

## HASHIYA Hiroshi

First of all, when I received and read the program for this symposium, though it may be an exaggeration you could say, I was extremely moved. The reason I felt this way is that, if a symposium of the theme “Korea under Japanese Rule” was held just ten years ago, themes that likely would have been proposed ten years ago have not been proposed this time. Symposium themes that would have been proposed ten years ago, or earlier, would have been different. For example, one would be the history of policy during the period of colonial rule as a part of Japanese political history, or the history of the advancement of Japanese companies as a part of Japanese economic history. Another would be an extremely narrow definition of the history of nationalist movements. Previously, these topics would be sure to appear in the symposium themes. In fact, the situation was such that these would be the central topics. I felt it an extremely refreshing change that these topics were not even present in this symposium.

The framework known as “Invasion and Resistance,” which was given in Professor Chŏng Chae-jŏng’s keynote speech on the first day was popular in the 1950s, 60s, or maybe up to the 70s in the Korean academic society and Japan’s academic community. I believe that a new goal has appeared which is to look at the colonial period from a point of view different than that of this framework. Also, there is the “Development and Exploitation” point of view of recent years, which was also covered in Professor Chŏng’s keynote speech. From this symposium, it can be seen that the level of issue awareness to allow us to go beyond this issue, and consider other future issues has been reached. In other words, I can see a proactive awareness of the issue regarding the orientation of the colonial period within the particular flow of Korean history in its entirety or, to narrow it down further, the orientation of the colonial period in the modern history of Korea.

I once heard a researcher state, “there was no history during the colonial period.” Especially in Korea, I believe that there was a strong tendency to think that way. This is to say that the period under Japanese colonial rule was a period different than the primary flow of Korean history. It is as if it was a period cut out of Korea’s history. However, that this series of reports has enough awareness of the issue to proactively attempt

to orient this colonial period in modern history, while also including a negative meaning as well extremely attracts my interest.

My second comment is as follows. One more characteristic that this symposium has when considering the colonial modern age from a colonial standpoint, is that it has enough awareness of the issue to orient the colonial period from the perspective of world history, or comparative history. This proposition was established on the first day from Professor Yun Kōn-ch'a's report, which was one of the keynote speeches and in other individual reports as well. For example, take the concepts of post-modern and post-colonialism that was proposed as a result of researching European colonies and history. I believe that since the point of view that attempts to introduce these concepts into the framework used to shed light on Korean modern history can be seen here, it shows a new side of the dialog. However, I would like to make a comment here. When considering the issue of post-colonialism, I believe it is a good that a foundation is available on which debates on world history can be held. However, at the same time, we must be aware that one aspect is critically different between the colonies controlled by Europe, and the colonies that were controlled by Japan, such as Korea.

This different aspect is that Korea under Japan's control had a double meaning regarding "restrictions to modernization." Restrictions are factors that cause friction or complications, and these were unavoidable. One of these double restrictions was, of course, the friction and complications caused by the fact that Korea entered the modern age while under colonial rule. As also mentioned in today's report on the history of medicine, an aspect of the modern age, so to speak, is that it was a modern age transplanted upon Korea forcibly from the outside. This is a common point that can be seen in all regions that were under Europe's colonial rule whether it be India or Africa. At the same time, there is another notable characteristic of Japan's colonies. The colonial modern age that Japan brought to these regions, was itself brought to Japan from the outside. For instance, using today's report on medical history as an example, the medicine forced upon the colonies while oppressing practitioners of traditional Chinese medicine was not Japanese medicine. Thus, even if the medicine did in fact enter the colonies directly from Japan, if traced to the source, the truth is that it was actually Western medicine, and foreign to

Japan. By extreme logic, the orientation is such that this medicine first came to Japan only after Japan had already entered the modern age. This modern age, for East Asia, including Japan, which controlled other regions, is a modern age that, put simply, has a nuance of “East versus West.” This is another issue that Korea had to bear as a restriction.

Basically, there is the colonial modern age, and the East Asian modern age. Professor Nam also touched on this in his comment earlier. Why is the term “modern age” so disliked in East Asia? It is also related to this issue, but Korea was forced to bear the shackle or restrictions of such a double meaning of the modern age. I believe this is a particular issue of Korea’s period as a colony of Japan which differentiates it from the colonies of Europe.

Today’s symposium provided a lot of concrete research that gives us suggestions to use when thinking about these things for future research. With the accumulation of half a century of research since the end of the colonization of Korea, or from the research of Korean history, I believe that it is highly significant that this symposium was held with contents that symbolize this new issue awareness just at this period. A period in which the colonial period should be oriented in history with the new awareness of this issue that we have in the 21st century.