry who could guard the national prestige for the sake of

the “Japanese people.” A travelogue written by Katsuragi Tenka for his friend Gomada Kyokuko, who traveled to Korea, seems to portray the kinds of romanticism that these continental *roñin* advocated.⁶⁾

Written mostly in the first person, *Chošen hantō goketsuteki ryoko* (*Heroic Travel to the Korean Peninsula*, 1903),⁷⁾ is nevertheless a reconstruction of Gomada’s experience based on letters sent from him to Katsuragi. The traveler, Gomada, was from Okayama and possessed a military background. He also worked as a freelancer in Tokyo. One summer (1901), “in the manner of an oriental hero (*toyōteki goketsu*),” he suddenly went off to Korea by himself, because he “resented society” and “wanted to surprise the snobs.” (Ibid: 1) Interestingly, although the traveler’s impulsive, unplanned, and “manly heroism” (*goketsuteki*) is emphasized repeatedly throughout, as the story unfolds, the traveler and his journey become more and more purposeful, focused, and ambitious. The travelogue becomes a story of international politics rendered into the romantic adventure of an individual hero. However, the travelogue is not a success story in spite of the effort of the writer, Katsuragi, to make it one, because the traveler’s political plotting in Korea did not succeed as planned and the traveler had to flee Korea for Manchuria.⁸⁾ Worse yet, the traveler disappeared.⁹⁾ Just as the People’s Rights Movement (*jiyu minken undo*) in early Meiji Japan was channeled into a strong right-wing expansionism when it met government oppression and the power rivalry with the West,¹⁰⁾ the book is a curious mixture of excitement and frustration, heroism and defeatism, or, eulogy and elegy.

The protagonist’s adventurism is traced back to his teenage yearnings for chivalrous achievement, which was motivated by the expanding national boundaries of the early Meiji period. Notably, his romanticism is not directed at the Other, but at himself.

. . . I was a teenager in full vigor, and was a diligent student at a commercial school in Otsu, Shiga prefecture, where my father served as a commander-in-chief of a regiment. Then, I learned about the heroic deeds of our (*waga*) courageous Captain Gunji who had left for the Kuriles to develop and colonize (*takushoku*) the islands with scores of other vigorous youths who joined him. It was said that they sailed out from the Sumida River of Tokyo, kicking off waves of the ocean, to city-wide applause. I got so envious of the courageous voyage, and could not help thinking about it all the time. I fretted day and night in order to find out a way to join the expedition. But what could I think out as a young boy (*bonchi*) unexposed to the world? Parents would stop me if I were to tell them, and I just burned with anguish in vain. I had no other choice but to go back to my study, but Fate did not leave me in despair.

Within a few months, it happened that my father had something to do in Tokyo, and he decided to take me with him so that I could be educated in the Imperial Capital from then on. The chance came up finally. I discerned that if I missed this opportunity, I would never be able to find another. Since my mother had related

about my father's decision beforehand, I resolved that once in Tokyo, I would sneak away during my father's absence and follow the Captain's path. As soon as I arrived in Tokyo, I left a letter to my father explaining my determination, and went off to the Ueno station to catch the Ōsen train bound for Kamaishi of the Ōshū-region. There, I got on a small boat, and undauntedly sailed off to the Kuriles all by myself . . . (Katsuragi: 1903: 74–76)¹¹⁾

Although this first voyage began in “boyish innocence,” and although Gomada is depicted in the beginning of the book as a penniless wanderer with vague thoughts about going to the Asian continent, once in Korea, through letters of introduction written by his school friends in Japan, he easily gained a position as an editorial staff member of the *Chōsen shinbo* (*Korea Daily*) in Inchon.¹²⁾ This was a “strategic position” (Ibid: 88) from which he could observe Korean society. As can be inferred from the traveler's original itinerary, which he changes later according to the advice of a friend, China rather than Korea was the central objective of his heroic adventure.¹³⁾ But, wherever he goes, the place emerges through metaphoric articulation as a passive stretch of land waiting to be conquered.

(Gomada) After traversing Tokai, Kinai, Sanyō, and Kyushu, I would sail to Taiwan, and then on to mainland of China. My iron legs would then forage the 400 provinces of China. Manchuria and Vladivostok would be next. Following along the Heilung River, I would then go on to Kyerim,¹⁴⁾ and reproaching and commanding the winds and clouds of the eight provinces,¹⁵⁾ I will resolve the intricate situations of East Asia all at once . . . (Ibid: 20)

(Friend) Yoshida: Instead (of Taiwan and China), how about thrusting in between the Korean mountains on a horseback ride and roaring against the winds and clouds of the times? If it is alright with you, I can arrange it for you immediately. (Ibid: 67)

It is interesting to note that the capital city of Shilla, a kingdom in the southeast of the peninsula from the third to the tenth century, is metonymically chosen to represent Korea. The tropes are also gendered, because Gomada, who identifies with the ideal of traditional warriors (*kobushi*), “unwillingly” agrees to go to Korea, thinking that “to choose an easy way for convenience's sake is something for the feeble womenfolk (Ibid: 69).” Since the travelogue is self-romanticizing and rather narcissistic, there is no attempt to engage with the Korean Other except for hierarchizing each other's places in the absolute ladder of civilization (*bunmei*).¹⁶⁾ In the streets of Inchon, a line of civilization is clearly drawn between the two separate and non-interacting spheres of Koreans and foreigners, the former “ugly, run-down, and dirty” and the latter “lively, very Japanese, and beautiful (Ibid: 91–95).” His descriptions of Korea are sometimes groundless, but they certainly touch on two favorite themes in popular Japanese travelogues on Korea, graves and female professional entertainers (*kisaeng*). Characteristically, Gomada uses these themes to reconfirm the alleged moral decadence of Korea, which for him was irrefutable evidence of the doomed

destiny of Korea.

I was really surprised . . . On one side, groups of people sitting on a blanket right near the graves were throwing a loud liquor party, and on the other side, other groups of people, brandishing the long tobacco pipes, were making a fuss . . . Can this be the yearly ritual for the dead? They are using the spirits of the dead (*hotoke*) as an excuse to make a nationwide (*kokuminteki*) amusement . . . It seems that in Korea, honoring of the dead spirits doesn't fall on the category of courtesy (*rei*) . . . It must be due to their low civilization and underdevelopment of knowledge within the nation. We can therefore deduce from this fact why Koreans are people of a doomed country (*han bokokumin*). (Ibid: 99–100)¹⁷⁾

The mother of the entertainer (*kisaeng*) sold her daughter in order to pay for her own re-marriage. It was really cruel of her, and no sensible person would find it understandable. But it is held neither as a crime nor as an iniquity in Korea. Rather, it is a national custom that children are frequently sacrificed to pay for all sorts of things. What a doomed country (*han bokokumin*) it is! It is beyond our imagination that there can be a people with such a base morality. (Ibid: 108)

Nation emerges as a primary unit of talking about Self and Other as collective entities, and the “ambitious, vigorous, and patriotic” young men (*seinen*) of Japan are called upon to “penetrate” (*shinnyu*) Korea and awaken those “obstinate and ignorant” people, for it is “their mission to spread civilization and humanitarianism in Asia (*Ajia*)” (Ibid: 110–111). Here, the similarity to the Victorian ideology of “civilizing mission” (Adas 1989: 199–270) is striking. In both the Japanese and the European cases, the civilizing mission gave a moral dimension to the arguments of imperialist expansion that were otherwise directed toward economic and political self-interest. In both cases, the gendered narratives were directed at a specifically young audience, the future rulers of the world.¹⁸⁾

As shown in the localization of the “civilizing mission,” what was distinctive about Japan was that it had to invent an explanatory scheme which could resolve the tension between the progressive history and its own Asianness (Tanaka 1993). Within the European discourses on the Other, Asianness was conceived to be timeless and stagnant. The idea of progress in civilization was closely related to a heightened consciousness of European ideas about Europe's superiority. The Enlightenment philosophy imported to Japan in the 1870s sharpened Japanese self-consciousness and encouraged her to figure out her position in the world. However, the Enlightenment focus on generic human nature and singular civilization did not, as in the case of the French philosophe (White 1978: 194), result in the polemic use of the Other as a foil in the critique of the contemporary social forms. Rather, Japanese self-consciousness about its own Otherness in the European narrative of progress brought about first, the denial of its Asian connection,¹⁹⁾ and then, later, the attempt to construct an equivalent position with Europe by “embracing” Asia. The emergence of Japanese “Oriental history” (*Toyōshi*) in the 1890s and its subsequent institutionalization in the early twentieth century was none other than this attempt “to extricate Japan both from the

newly imported Eurocentric Enlightenment history and from the Sino-centric worldview of the philological study of China (*kangaku*)” (Tanaka 1993: 17).²⁰⁾

It is notable that never in this process of negotiating Japanese identity both as modern and Asian did the Japanese use a romanticized version of the Asian Other for a critique of their own society. That is, when the Japanese denied the Eurocentric Enlightenment narratives, the satiric tradition of the Noble Savage was also thrown away, and the Asian Other loomed large for an international politics rather than for a domestic polemic.²¹⁾ That was the case with *Seikanron* in the 1870s, and as noted above, the People’s Rights Movement also turned imperialistic and expansionist after having given up democratization²²⁾ and social reform. (Hatada 1983 [1969]: 26, 44). For the emerging political parties as well as for the associations of continental adventurers, the Asian Other was a pawn, a geopolitical object rather than a cultural being, to be used to castigate the Meiji government into a stronger foreign policy.

Thus, in Meiji Japan, as the conservative aspects of a Spencerian sociocultural evolutionism took root in the ideology of the political elite, the Victorian way of imagining the Other overshadowed the possible radical elements in the Enlightenment romanticizing of the cultural Other.²³⁾ And, just as the association of primitive life with paradise became a taboo for the Victorians, so did the association of Korea with cultural superiority, which was the dominant picture of Korea in the world of the Tokugawa-period Confucianists.²⁴⁾ Concerned primarily with the Western Other in terms of procuring security as well as co-evalness, Meiji Japan thus pushed the Asian Other far back into Japan’s past and orientalized it, just as the Victorians pushed their “savages” far back into the secularized time-scale and naturalized them (Fabian 1983; Stocking Jr. 1987). Left in the murky landscape of Korea was thus the self-romanticizing adventurer with a “civilizing mission in Asia,” who sought to realize himself through the collective Self of the nation.

II. Popular Tourism to Asia after the Russo-Japanese War

If the nineteenth century European Orientalists’ travelogues to the Middle East reverberated the Judeo-Christian rhetorics of pilgrimage and were written in “the Romantic redemptive terms of a Christian mission to revive a dead world” (Said 1979: 172), Japanese travelers in the early twentieth century, whether “Orientalists” or not, were pilgrims of the “national” tradition which was being re-invented. Archaeological sites, battle fields, and residential districts of the Japanese were repeatedly invested with meanings to celebrate the expanding boundary of the nation. When the Russo-Japanese War ended, the Ministry of War and the Ministry of Education actively encouraged and supported young students to travel to the newly acquired lands, to which the 1907 travelogue of the *Gakushuïn hojinkai* (a group led by Shiratori Kurakichi, the historian/founder of Japanese Oriental Studies; 1907) belongs. On the other hand, the Asahi Newspapers, one of the leading national dailies in Japan, organized the first large-scale commercial cruise to the Asian continent in 1906, with support from the Ministry of War, the Ministry of Navy, and the two *Honganji* Buddhist

sects (Higashi and Nishi), “in order to raise the morale of young men and to foster a true character of the men of a maritime nation” (Ishikawa, 1906: 4).²⁵⁾

Mankan junyuŕsen (Voyages to Manchuria and Korea, 1906) was the outcome of this cruise. This travelogue is constituted mostly of short essays by the Asahi Newspapers correspondents who followed the tour. The writings are descriptive rather than analytical, and instead of delving into the ideological bases of the nation/empire, they simply follow the on-the-spot movements of the passengers in a reportage style. In the beginning of the travelogue, the nature and purpose of the trip is defined:

The seaports, bays, mountains, and fields of Manchuria and Korea are the places where our loyal and courageous soldiers exalted the military prestige of the empire with bitter struggles and bloody fights. Therefore, it is expected of us to go there and propitiate the loyal dead as well as to see the frontiers of the Imperial prestige. Still more, it goes without saying that for our postwar management of these areas, our countrymen (*kokumin*) had better have an observation tour to these lands. (Ibid: 2)

Although most of the travelogue is about the “joyful” moments of the passengers on board the ship as well as on land,²⁶⁾ the narration of the journey is punctuated by the heroic war memories of the Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese wars. The places visited were provided with background information which linked them to “Japanese” history,²⁷⁾ some of which were turned into battle fields. At those places, lectures were given by military officers from the army or from the navy. Firsthand experiences in the specific battles at the very same spots thus were recounted and shared.

. . . ‘The routed Chinese soldiers from Asan in the south came northward to join the Chinese headquarters in Pyongyang,²⁸⁾ and the total number of Chinese soldiers reached 40,000. At that time, the Fifth division was away at Keijo (Seoul) so we decided to attack the Chinese army with soldiers from our division and some from the Third division’.

Thus began the story of Major Yasumitsu. Major Oshima led two regiments, Major Tatsumi led two battalions, Captain Sato led the Wŏnsan detachment troops of the Eighteenth regiment, and General Nozu led four battalions. Stories about how General Nozu with his troops followed the Oshima regiments from behind along the Taedong River, how the Oshima regiments had a hard fight at Sŏnkyori, how the Sato regiments were famous for their singing of war songs . . . were followed. Finally, he ended the story by saying that since Pyongyang castle was similar to the Japanese castles with a river in the front and a mountain in the back, it was rather easy to attack the enemy in the rear, and that this strategy of General Nozu was the same as that of Konishi Yukinaga.²⁹⁾ A surge of applause ensued. (Ibid: 129–130)³⁰⁾

As much as the travelogue is about the heroic war deeds of the Japanese, it includes very little “observation” of the Asian Other, Korean, Manchurian, or Chinese. The description of the Royal Palace in Seoul in relation to the 1895 incident³¹⁾ is revealing,

as it discloses how much this travelogue is about the Japanese themselves rather than about the Koreans.

The appearance of vast grasses before the Künjōng-jōn [the public, King's section] is like a poem without a meter, and inside of the building is left the Royal Throne as a form only. What a pathetic scene! Deeper into the palace is a lotus pond in the middle of which stands a small pavilion, the Ch'uihyang-jōng, connected to the lakeside by a bridge. To the other side of the pond is the Choch'ōng-gung [the female section] but all its doors are closed, probably not to show the last site of Queen Min's misery. What a heart-throbbing story to hear and to tell! What kind of person was the principal actor on stage in this opening act (*jomaku*) of the *Kabo* warfare?³² What could have been the lines in that action drama? The location is chilling even in the summer, but what a great background scene all this is! (Ibid: 107–108)

Surprisingly, the assassination of Queen Min, the tragic outcome of a problematic amalgam of pro-modernization and pro-Japanese elements in Korea, is rendered into an “action drama.” Indeed, one of the characteristics of this travelogue is that instead of the excitement and justification over “the civilizing mission,” things seen and heard are fused into an objectified still landscape against which remains only Japanese agency.

At Anju, the rice fields are extensive, blue, and beautiful, and the Koreans with white clothes standing in the middle of the rice fields look like cranes or herons from afar. But sometimes, they really are white herons and cranes . . . It is said that during the winter, groups of herons and cranes cover the fields all over . . . and . . . one can catch them with a trap. However clumsy one may be, one can surely make money enough for the traveling expenses . . . It is said that herons and cranes do not run away from those in Korean clothes, so it is better to wear them if one seriously plans to go for a big hunt. (Ibid: 198–199)

Here, the Korean people are assimilated into the scenery and nothing more is discussed about them. Karatani Kōjin's argument about the “discovery of landscape” as a modern element in the Japanese structures of perception needs to be complemented, because the “landscape” was discovered not only by the “inner man” (Karatani 1993, 23–34), but also by the “interested man.” Tokutomi Soho,³³ who traveled to China via Korea on his own, also denies any agency on the part of the Korean people and immerses them into the natural landscape in his travel diaries.

(On the Kyōngūi line) All the passengers on the train, except for the Koreans, seem to have the two characters *bo-ken* (adventure) written on their faces. Seeing the various kinds of people mingling within the plain and robust third-class compartment, I somehow feel that indeed this is a train that runs on a colonized land . . . Outside the windows, I see some Koreans in white clothes through the shade of green weeping willows, and my heart, again, is filled up with poetic

sentiments (Tokutomi 1960 [1906]: 61).

Indeed, one of the interesting characteristics of Japanese travelogues throughout the colonial period is the repeated occurrence of the metonymic portrayal of Korean people in white color, the color of everyday Korean costume during the Chosŏn period (1392–1910). Importantly, in so doing, Korea becomes a “nature” to be appreciated as such,³⁴⁾ or, it becomes simply a vast open museum of the Japanese military success, past and present. No wonder that the Japanese had an “illusion” about Korea until 1910 that there was enough room for 10 million Japanese immigrants for agricultural settlement.³⁵⁾ It was not that Korea was sparsely populated, but that Japanese who had a chance to think about Korea did not have any serious interests in the Koreans per se. For the policy-makers as well as for the general populace in Japan, Korea was described, propagated, and taught as the “Korean peninsula,” a space mapped with natural resources and ready to be occupied.

III. Academic Travel and its Aftermath: The Beginnings of Anthropology in Japan

The tendency to submerge the Koreans as part of the natural landscape was reinforced with the application of Japanese “anthropology/ethnology” to Korea after the Russo-Japanese War. This academic discipline was meant by its founders to be “scientific” as well as “historical” in its methodology. Anthropology was introduced to Japan by Tsuboi Masagoro, who, stimulated by the American E.B. Morse’s archaeological writings on the *ōmori* shell mound in 1877, decided “to keep the study of Japanese within the hands of the Japanese.” (Obayashi 1985: 288) He seems to have been exposed to “anthropology”³⁶⁾ as an under-graduate in the early 1880s through the writings of E.B. Tylor (*Primitive Culture*), who, unlike Spencer, tried to find the “missing link” in the grand scheme of human evolution by using empirical data.³⁷⁾ Backed by the entrenchment of the Industrial Revolution and the developments in science and technology, Tylorian anthropology was an attempt to relate material progress to spiritual progress by showing that the latter was also governed by the same natural law of progress.

A zoologist-turned-anthropologist, Tsuboi also created his foothold in anthropology at the College of Sciences, Tokyo Imperial University, after he returned from London in 1892.³⁸⁾ However, his works were quite different from his British counterparts, for whom “savages” played a more prominent role than the “Asiatic societies” (Stocking Jr. 1987: 111). Tsuboi’s anthropology was indeed so broadly diffused that it ranged from the archaeology of the Japanese Stone Age to a minute description of the ratio of Western clothing and Japanese clothing in the streets of Tokyo (Sofue 1985: 287).

Torii Ryuō (1870–1953), a student of Tsuboi, laid firmer ground for the development of “the science of men” as part and parcel of the concerted efforts to figure out Japan’s place in the world, or more specifically, in Asia (Shiratori and Yawata 1978:

268). Like Tylor and Tsuboi, Torii also tried to study human beings as a part of nature. However, unlike either of them, he clearly drew a line between anthropology (*jinruigaku*), “the study of men as an animal species”, and ethnology (*jinshugaku*, *minzokugaku*), “the study of men as a ‘race’ (*jinshuminzoku*)” (Torii 1976 [1913] v.1: 481), and then proposed the establishment of Oriental Ethnology (*tōyō jinshugaku*, *tōyō minzokugaku*) in Japan.³⁹⁾

I gradually felt the need to establish Oriental Ethnology in Japan as a special field of general ethnology. Japan is no longer the Japan of the past. Not only is it that there are many academically interesting ‘races’ (*minzoku*) within the colonized land of Japan, but the outskirts of our empire have also become closer to us; that is, not only Manchuria, Siberia, Mongolia and China of the Asian continent, but also islands like the Philippines, Malays, Micronesia, and Polynesia have drawn near. These areas should be studied by Japanese scholars even if some of them do not belong to our empire politically. Also, Inner Asia, Tibet, and Indochina should be added as related areas. (Torii 1976 [1913] v.1: 482)

The expansion of the empire prompted the study of the Asian Other, but “unlike the study of Africa or the Pacific islands” (Torii 1976 [1910]; v.1: 477), the study of the Asian Other, or Oriental Ethnology, was about the historical relationships between ‘races’ (*minzoku no rekishiteki kankei*) (Torii 1913: 481). The conflation of culture and biology in the notion of ‘race’ was characteristic of Victorian anthropology, but in Japan, this notion of “race” was again historicized and sometimes used interchangeably as a “national people” (*minzoku*).⁴⁰⁾ Therefore, instead of trying to “prove” empirically the developmental stages of human civilization in general, the job of ethnologists became the search for racial/national identity (*minzoku o shōnei suru koto*). Instead of reconstructing human history by finding the “missing link” in the supposedly ahistorical savages, the reconstruction of many racial/national histories in every possible means — investigating “physical characteristics,⁴¹⁾ mental characteristics, languages, myths and legends, customs,⁴²⁾ and archaeological objects” (Torii 1976 [1910]: v. 1: 471–480) — became the job of the late Meiji ethnologist who tried to answer questions like “Who are the Japanese?” or “Where did the Japanese come from?” (Torii 1976 [1904] v.7: 506) by studying “who the Asian others are.”

Torii’s first trip to Korea was in 1896. But it was his second trip, organized by the Tokyo Imperial University in 1905 (towards the end of the war) that made him write about Korea for the first time.⁴³⁾ He continued to conduct research in Korea, at the request of the Government-General of Korea (*Chōsen sōtokufu*), to help the new colonial government compile the historical textbooks. However, it is important to note that his interest in Korea, like the interests of many other Japanese scholars at that time, arose primarily from the concern with Japanese identity and therefore was concentrated on the ancient history of Korea in line with the Nativistic (*kokugaku*) tradition in Japan.⁴⁴⁾ Although Torii contributed to the discovery and verification of the

Bronze Age period in the Korean peninsula and showed the similarities in the ancient tombs of Korea and Japan, he could not transcend the “historical facts” (Torii 1976 [1910] v.1: 477) about ancient Korea as narrated in the myths and legends of the Japanese classical texts, the *Kojiki* and the *Nihon shoki*.⁴⁵⁾ Moreover, through his conflation of “race” (*jinshu*) and “national people” (*minzoku*), he later backed up the Japanese state’s expansionist ideology on a “scientific” basis.

Many of Torii’s academic writings on Korea were published in the form of travelogues. But these were always written in a very detached, positivistic tone. Distinctively, under the rubric of “scientific” ethnology, Koreans emerge as human bodies marked by a set of physical characteristics⁴⁶⁾ and by the place they live,⁴⁷⁾ as objects knowable and controllable like any other objects in nature. What is more, the necessity to secure and maintain anthropology/ethnology as a separate field of study seemed to have intensified this objectification of the Asian Other. In *Manmoño tansa* (*An Anthropological Travelogue to Manchuria*, Torii 1976 [1905] v.9),⁴⁸⁾ Torii wrote,

Next, the Koreans (*Chošenjin*). . . . This time I had a chance to see many Koreans. . . . I decided to use this opportunity for measuring their heads, if not all the body parts. I chose about 60 people for this. . . . The investigation of Koreans should be done by the Japanese. There are many ways to study them, languages, archaeological objects, mythologies and so forth, but from the anthropological/ethnological point of view, the measurement of body is the most important. Otherwise, anthropology/ethnology would always have to follow the achievements of historians or linguists. (Ibid: 562)

No voices of the Korean people are represented, and no “gestures of listening” (Harootunian 1990: 109), the role of a traditional traveler which characterized Nativistic studies, are extended to the Asian Other.⁴⁹⁾ Despite his avowed aims of ethnology, which includes studies of myths, legends, customs and mental characteristics, his depiction of Korea, or his ethnology in general, is completely severed from the meaningful realms of the Koreans.

It is interesting to note what Torii said about the vehement resistance against Japanese colonialism on the part of the Koreans in 1919 (the March First Movement) following his scholarly faith, which was bolstered by the authority of “science” as well as of the Japanese classical texts.

Some assert that Koreans should be separated from the Japanese and become independent on the principle of self-determination of peoples (*minzoku jiketsushugi*), but they are fundamentally wrong. This is because Japanese and Koreans are the same race/people (*minzoku*). Where on earth can any of you find any reason that the same national people (*minzoku*) should divide up and get independent of each other? Since they are one and the same people, not only that the annexation of Korea to Japan truly realizes the principle of self-determination, but it will also provide an excellent ethnological (*jinshugaku*) reason if the annexation becomes an international problem. (Torii 1976 [1919] v.12: 538)

Around the early 1920s, folklore studies in Korea, the first attempt to “listen to what they say,” was begun and fostered by the colonial government as a way of encouraging a “milder” form of nationalism among the colonized (Janelli 1986). That is, if the late eighteenth-early nineteenth century crises in European imperialism in Latin America produced sentimental travel writings which dealt with “the ideal of cultural harmony through romance”⁵⁰⁾ — that is, transracial colonial love stories as a substitute for brutal domination (Pratt 1992: 69–107) —, Japanese responded to their own crisis by allowing the emergence of folklore studies on Korea by the Koreans, as well as by the Japanese.⁵¹⁾

Thus, in Meiji Japan, scholars of Oriental Ethnology shared with scholars of Oriental history the dissatisfaction with Eurocentric paradigms as well as the search for Japanese identity in a wider world which was “different but not inferior.” (Tanaka 1993) Although the two group of scholars had different viewpoints regarding the historical relationship between Japan and Korea, both turned to German historicism to find a “better” framework to explain human variety in a genetic-processual concept of history (Tanaka 1993; Torii 1910, 1913). However, if they had refused to accept the ramifications of the Eurocentric narratives of progress, they made the Asian Other subject to the same kind of objectification. In their common search for the origins of “Japanese race,” the Oriental historians posed a disjunction in progressive time between the Japanese Self and the Asian Other, whereas the Oriental ethnologists objectified the Asian Other further into the natural landscape of different places.⁵²⁾

IV. Imperialist Nostalgia: Temporal Distancing of the Other

One of the most powerful ideological devices of Victorian evolutionism which helped to justify the colonial relationship of fundamental inequality was “the temporal distancing of the Other” (Fabian 1983), because in the grand evolutionary scheme of Nature, difference was conceived as “distance” both in Space and Time. In the Japanese case, the Oriental historians’ desire to verify or falsify “scientifically” the validity of existing classical texts — either Japanese or Chinese — made the historical studies of Korea geography-oriented as well as ancient history-oriented (Hatada 1983 [1969]: 148).⁵³⁾ But for many other Japanese, too, Time seemed to have become stagnant and inert in the Space of the Asian Other, whereas it was purposeful and progressive for Japanese Space as well as in Western Space.

Yamaji Aizan, another famous *minyuōsha* historian and journalist who had been active first in the People’s Rights Movement and then in the anti-Russian jingoism at the time of the Russo-Japanese War, traveled to Korea in 1904 and wrote about his travel in his *Kansan kiko* (*Travel to Korea*). It is interesting to see how Yamaji perceived Time in Korea, because, like the Victorian travelers who found the lackadaisical attitude of Africans (and some Asians) as further evidence of their failure to reshape nature for human purposes (Adas 1989: 250), he constantly remarked on the “idle and rolling tempo of life” (*yuū kankan*) among the Koreans to confirm Japan’s civilizing mission as the right and duty of a neighboring country.⁵⁴⁾

Korean laborers excel our countrymen in stature as well as in physical strength. However, they are extremely lazy. They get up and go out for work only when they feel hungry, but even then, as soon as they quench their hunger for the day, they begin to think about going home and having a nap. They do not know how to save things, neither do they have any will to change their dispositions. They shut themselves up in their dirty, pigpen-like houses, and maintain old customs blindly and bigotedly. As soon as I arrived in Pusan, I quickly realized that the management of Korea would not be an easy task. (Yamaji [1904] in Yoshimoto 1964: 58)

The languid pace of life among Koreans⁵⁵⁾ briefly made him feel that Koreans were “the resurrection of our life in the Nara period” (Ibid: 58), in the manner of what Renato Rosaldo has termed the “imperialist nostalgia” (Rosaldo 1989: 68–87). Importantly, however, Yamaji’s observation is characterized not by a feeling of identification but by a feeling of distance and difference, which is augmented by a qualification, “but without the spirit (*seishin*) of the Nara.” His attention then shifts to “the absurd hope” that Koreans would ever be awakened and try to strengthen themselves on their own. (Ibid: 72)

Even those who first visit Korea with such poetic imagination that Koreans can be encouraged to become an independent people (*jinmin*) like us after a while realize how cunning and impudent the Koreans are, and feel that Koreans should be whipped like a worn-out horse. The bigotry, pointlessness, meanness, and servility of Koreans are really unbearable. (Ibid: 65)

As is frequently noted, Japanese economic historians often cited the absence of a manor system in Korean history as clear evidence of Korea’s comparability at the beginning of the twentieth century to Japan’s “pre-feudal” period⁵⁶⁾ (Hatada 1983: 134–135). But apart from the issue of industrialization as a “measurable” economic phenomenon, what is noticeable is that the putative stagnation of Korean society is described by Yamaji as essential mental characteristics innate in Koreans.⁵⁷⁾

Nitobe Inazō, an agricultural economist and the founder and pioneer of the study of colonialism in Japan (Tanaka Shinichi 1980–1981: 51),⁵⁸⁾ also wrote two short travelogues to Korea in like manner. In *Koshikoku Choōsen (Korea, The Withering Country*, November 1906) written in the city of Chōnju, life in Korea is familiarized into the peaceful scenes of the Japanese mythical period via Nitobe’s nostalgic imagination. Nitobe’s way of describing “stagnation” is certainly more romanticized than Yamaji’s writings on Korea, suggesting his Research Association for the Native Place (*Kyōdōkai*)⁵⁹⁾ activities which formally began in 1910. But he, too, makes it clear that the Asian Other lack the energy to raise themselves out of the “prehistoric” state.

Life is Arcadian. I feel as though I were living three thousand years back, in the age of our *Kami*. Many a face do I see that I should have taken for the likeness of a *Kami* — so sedate, so dignified, so finely chiseled, and yet so devoid of expres-

sion. The very physiognomy and living of this people are so bland, unsophisticated and primitive that they belong not to the twentieth or the tenth — nor indeed to the first century. They belong to a prehistoric age . . . The Arcadian simplicity of this people gives no promise of primitive energy (*genshiteki jinmin no seiryoku*); their habits do not remind us of the untamed vigor of Homeric songs, nor of Tacitus' description of early Germans, nor indeed of the fresh chronicles of the *Kojiki*. (Nitobe 1970 [1906] : 81–82)⁶⁰

Nitobe's invocation of Homer, Tacitus, and the *Kojiki* reinforces the temporal distancing of the Asian Other, but on the other hand, it highlights how the way he imagines the Asian Other is different from the way Homer, Tacitus or the writers of the *Kojiki* imagined their respective Others. Rather than the reconstruction of a glorious past, the taming of a contemporary cultural Other into the topography of an expanding nation is intended. Rather than a resurrection of "ancestors," it is a "mourning over the victim" (Rosaldo 1989:70) waiting to be destroyed. Nitobe's nostalgia is a constructed one, because the Asian Other is arbitrarily arrested in Japan's past. However, it did provide an effective and tender paraphrase for Japan's role in Asia — at least toward international audiences — expressed in his own words as the "Brown Man's Burden" (*kasshoku Nihonjin no omoni*). (Nitobe 1970 [1905]: 66)

V. Concluding Remarks

In this paper I have tried to take an anthropological look at major themes in the Japanese depictions of Korea in travelogues written in the late Meiji period. Since I have mainly relied on archival research rather than on ethnographic materials of my own, it is more an attempt to anthropologize history — if historians allow this expression — rather than to historicize anthropology. Although Benedict Anderson emphasized the importance of "print communities" formed around newspapers and novels in creating an imagined community called the nation (Anderson 1983: 37–46), some questions still remain unresolved as to how the messages broadcast in such print media were consumed by the constituent Japanese as well as Koreans of the community.

Instead of proposing a generalized conclusion about the late Meiji imaginings of the Asian Other, therefore, I would like to concentrate on refining the themes discussed above as a way of conclusion. First, it is important to explore the well-known modern myth of "Japanese Uniqueness"⁶¹ from a comparative perspective. Although the Nativists began to reformulate Japanese identity separate from China and Korea in the late eighteenth century, a more acute sense of self-consciousness arose with the influx of the European Enlightenment thoughts and evolutionism which placed Japan in a wider, more competitive, and structurally fluctuating world. The images of Asian Others in Meiji Japan grew out of the Japanese search for their own identity in this enlarged world. These images, except for the grand exercise in historical re-interpretation, bore striking similarity to the Western colonial discourses on the distant Other. Among them were the use of Time in the construction of Other, emphasis on the

“civilizing mission,” and use of the myth of “past invasion” as a charter for the beliefs and actions of the present (Shiratori 1971, vol. 9;⁶² Leach 1990: 227–245). This similarity alerts us to the dangers of reifying a certain regional category in our analysis of power and domination. Said’s thesis on Orientalism is a case in point. An admirable critique of the essentialistic renderings of the Orient within the European discourses on the Other, it nevertheless runs the risk of not only reinforcing the power-laden East/West dichotomy that it tries to subvert, but also of obscuring power relations within the respective regions, East or West.

Second, more attention needs to be paid to the gendered nature of imperial projects. Mosse has argued that in late eighteenth-early nineteenth century Western Europe there emerged an alliance between nationalism and respectability, “an alliance that regarded control over sexuality . . . as vital to the very existence of bourgeois society.” (Mosse 1989: 3) Ideals of manliness loomed large as the driving force of the nation, whereas women were relegated to the limited, passive role of protecting morality. As the embodiment of respectability and custodian of tradition, women were transformed into the immutable symbol of the nation, but it was precisely this idealization of women which legitimated the domination of men over women in the nineteenth century Western Europe. (Ibid: 99)⁶³

Interestingly, this double policing of sexual categories by nationalism and respectability was projected onto international relations, and the symbolism of gender came to be used to portray national and/or racial inequalities. The modernist, masculine, and nationalistic narratives of late Meiji Japan analyzed in this paper suggest that gender imageries can be drawn on not only to feminize less powerful others, but also to resist being feminized by more powerful others.⁶⁴ Indeed, the mutual implication of gender and power does not necessarily require the conventional binarism of “masculine West” and “feminine East.”⁶⁵

Notes

I would like to express my gratitude to Professors Helen Hardacre, Albert Craig, Carter Eckert, and Emiko Ohnuki-Tierney for their support and encouragement. I also thank Hong-Koo Han, a scholar of Korean history, for his suggestions and criticisms.

- 1) Both the bureau and the chair were made possible by the support of Goto Shimpei, then the president of the South Manchuria Railway Company, who had previously been the first Governor-General of Taiwan.
- 2) For the ideological underpinnings of the emergence of *Toyōshi* in Japan, and how this *Toyōshi* objectified and authorized a particular view of China, see Stefan Tanaka (1993). Joshua Fogel (1989) also deals with the issue of how pre-war Japanese literary travellers described China in their travelogues. But, he works from different analytical assumptions than Tanaka.
- 3) Duus (1976: 125) argues that this political orientation distinguishes Japanese expansionism from European varieties, which were more commercially oriented. Although expressed in terms of security issues, Japanese expansionism was nevertheless intimately related to the economic potentiality within the enlarged national boundaries. Government brochures promoting the emigration of Japanese to Korea constantly emphasized the economic benefits of living in Korea.
- 4) The Amur River Society or the *Kokuryūkai*. Members of this society considered themselves to be the guardians of national prestige. However, unlike its predecessor *Genyōsha* (Dark Ocean Society), which was more attuned to the early Meiji People’s Rights Movement of discontented

samurai (constitutionalism, for example), the Amur River Society was more explicitly oriented toward continental expansion by pursuing aggressive foreign policies. Containment of Russia, the fall of the Qing government, and the annexation of Korea were their objectives, and the Amur River was thought to be the ideal border for Japanese influence in the continent. The society subscribed to such ideas as harmony between East and West, revival of the martial spirit, educational reform, and overseas expansion (Hunter 1984: 94).

- 5) The Amur River Society is believed to have been funded by Fukuoka mine owners, the Yasuda firm, and General Kodama Gentarō when he served as Minister of War (Jansen 1954: 34, 249).
- 6) I could not find any other information about Gomada Kyokuko. From the contents of the travelogue, it is clear that he had been involved in secret political plots in Korea (Katsuragi 1903: 116–117).
- 7) I express my gratitude to Mr. Takeshita Fumio, Chief Editor of Heibonsha Ltd. Publishers, who generously agreed to copy this book (and other materials) from the National Diet Library of Japan when I could not find it in the Meiji Maruzen microfilm collection at Harvard-Yenching library.
- 8) The plot is never explicitly described in the travelogue “for order and security’s sake” (Ibid: 117). Because of this lack of information, the book is indeed mainly about the protagonist’s heroism. For rough descriptions of the general outline of the travelogue, see pages 114–128.
- 9) This travelogue was written in 1903, just prior to the Russo-Japanese War. Katsuragi, now in the third person, speculates that his lost friend must be somewhere in Manchuria or Siberia, active and alive (Ibid; 124), and that “his ventures may bring about interesting results unexpectedly.” From this, and from the fact that the traveler was involved in political plots, I conjecture that Gomada might have been following the pattern of the continental adventurers.
- 10) The Triple Intervention forced Japan to relinquish the Liaotung Peninsula, one of her war trophies. This incident left a legacy of bitterness against the powers involved, and by suggesting to Japan that military strength was the only means of commanding international respect and prestige, it pushed her toward subsequent aggressive policies (Hunter 1984: 234).
- 11) I think it is important that the voice of Gomada and the voice of Katsuragi were merged in “I.”
- 12) The *Chošen shinbo* was a Japanese-language newspaper for Japanese residing in Korea.
- 13) Many Japanese traveled to China via Korea. Interestingly, some of them omitted Korea in their travelogues. Natsume Soṣeki went to Korea and Manchuria, but his travelogue *Mankan tokorodokoro* (Here and There in Manchuria and Korea), which was serialized in the *Asahi shinbun* in 1909, does not mention anything about Korea. Korea seems to have been an empty space for some of the writers, a mere transitory path. See Fujii (1993) on Soṣeki for the role of memory loss in the construction and establishment of Japanese literature as a modern canon.
- 14) Kyerim is an old name for Kyōngju, the capital of Shilla. Shilla was one of the Three Kingdoms in ancient Korean history, and in alliance with Tang China finally unified the other two kingdoms in 676. New interpretations of this first unification process as well as of the history of Mimana (the putative Japanese colony in ancient Korea) arose in the Meiji Japanese academy at the same time as the Japanese expansion into the Asian continent. These interpretations were critical in formulating the popular images of the “Korean national character.” See *Shiratori Kurakichi Zenshu* (Collected Works of Shiratori Kurakichi), vols. 9–10, 1970, as well as Katsuragi, pp. 144–155. In the Japanese version of ancient Korean history, Koguryō — one of the three kingdoms, and located in northern Korea and southern Manchuria — was excluded from “Korea,” and Shilla was used to essentialize the Korean people as “toadies and flunkies” who worshiped China mindlessly because it was more powerful.
- 15) Korea had eight provinces when the travelogue was written.
- 16) The so-called Civilization history (*bunmeishi*), a Japanese version of the Enlightenment history, appeared in the early 1870s, since new intellectuals of Meiji Japan sought to promote reform by using the philosophies of the West. Fukuzawa Yukichi, Taguchi Ukichi, Miyake Yonekichi, and Naka Michiyo were the first influential propagators of the Enlightenment history. They were followed by other *Minyuṣha* historians such as Tokutomi Sohō, Takekoshi Yosaburo, and

- Yamaji Aizan. They played an important role in the People's Rights Movement until the Liberal Party (*Jiyūō*) was dissolved in 1884. The Triple Intervention expedited their transition to nationalistic conservatism (Duus 1974; Pyle 1969; Tanaka 1993).
- 17) It seems that he went to a communal graveyard after the ancestor rituals were over. (He went there after 7:30 pm.) Also, he uses the word "*hotoke*," a Japanized Buddhist concept for the dead spirits in ancestral worship.
 - 18) Katsuragi's book summons *seinen* to rise and go to other Asian countries, and has detailed *furigana* for every word written with Chinese characters. Also, "In the works of Marryat, Mayne Reid, G.A. Henty, W.H.G. Kinston, Dr. Gordon Stables, Stevenson, Haggard, and Kipling, Britain turned youthful as it turned outward, following a regressive path parallel to 'going native.'" (Brantlinger 1988: 190) See Oshikawa Shunro's novel "*Kaitei gunkan*" (*Submarine*) (1900) and its sequels for nationalistic children's literature of the late Meiji period.
 - 19) Asia-escapist (*datsuaron*) means an all-out Westernization and severance from Japan's past as well as from the Asian Others in order to fit fast into the universal law of progress.
 - 20) As a creative appropriation of German romanticism, the Orient (*toyō*) served as a "mediating object" (Ibid: 19) between Japan and Europe in which both looked for their origins and against which both could measure their progress respectively.
 - 21) The interpretations of Tarui Tokichi's claims for "Asian Solidarity" (1983 [1885]) are controversial regarding whether or not he really meant, out of "romantic" intention, Japan's alliance with other Asian countries on an equal basis (Hatada 1985 [1969]: 28). But even if this was the case, the controversy was out of a sense of crisis against the expanding West rather than out of a will for social reform.
 - 22) It is notable that "people's rights" — as political rhetoric — was believed to be realizable through the strong state rather than against the state. Both the political parties and the associations of continental adventurers were led by discontented samurai. The difference between the parties and the associations was that the latter never lost their regional character (Jansen 1954: 28–34).
 - 23) See the section on Nitobe Inazō in this paper. Herbert Spencer was one of the best-known English philosophers during the early Meiji period, and his books had deep influence in Japan at the same time as in Europe. Interestingly, the liberal aspect of Spencer's ideas emphasizing natural law, human rights, and equality were welcomed by the popular rights front, whereas the conservative aspects which rationalized the existing social order on the basis of the law of survival of the fittest appealed greatly to the Meiji government and inspired the reactionary bureaucratic ideology. (See Yamashita 1984) For the acceptance and subsequent denunciation of social evolutionism among Koreans, see Lee Kwangnin (1986, 1989).
 - 24) The impact of Victorian evolutionism was such that the European fall from Eden became the savage's fall from God's Blessings. "The myth of the Dark Continent was largely a Victorian invention. As part of the larger discourse about empire, it was shaped by political and economic pressures . . . The product of the transvaluation from abolition to Scramble, it defined slavery as the offspring of tribal savagery and portrayed white explorers and missionaries as the leaders of a Christian crusades that would vanquish the forces of darkness. Blame for the slave trade, which the first abolitionists had placed mainly on Europeans, had by mid-century been displaced onto Africans. This displacement fused with sensational reports about cannibalism, witchcraft, and apparently shameless sexual customs to drape Victorian Africa in that pall of darkness which the Victorians themselves accepted as reality" (Bratlinger 1988: 195–196).
 - 25) For the role of Japanized Buddhism in colonial policy, see Nam Lim Hur, unpublished paper on this topic given at the Meiji Conference at Harvard University, 1994. Buddhism was used by Japan for colonial purposes in Korea. The Honganji sect followed Japanese people to Korea, and established many branches there.
 - 26) For example, there were dances by Korean female entertainers, reception dinners, and tea parties organized by Japanese residing in Korea. The travelogue is also a predominantly masculine narrative, not only because all the drawings inserted pictured Japanese military officers in uniform telling these stories to non-military men wearing Japanese traditional clothing, but also

because the Asian Other pictured are only women. There might have been one woman among the passengers. The passenger namelist does not include the item of “sex,” but there is one name ending with the Chinese character for *ko*, a feminine suffix. However, there is no further trace of her in the travelogue.

- 27) For example, “At the top of Yongdu mountain (in Pusan) was a tea party for us. The atmosphere of the mountain with the overgrown pine trees *didn’t look Korean but Japanese, and I could see the traces of the rule of the daimyo of Taishu (Tsushima) long ago.*” (Ibid: 86) This description probably refers to the Japanese invasion of Korea in 1592, which lasted seven years. However, there was no “rule” of the daimyo of Tsushima in Korea. Although this incident was described in the colonial history as further evidence of Japan’s past rule over Korea, the Chosŏn dynasty lasted 300 more years after this invasion, whereas Toyotomi’s regime collapsed with his death toward the end of the war.
- 28) This passage is about the Sino-Japanese War as described by the Japanese military officers.
- 29) Konishi Yukinaga was a Japanese general during the invasion of Korea.
- 30) See *Unen kaganroku (Impressions of South Japan and Korea; Murase 1905: 126)* for similar descriptions with solemn war memories over the Sino-Japanese and the Russo-Japanese wars (p. 126).
- 31) On October 8, 1895, Queen Min was murdered in the palace by assassins authorized by Miura Goro, the Japanese minister in Korea, in an attempt to restore pro-Japanese influence within the Korean government. Queen Min, the wife of King Kojong, had gathered pro-Russian factions to play Russia off against Japan right after the Triple Intervention and had created a pro-Russian cabinet, deposing a pro-Japanese cabinet led by Pak Yŏnggyo. Fearing an outcry of condemnation from abroad, Japan recalled Miura to stand trial in Japan. But he was declared not guilty on grounds of insufficient evidence (Lee 1984: 294).
- 32) “*Kabo* warfare” (1894–1895) usually refers to the Tonghak (Eastern Learning) Peasant uprising in Korea. This was a religious/social reform movement which went as far as the systematic formation and uprisings of armed peasants. Originally named as opposed to Catholicism (Western Learning), but in essence an outcry of the oppressed class toward the government to solve economic difficulties and political corruption, Tonghak nevertheless was severely suppressed by the Korean government which called in the Chinese armies for help. The uprising eventually developed into the Sino-Japanese War. Since Queen Min died in the *Ŭlmi* year (1895) and not *Kabo* (1894), and since the subsequent rise of the anti-Japanese Righteous Army, which was not of the scale of the Tonghak uprising, was called the *Ŭlmi Ŭibyŏng*. I think the Japanese traveler/writer confused the chronicle.
- 33) Tokutomi was a political journalist and one of the representative *minyuŝha* historians. He had actively supported the People’s Rights Movement, but transformed himself into an expansionist after the Triple Intervention.
- 34) See *Mankan junyuŝen* pp. 122–124.
- 35) Takekoshi Yosaburo, re-quoted from Peattie (1984: 89). Many other Japanese colonialists shared this view.
- 36) In Meiji Japan, there was no such concept as *jinrui*, which denoted human beings as a generic category (Kawada 1985: 286), although “anthropology” as “the study of men” was translated into *jinruigaku*.
- 37) Stocking (1987) writes on Spencer, “Because Spencer was preoccupied by the more general problem of establishing an overall evolutionary development in all realms, analogies of structure and process played a critical role in his argument. By contrast, the evolutionism of Lubbock, Tylor, and McLennan was a solution to problems posed by the already accomplished biological and archaeological revolutions. Tylor later felt it ‘most strange’ that Spencer did not place ‘in its proper niche the evidence of pre-historic archaeology’” (Stocking 1987: 136).
- 38) During his 1889–1892 stay in London which was supported by the Ministry of Education, Tsuboi studied alone by reading books. He was not enrolled in any formal degree program, nor did he have close relationships with scholars there, except for attending the lecture of Tylor once (Torii 1976 [1927]: 461).

- 39) Torii said that anthropology is completely a natural science, whereas ethnology is 70% natural science and 30% human studies (*Kulturwissenschaft*). It is interesting to see how he was influenced by the German distinction between civilization and culture. Even today, “anthropology” (*jinruigaku*) in Japan means physical anthropology, and “ethnology” (*minzokugaku*) means socio-cultural anthropology.
- 40) It is important to distinguish the Victorian evolutionists’ conjectural history from German historicism. Torii quotes the writings of Friedrich Schlegel as the first Western ethnological work (Torii 1976 [1910] v. 1: 479). However, Schlegel was also different from the German historicists, because he never paid attention to the historic period per se. What Torii meant by “history” was thus more akin to myths and legends recorded in written texts.
- 41) Torii was also very much influenced by Koganei, his teacher and an anatomist/anthropologist.
- 42) Ethnography was translated as *dozokugaku* (study of native customs), and was regarded as a methodology.
- 43) The trip was to the southern Manchuria, but it included the northern parts of Korea around the Yalu River. Torii and two others were dispatched by the Tokyo Imperial University. Naito-Konan of Kyoto Imperial University also joined the trip to study Manchurian history at the request of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (Torii 1976 [1910] v. 10: 11)
- 44) In fact, there were two arguments in Meiji Japan regarding the historical relationships between Korea and Japan. Scholars of Japanese history (*Nihonshi*) inherited the tradition of the Nativists (*kokugaku*) and asserted that Koreans and Japanese derived from the same ancestors (*Nissen došoron*), and that Korea used to be under Japanese rule in the “mythical” period as well as in the ancient Three Kingdoms period. On the other hand, scholars of Oriental history, who grew out of and tried to transcend the philological study of China (*kangaku*), argued that Japan and Korea had separate origins, and instead proposed that Manchuria and Korea be treated as one entity (*Mansenshi*) in their subordinate relations to Japan (Hatada 1983: *passim*).
- 45) For example, see Torii’s interpretation of the King Kwanggaet’o stele, near the Yalu River in southern Manchuria. Controversies over the interpretations of the stele remain unresolved and show the wide gap between the historical narratives of Korea and Japan.
- 46) In his *Nanman kiko*, Torii also states, “There are many ways to investigate a people (*minzoku*) ethnologically (*jinshugakuteki*), but the measurement of the body is the most important. There are two ways to do that. One is to measure the body of a living person and observe skin-color, hair-style (*tohatsu*), and eye-luster, and the other is to investigate bone, that is, the physique. These methods will enable us to find out the value of the race/people respectively” (Torii 1976 [1909] v. 12: 571).
- 47) The theoretical formulations of Shiratori and Torii from 1910 to 1930 regarding the origins of East Asian races were based on the assumption that territory and primitive races (who were nomads and reindeer herders when Shiratori and Torii first met many “races” settled in Manchuria and Siberia) were contiguous.
- 48) Since Torii’s institutional affiliation was with the Department of Anthropology, he used the word “anthropological” in dealings with outside organizations (Torii 1976 [1910] v. 1: 471). He claimed, however, that “by 1903, I realized the importance of ethnology and decided to devote myself to it afterwards” (Ibid [1913] v. 1: 482).
- 49) Folklore studies (*minzokugaku*, which carries same pronunciation as ethnology but is written with different Chinese characters) emerged in Japan after 1910 with Yanagita Kunio as the pioneer. But since Yanagita sought to find a solution to the dismantling effects of industrialisation in the vanishing ideal of the village community — after the manner of English Antiquarianism and Tylor’s notion of “survivals” — folklore studies was limited to the study of “ordinary people” (*joimin*) living in remote places in Japan.
- 50) Peter Hulme, *Colonial Encounter* (1987); Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (1992: 97), also refers to this passage. Pratt (Ibid: 74–75) argues that the eruption of sentimental travel writing should be examined in the context of the late eighteenth century crises in European imperialism, especially debates over slavery. Particularly after the French Revolution, contradictions between democratic ideologies at home and ruthless struc-

tures of domination abroad became more acute, although the demands of North European capital remained.

- 51) Marxist-leftist nationalists in Korea attacked these so-called “Cultural Nationalists” as “collaborating” with the Japanese, because, it was generally said, their vision of independence required such a long period of time that it amounted to the maintenance of the status quo. Critically, in the 1930s, key figures among the Cultural Nationalists, mainly novelists, made speeches throughout Korea, albeit by coercion, encouraging young Koreans to volunteer for the Japanese Army. Also, it is interesting to note how few Japanese novels dealt with intermarriage between Japanese and Koreans. Except for novels written by Koreans living in Japan and their descendants who now only speak Japanese, I have not yet found any novel by Koreans in Korea about intermarriage, either. The fact that there does not exist a well-known, highly popular novel about such intermarriage written by Koreans shows how the ideology of “one origin,” which many Koreans also uphold but with different contents (Koreans believe that the ancient rulers of Japan and even the imperial household came from Korea), with all its spinning political effects, could not deal with the issues of nationalism properly.
- 52) Discussing Yanagita Kunio’s notion of the “folk” (*jōmin*), Harootunian (1990) succinctly points out how the discourses on “the ordinary and abiding people” (*jōmin*) were in fact aimed at constructing a “fixed common identity” (Ibid: 110) attached to “a vanished place (in actuality a no-place, neither here nor there, past nor present)” (Ibid: 107). According to Yanagita, the importance of “place” in Japanese cosmology comes from the idea of people becoming spirits after death and remaining rooted in the place of their former life. Karatani Kojin (1993: 32) also discusses how Yanagita began to use the term *jōmin* in the early Showa period instead of earlier terms such as *heimin* (commoner) and *nōmin* (farmer), which had had very specific referents in Meiji society.
- 53) The exact investigation of old place names, location of old castles, marching roads of past military invasions, and other topics preoccupied the historians’ imagination more than anything else. See, for example, Shiratori’s *Chōsen ryokōdan* (*Travelogue to Korea: 1971 [1914]*), about his efforts to prove the old name for a river that appeared in classical texts.
- 54) Yamaji Aizan was not simply pushing Korea far back into Japan’s medieval Heian period. For him, the power imbalance between the “swaggering women” and the “effeminate men” of Korea was a symptom of the declining fate of Korea. For example, he wrote;
“Women are stronger than I had expected. Especially, without exception, upper-class women (*jōryu shakai no saijo*) are good at political debates. This is really surprising. But look at the last stage of our Heian period. Men were in low spirits whereas women produced *Genji monogatari* and *Makura no sōshi*. The last days of the Ashikaga family were indeed characterized by enfeebled men and plotting women. In a decaying period, hens, instead of roosters, announce the dawn, and Korea is not an exception.” (Yamaji [1904] in Yoshimoto 1964: 64)
Yamaji also wrote, “It is amazing to find so many pretty boys in Korea (*bishōnen no ooki ni wa ikkyōo kissuru*). I heard that male homosexuality is prevalent here so that jealousies, rumors and love affairs between men are common among the Koreans. It certainly must have worked to consume Korean men’s energy” (Ibid: 63).
- 55) And again, the white Korean clothing is cited as another reason for this association. See also Tanizaki Junichiro’s travelogue to Korea in 1919 for the equation of the twentieth-century Koreans with the Heian period Japanese. “I strongly recommend those novelists and painters who are trying to write on or draw about the Heian period to go to Keijō or Pyongyang in Korea, instead of looking at *emakimono* [Japanese historical drawings] for reference. When I was rambling around the Kwangwha Gate [the front gate of the Royal Palace], I could not help but feel that I became the protagonist of my own play, ‘The Nightingale Girl (*Uguisu hime*).’ In terms of the atmosphere, there is indeed no difference between the commoners of Kyoto during the Heian period in their amply measured white clothings (*yuttari to shita shiroi kareginu*) and the contemporary Keijō citizens in their own clothings” (1960 [1919]: 62).
- 56) According to Kang Chinch’ol (1987: 28), economic historians believed that feudalism was an important “common feature” of both Europe and Japan.

- 57) See also Yamaji's conversation in writing with a Korean school teacher in Chinnamp'o (He seems to have described a teacher at a *sōdang* [Ibid: 67–68]) where he contrasts Ogyu Sorai's ideas to Neo-Confucianism in Korea.
- 58) I thank Professor Carter Eckert for referring me to this article.
- 59) The Kyoōdokai was attended by leading policy-makers of the central government, such as Ishiguro Tadaatsu, Odauchi Michitoshi, Kimura Shuzo, Ono Takeo, Nitobe Inazo, and Makiguchi Tsunesaburo. Yanagita also joined this association in 1910 (Yoneyama 1985: 37, 41).
- 60) The same passage is quoted in Tanaka Shinichi (1980–81: 58).
- 61) "Unique" because Japan is different both from the West and from Asia.
- 62) The putative invasion of Emperor Jinmu, for example, is a case in point.
- 63) Colonial contexts did not affect this alliance between nationalism and respectability. In fact, Chatterjee (1989) discusses the fixation of masculine/feminine qualities in terms of the material/spiritual dichotomy in the nationalist resolution of the "women's question" in colonial India. That is, the new patriarchy advocated by Indian nationalism conferred upon women the "honor" of a new social responsibility — that of protecting and nurturing the spiritual quality of the now "classicized" national culture.
- 64) It is interesting to note that Puccini's classic opera *Madame Butterfly* debuted at La Scala in 1904, that is, around the time of the beginning of the Russo-Japanese War.
- 65) For the subversive attempts of these imageries, see David Hwang's play *M. Butterfly*, and Dorinne Kondo's comments (1990).

List of References

- Adas, Michael.
1989. *Machines as the Measure of Men: Science, Technology, and Ideologies of Western Dominance*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Anderson, Benedict.
1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London, New York: Verso.
- Brantlinger, Patrick.
1988. *Rule of Darkness: British Literature and Imperialism, 1830–1914*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Calman, Donald.
1992. *The Nature and Origins of Japanese Imperialism: A Reinterpretation of the Great Crisis of 1873*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Chatterjee, Partha.
1989a. *Nationalist Thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
1989b. "Colonialism, Nationalism, and Colonized Women: The Contest in India." *American Ethnologist*. Vol. 16, No. 4.
- Cooper, Frederick.
1992. "Colonizing Time: Work Rhythms and Labor Conflict in Colonial Mombasa." Nicholas Dirks, ed. *Colonialism and Culture*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- De Certeau, Michael.
1986. *Heterologies: Discourse on the Other*. Translated by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Dirks, Nicholas.
1992. "Introduction: Colonialism and Culture." Nicholas Dirks, ed. *Colonialism and Culture*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Duus, Peter.
1974. "Whig History, Japanese Style: The *Minyuōsha* Historians and the Meiji Restoration." *The Journal of Asian Studies*. Vol. 33, No. 3.
- Fabian, Johannes.

1983. *Time and the Other: How Anthropology Makes its Object*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fogel, Joshua.
1989. "Japanese Literary Travelers in Prewar China." *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*. Vol. 49, No. 2.
- Fujii, James.
1993a. "Writing Out Asia: Modernity, Canon, and Natsume Soṣeki's *Kokoro*." *Positions*. Vol. 1, No. 1.
1993b. *Complicit Fictions: The Subject in the Modern Japanese Prose Narrative*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gakushuīn Hojīnkai.
1907. 3. *Mankan ryoko-kinen-go* (Special Issue: Trip to Manchuria and Korea). Tokyo: Gakushuīn.
- Garber, Marjorie.
1992. "The Occidental Tourist: M. Butterfly and the Scandal of Transvestism." Andrew Parker, Marry Russo, Doris Sommer, and Patricia Yaeger, eds. *Nationalism and Sexualities*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Greenblatt, Stephen.
1991. *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gould, Stephen Jay.
1981. *The Mismeasure of Man*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Harootunian, H. D.
1990. "Disciplinizing Native Knowledge and Producing Place: Yanagita Kunio, Origuchi Shinobu, Takata Yasuma." J. Thomas Rimer, ed., *Culture and Identity: Japanese Intellectuals During the Interwar Years*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hatada, Takashi.
1969. *Nihonjin no Choṣen-kan* (Japanese Views on Korea). Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo.
- Hunter, Janet.
1984. *Concise Dictionary of Modern Japanese History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Iriye, Akira.
1972. *Pacific Estrangement: Japanese and American Expansionism, 1897-1911*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Ishikawa Shuko.
1906. *Mankan junyūsen* (Voyages to Manchuria and Korea), Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha.
- Janelli, Roger.
1986. "The Origins of Korean Folklore Scholarship." *Journal of American Folklore*. Vol. 99, No. 391.
- Jansen, Marius.
1967. *The Japanese and Sun Yat-Sen*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Kang, Chinch'ŏl "Chōnjesŏn inon pip'an" (A Critique of the Theory of Stagnation), *Hanguksa shimin kangjwa* (Citizen's Forum for Korean History). Vol. 1, No. 1.
- Karatani, Kōjin.
1993. *Origins of Modern Japanese Literature*. Translated and edited by Brett de Bary. Durham, London: Duke University Press.
- Katsuragi, Tenka.
1903. *Choṣen hanto goketsuteki ryoko* (A Heroic Travel to Korea). Osaka: Yukan Seikado.
- Kawada, Junzo.
1985. 3 "Zadankai: Nihon to minzokugaku" (Discussion: Ethnology in Japan). *Minzokugaku kenkyū*. Vol. 49, No. 4.
- Kondo, Dorinne K.
1990. "M. Butterfly: Orientalism, Gender, and a Critique of Essentialist Identity." *Cultural Critique*. No. 16.

- Kuklick, Henrika.
1991. *The Savage Within: The Social History of British Anthropology, 1885–1945*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Leach, Edmund.
1990. “Aryan Invasions over Four Millennia.” Emiko Ohnuki-Tierney, ed. *Culture through Time: Anthropological Approaches*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Lee, Kwangnin.
1986. *Hanguk kaehwasa ūi chemunje* (Problems in the Korean Enlightenment History). Seoul: Ilchogak.
- Lee, Ki-baek.
1984. *A New History of Korea*. Translated by Edward Wagner with Edward J. Shultz. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Moose, George L.
1985. *Nationalism and Sexuality: Middle-Class Morality and Sexual Norms in Modern Europe*. Lansing: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Murase, Yonenosuke.
1905. *Unen kaganroku* (Impressions of South Japan and Korea). Nagano: Nishizawa Shoten.
- Nitobe, Inazō.
1970. *Nitobe Inazō zenshu* (Collected Works of Nitobe Inazō). Tokyo: Kyōbunkan.
- Ohnuki-Tierney, Emiko.
1993. *Rice as Self: Japanese Identities through Time*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Oshikawa, Shunrō.
1970. “Kaitei gunkan” (Submarine). Fukuda, Kiyoto, ed. *Meiji Shoñen Bungaku-shu* (Children’s Literature during the Meiji Period). Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo.
- Peattie, Mark R.
1984a. “Japanese Attitude Toward Colonialism, 1895–1945.” Mark Peattie, ed. *The Japanese Colonial Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
1984b. “The Nanyo: Japan in the South Pacific, 1885–1945.” Mark Peattie, ed. *The Japanese Colonial Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Pratt, Mary Louise.
1992. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Rosaldo, Renato.
1989. *Cultural and Truth: The Remaking of Social Analysis*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Said, Edward.
1979. *Orientalism*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Shiratori, Kurakichi.
1971. *Shiratori Kurakichi zenshu* (Collected Works of Shiratori Kurakichi). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Shiratori, Yoshiro.
1966. *Nihon minzokugaku no kaiko to tenbo* (Retrospect and Prospect for Japanese Ethnology). Tokyo: Nihon Minzoku Gakkai.
- Shiratori, Yoshiro and Yawata, Ichiro.
1978. *Nihon Minzoku bunka taikai Shiratori Kurakichi / Torii Ryuzo* Vol. 9. Tokyo: Kodansha.
- Stocking Jr., George.
1987. *Victorian Anthropology*. New York, London: Free Press.
- Tanaka, Shinichi.
1980–1981. “Nitobe Inazō and Korea.” *Hokudai Economic Papers*. Vol. 10.
- Tanaka, Stefan.
1993. *Japan’s Orient: Rendering Pasts into History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tanizaki, Junichiro.
1960. “Chošen jakkan” (Miscellaneous Thoughts on Korea). Originally published in 1919. *Sekai kiko bungaku zenshu* (Collections of Japanese Travelogues). Vol. 13. Tokyo: Shūdoōsha.
- Tokutomi, Soho.

1960. "Heijo yori Gishu" (From Pyongyang to Ūiju) Originally published in 1906. *Sekai kiko-bungaku zenshu* (Collections of Japanese Travelogues). Vol. 13. Tokyo: Shuōdoōsha.
- Torii, Ryuzo.
1976. *Torii Ryuōo zenshu* (Collected Works of Torii Ryuōo) Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha.
- Yamaji, Aizan.
1964. "Kansan kiko" (Travel to Korea). Yoshimoto Takaaki, ed. *Nashyonarizumu* (Nationalism) Gendai Nihon Shiso-taikei Vol. 4. Tokyo: Chikumashobo.
- Yamashita, Shigekatsu.
1985. "Herbert Spencer and Meiji Japan.." Hilary Conroy, et. al., ed. *Japan in Transition: Thought and Action in the Meiji Era*. London, Toronto: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press.
- Yoneyama, Toshinao.
1985. "Yanagita and his Work." J. Victor Koschmann and Shinji Yamashita, eds. *International Perspectives on Yanagita Kunio and Japanese Folklore Studies*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- White, Hayden.
1978. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.