

NAMIKI Masahito

During these three days I have been overwhelmed by the power of the papers read by all of the professors and have not had sufficient time to digest the material. However, the three days of discussion have borne fruit for me in two ways, and as a participant in the debate I wish to introduce them to you.

The first one is the light that has been shed on the concept of "modernity" that many professors, especially including Chŏng Chae-Jŏng, Yi Chong-min and Yun Kŏn-ch'a, have discussed. This may be what is called post-colonial and post-modern in Japanese or, in their Korean equivalents, ex-colonial and ex-modern, but the fact that there is criticism or appreciation of this term and that academic debate about it has begun in many forms is, I think, the most important result of this conference. "Colonialism," "modernity," and "nationalism" are words that we often use when doing research into Korea in the colonial period, but the meaning of these terms has not been thoroughly investigated, which is a very dangerous situation.

In relation to this problem, Professor Carter J. Eckert of Harvard University, for example, uses the term "Manichean dualism." To borrow Professor Eckert's expression, from the point of view of "Manichean dualism," nationalism and modernity are on the side of good, falling under the god of goodness, and have been praised by many scholars as sublime and wonderful. However, evaluation of how or why nationalism and modernity are wonderful or how they compare to other concepts has not yet been sufficiently undertaken. On the other hand, colonialism is seen to be on the bad side, pertaining to evil gods, and there has not been enough research in this area, as people do not want to be contaminated by this type of subject. Nationalism and modernity, on the one hand, and colonialism, on the other, have a sense of inviolability about them. This kind of thinking, the seizing of dualism itself, could be considered "the negative legacy" of Japanese colonial rule. At this symposium, these shackles have been broken and a real debate has become possible, which I think is most important. The word "post" might imply that debate about modernity or

colonialism is over or give the impression that a conclusion has been reached, but on the contrary, the questions about the nature of modernity, colonialism, and nationalism are at last being seriously debated.

Many points of view have been expressed during these three days of discussion and debate especially regarding the question of what is "modern." To make a rough categorization, the idea of "modern" has been examined from three points of view. The first is "colonial modernization," the second "colonial confiscation," and the third, introduced by Professor Yi Chong-min, I am not sure how to describe, but perhaps it could be called "disciplinary power." These three positions each give an image of the "modern" in their own way. Adding a few remarks to these, in general the points of view that give "modern" a positive value are "colonial modernization" and "colonial confiscation," and the point of view that includes the negative sides of "modern" is "disciplinary power." The decisive difference between "colonial modernization" and "colonial confiscation," which both give a positive value to "modern," is in the way that they see the relationship between modernization and colonization. "Colonial confiscation" says that modernization and colonization are completely incompatible, and in fact colonization is totally against modernization and is seen as something that crushes it. On the other hand, according to "colonial modernization," although it could not be seen as a friendly rule, colonialism promoted modernization to a certain extent and prepared the way for it. "Disciplinary power" also has an image of the "modern." I will not suggest here, which seems to me the most convincing image, but one of the fruits of this symposium is that the image of "modern" has expanded and has become substantial. From now on it will be a great task for us to thoroughly examine the meaning of the concept "modern" through further research undertaken from such viewpoints. I am not expressing myself very clearly, but these are my thoughts on the first achievement of the symposium.

The second achievement, mainly expressed in the presentation of Professor Hotei Toshihiro, and which was glimpsed in the presentations of other participants was the discussion of "collaboration" shown in the relationship of between Japan and Korea under colonial rule. I myself have said that as for the problem of the so-called "pro-Japanese group," the

terms “collaborators” and “collaboration” should be used. That this problem of collaborators and collaboration, which has not been clearly stated in historical narratives and has been treated as something to be hidden if possible, and has been the subject of scholarly discussion in public among Japanese, Koreans, and Korean residents of Japan, is another of the great achievements of this symposium. With regard to this, as Professor Hotei expressed in his detailed presentation yesterday, literature is leading history, and literary research is pursued at a deeper level than historical research. By overcoming many taboos, literary research is achieving much, and historical studies are following in this direction. An important task from now on is to somehow give this research its proper place within historical studies.

However, on the other hand, the fact that “pro-Japanese literature” has been treated as a leading topic in literary research can itself be said to pose problems. One is that in Korea, rather than “collaboration” the term that is on everyone’s lips to an overwhelming extent is “pro-Japanese,” and this evaluation is based on personal character. This perspective should be recognized as inappropriate. This kind of perspective makes people liable to fall into the danger of categorizing and labeling people as either pro-Japanese or not pro-Japanese. To put it in an extreme way, this kind of research puts “collaborators” on one side and the “heroes of the people” on the other, and then asks what status should be given to the eminent people in the center. This is the kind of crudeness and sensationalism into which this kind of thinking can descend. As Professor Hotei told us in his presentation yesterday, for Kwangboktchöl (Anniversary of Liberation), the annual celebration on August 15 of the emancipation from Japanese rule, this year a nationalist group in Korea chose “pro-Japanese men of letters” as the subject of a publication, showing that this is still continuing officially.

However, the fact that this kind of labeling is continuing poses a big problem. What is called “pro-Japanese” activity should be assessed in actions and words inclusively, and I think we should not stigmatize some people as “pro-Japanese” arbitrarily. Moreover, from the point of view of a historian, the kind of behavior which at first seems to be “resistance” actually has “collaboration” within it, and what looks like “collaboration” actually has an element of “resistance.” Multiplicity, complexity, and

fluidity are important things to be investigated. If these things are overlooked and not properly evaluated, it will be difficult to grasp the nature of Korean society during the colonial period. Literary research has until now taken the lead in this area, and has made various things clear to us. On the other hand, though, there is the danger that the point of view hitherto taken by literary researchers could become a kind of restriction in future research into collaboration with Japan. Overcoming these problems is another task for those of us who are doing historical research. That the existence of this kind of problem has been made clear is the second fruit of the present discussion.