

The Ethnology and Folklore of Colonial Korea

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| 著者 | CH'OE Kil-song |
| journal or publication title | JAPANESE STUDIES AROUND THE WORLD |
| volume | 2002 |
| page range | 69-101 |
| year | 2009-09-30 |
| その他の言語のタイトル | 植民地朝鮮の民族学・民俗学 |
| 特集号タイトル | Korea under Japanese Rule : Past and Current Research Results and Issues for Future Research 日本統治下の朝鮮 : 研究の現状と課題 |
| URL | http://doi.org/10.15055/00007507 |

The Ethnology and Folklore of Colonial Korea

CH'OE Kil-sŏng (CHOE Kil-sŏng)

Introduction

The post-colonial research conducted in South Korea is framed mainly in terms of the history of the independence movement and opposition to Japan, the former colonial ruler, and to the pro-Japanese feelings that form part of the colonial legacy. It is a manifestation of the spirit of resistance and reactive nationalism that exists in a state that has achieved independence from colonization. It is something that originates from the awareness of another party, of the perception of the former colonial ruler as an enemy. It is not proactive, and is not based on introspection. It is based on a strong awareness of Japan, and in a sense, characterizes South Korea as being in a later stage of colonization. There also seems to be little introspection in Japan. For example, while North Korea is perceived as impoverished and uncivilized, and criticized strongly for its political character, there is little awareness of Japan's own nationalism and imperial system. In this sense, I sometimes feel that all Japanese people harbour right-wing sentiments.

This externally centred post-colonial awareness often surfaces at meetings between historians from Japan and South Korea. Even, ironically, in discussions involving Japanese and South Korean scholars held at academic conferences, it is possible to detect an implicit communication in which the two sides are divided by nationalist sentiments, and strive to justify their own country's position. Such academics can be described as "nationality scholars." This kind of behaviour is common among researchers who specialize in the study of their own country's ancient literature and culture. Apparently, the Nazis used to speak of "Deutsche Physik," but I am puzzled by the notion that nationality can be assigned to learning. In this way, the learning of scholars is often severely restricted by their nationality. In such an environment, is it impossible to take a neutral-valued approach? I am from South Korea and my nameplate bears a Korean name. South Korea, the place where I was born and raised, is the

root of my identity. Although there may be a basic assumption that this prevents me from criticizing South Korea, I cannot be restrained by such an assumption. Learning cannot begin without this level of freedom. Nussbaum espouses “cosmopolitanism” in this era of globalization. She says that families, ethnic groupings, and states are randomly ascribed to us at birth and, while they provide a valuable foundation, we should not be bound by them (Nussbaum 2000, pp. 213–231).

I try to think about South Korea’s colonization from the perspective of cultural anthropology. By the 1930s, colonies and ex-colonies covered 84.6 percent of the land surface of the globe (Lomba 1998, xiii), and a large amount of almost global, post-colonial research has accumulated. This provides an important perspective in the research of Japanese colonies. In Western Europe, cultural anthropology has had a long and deep association with colonial policy. In colonies, many anthropologists have had some relationship, be it positive or negative, with the colonial aspects of their country, and many anthropologists have been cultivated by being in such an environment (Bremen and Shimizu 1999, pp. 1–10). In some cases, they have played leading roles in colonial policies, and in other cases, they have espoused anticolonialism. Of course, there are those who have pursued anthropology in contexts completely distinct from colonization, applying independent methodologies with a neutral-valued approach.

Many things have been shaped or reshaped by the course of wars, and anthropology is no exception (Terada 1975, p. 255). Although it could not be claimed that folklore and anthropology in pre-war Japan played an active role in colonial policies, it could be said that colonial Korea provided an environment that encouraged the cultivation of these academic disciplines. The products of this era include scholars, such as Torii Ryuzō, Imamura Tomo, Murayama Chijun and Akiba Takashi.

Post-war opinion of these scholars is not uniform. For example, various opinions are expressed about Akiba Takashi. He has been described as a “starting point in anthropological research” who achieved great things (Izumi and Muratake 1966, p. 260), and it has also been said that he is greatly admired as a pioneering researcher who has influenced modern-day South Korean folklore (Itō 1988, p. 219). I translated his *Chōsen fuzoku no genchi kenkyū* [Field Study of Korean Shamanism] (Keimyung University Press) into Korean, published *Akiba Takashi musok nonjip* [Anthology of

Dr. Akiba's Articles on the Shamanism] (Osōngsa Publishing) and I have presented several papers on his activities during the war (Ch'oe 1991, 1994). In contrast to the above, the following opinion has also been expressed: "The activities of colonizers who studied and collected data on folklore did not fulfil a scholarly function with respect to Korean folklore, and I view such people as tools who were used to formulate colonial policies or to act as pilots for them" (Yang 1980, pp. 135–142). Some think that Akiba's research on Korean folklore was based on colonial rhetoric and is therefore not worth using, that his learning was contaminated with colonial thinking, and it has also been remarked that his research was used for pacification (Nakao 1993, p. 237). However, criticism of Akiba as a colonialist still constitutes the minority opinion.

Akiba found employment at Keijō Imperial University in 1926, just after the university was founded. At this time, he was studying in Europe and did not take up his post until the end of the 1920s. In total, he spent nearly twenty years, throughout the 1930s and 1940s, conducting research in Korea. In other words, he spent a large part of one of the most important periods of his life as a scholar in Korea when it was a Japanese colony. At the very least, it did not exert as strong an influence as it did on Uchimura Kanzō and Yanaihara Tadao.

Although it is not clear whether, as an instructor at Keijō Imperial University during a time of war and colonization, he was acting under duress, whether he was simply swept along by the wartime mood, or whether he considered his field of learning to be colonization, Akiba conducted research and education in the fields of social anthropology and folklore against a backdrop of colonial rule. It is not clear what feelings he personally had about colonization. At first, in the same way that there is "silent resistance" (AVOIDANCE PROTEST; Adas 1992, pp. 89–126), there may have been an element of "silent control." However, his words and deeds of the 1940s were not coerced; they were extremely proactive.

In this paper, I will focus on Akiba's activities as a scholar of folklore in colonial Korea. At the time, while working at Keijō Imperial University as a "Japanese" instructor in what was a Japanese colony, he associated with many Koreans as a researcher of anthropology. I will consider, from a neutral-valued standpoint, how he struck a balance between colonialism and academia and how he thought about, and acted towards, the

relationship between colonialism and folklore, particularly during the war. In South Korea, debate tends to be polarized into pro-Japanese and anti-Japanese sentiment. In many cases, people considered to be patriotic in the early 1930s were considered to be pro-Japanese in the late 1930s. I do not, however, want to indulge in the characterizations of “good guys” and “bad buys” that one might find in a third-rate novel. In other words, I do not want to make any arguments regarding the question of whether Akiba was a colonialist or an academic. Looking at colonialism in this polarized way is considered to have limitations (Yamaji 2002, p. 16), and I believe that it is meaningful to depart from principles based on characterizations, such as “rulers and subjects,” “them and us,” and “good and bad,” and to examine the folklore of a former colony in the context of post-colonialism (Kang 2001, p. 8).

1. Early Research and Akiba Takashi

At the time of the Manchurian Incident in 1931 and the outbreak of the Greater East Asia War in 1941, and particularly during the war, Akiba actively supported the concepts of “Japan and Korea as One” and the “Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere.” He described the Greater East Asia War as a “crusade,” and was certainly not an anti-colonialist. He asserted that Japan and Korea shared the same ethnic roots, and asserted, “We can swear to live and die together in the liberation of Asia and the construction of Greater East Asia” (Akiba 1944, p. 53). Although he had little direct contact with the government-general, he cooperated with the promotion of colonial policies by participating in broadcasts, making speeches (e.g., for the Government-General and rural community movements), and writing. Why did he become a colonialist? Before considering the background of this, I will look at the relationship with the object of his studies in Korea at the time.

It is said that Akiba became interested in Shamanism after reading Imamura Tomo's *Chōsen fuzoku shū* [Korean Manners and Customs] (1914) while on board a ferryboat connecting Shimonoseki and Pusan. Imamura, with whom Akiba had the deepest relationship, went to Korea in 1908. In 1925, he left the Ch'ungch'ōngbuk-do Provincial Police Department, where he had held various positions, including the general

manager of police, and became a commissioned employee of the Government-General. He stayed in this position, which involved him in colonial policies, until the end of the war and, at the same time, conducted research into folklore, a pursuit in which he described himself as an amateur. His aforementioned book is regarded as a representative work of the early days of Korean folklore research (Mishina 1960, p. 131). It included previously published articles and unpublished manuscripts as well as a paper on practitioners of superstitious beliefs and practices that he completed in 1909. It also contained material in which he asserted that Korea had prospered as a result of colonization. Akiba maintained a relationship with Imamura throughout his life, and he was probably influenced to a significant degree by his colonialism.

Akiba was probably influenced by Torii Ryuzō (1870–1953) in an academic sense. As a commissioned employee of the Government-General, Torii performed excavations and field investigations with the cooperation of officials such as Satō Junkichi of the Government-General, Ko Sōng-gōn interpreter from Ŭiju City Police Station, and Fujii Kenkichi of the military police. In a travel journal entitled “Manshū yori Kita-Chōsen no ryokō” [Trip from Manchuria to North Korea], *Tōyō jihō* [East Asia Times], nos. 179 and 180, 1913), he wrote, “The Governor-General has said that these investigations must be conducted scientifically after the annexation of Korea and so they were initiated by the Government-General” (Collected Works, 12, p. 621). He argued that it was certain that Japanese and Koreans belonged racially and linguistically to the same *minzoku* (ethnic group) and so annexation was a domestic affair to be settled among like peoples, and the notion of independence was mistaken.

Torii was a colonialist who strongly opposed Korean independence. In a contribution to *Dōgen* [Same Roots] (no. 1, 1920) entitled “Nissenjin wa dōgen nari” [Japanese and Koreans share the same roots], he wrote, “Some people claim that Koreans must separate and be independent from the Japanese for the sake of the principle of self-determination, a notion that is totally erroneous. Japanese and Koreans belong to the same *minzoku*. Why should peoples of the same *minzoku* be separated and exist independently from each other? As Japanese and Koreans belong to the same *minzoku*, it is only right that they be united. It is in this way that the objective of national self-determination can be achieved. There can be no doubt of the

legitimacy of the union between Japanese and Koreans in the context of international affairs. Furthermore, as this union is an ethnological fact, its legitimacy can be asserted anywhere in the world” (Collected Works, 12, pp. 538–9).

It seems that this view of Torii's regarding ethnicity influenced Akiba. Akiba defined a *minzoku* to be “a group of people who share the same culture and aspire to the same ideals.” He wrote, “Koreans are our brethren with whom we share the same racial roots and culture ... From the peaceful sensibility of the Koreans, as well as their racial and linguistic characteristics, we can see that, in terms of race and culture, we Japanese have more in common with Koreans than we do with the Chinese ... The population of Korea is twenty-five million, a quarter of Japan's one hundred million. The Korean people have been given an honour and a responsibility, unprecedented in their history, to become a new member of the Japanese *minzoku* and, under the universal benevolence of the emperor, to act as an apprentice to the leader of Greater East Asia” (Akiba 1944, p. 60).

It seems that Akiba was influenced by Torii Ryuzō's investigations of shamanism. Torii wrote that the shamanic drum possessed powerful spirits, and that “the sound produced by the drum of a Korean female shaman is a kind of music” (Collected Works, 7, p. 333), but that in Siberian shamanism, the sound of the drum drove away evil spirits. He also wrote that the practice of dancing with bells and a fan was “just like the Japanese style ... The bells of the female shaman are considered to have a great power. Evil spirits are said to be surprised by their sound. Male shamans in the north do not use bells. The fact that Siberian shamans wear a Shamanic belt with bells attached, which they shake, distinguishes them from practitioners in the Korean Peninsula and Japan who hold the bells in their hands.” He further analyzed dance as being a divine state in which the shaman is possessed by spirits, and categorized dance into the following two types:

1. Dance for evoking spirits (i.e., to cure illness)
2. Dance for killing spirits (performed with a sword)

“The dance is quite interesting. The rhythm is chiefly maintained with

the drum, with an unvarying ‘do-don, don, don.’ The drumbeat varies from extremely slow to extremely fast, and the shaman must move her feet in time with it. The dance is extremely interesting. In Mongolian shamanism, the same ‘do-don, don, don’ rhythm is maintained with the drum. I think that it would be interesting to also compare these drumbeats with those used in Japanese Shinto dance as well as *sarugaku* (the prototype of the *kyōgen* farce) ... The dance starts off with a slow ‘do-don, don, don’ rhythm, and gradually intensifies until the shaman collapses. The shaman’s mental state changes dramatically at this point, giving the appearance of someone who has gone mad. This is necessary for the person being healed. At this time, the shaman gradually starts to approach the spirits inside the person’s body. I believe, as do others, that this state represents one in which the shaman is already in a divine state and is possessed by the spirits” (Collected Works, 7, p. 351).

Although Akiba does not quote Torii in “*Odoru miko to odoranu miko*” [Shamans Who Dance and Shamans Who Don’t], he probably was influenced by him (Akiba 1932). Although it is unclear whether or not there was a direct relationship between Akiba and Torii, Akiba wrote that, “The underlying trend of shamanism as a primordial religion of Mongols that predates the entrance of Tibetan Buddhism exists to this day. In Dr. Torii’s travels in Mongolia, one can see accounts of the shamanic rituals practiced by Mongols, and I was occasionally able to see these during my investigations in the Mongolian region of Manchuria” (*Daitōa minzokushi* [Ethnography of Greater East Asia], 38). The fact that Katō Kangaku who assisted in Torii’s 1932 investigation of Keijō (Collected Works, 12, p. 337), later assisted Akiba indicates that there was some relationship between the two. Torii’s oldest son, Ryujirō, says that he can remember Koizumi Akio showing Torii to Akiba’s study. From this time, there must have been some relationship between the two, whether it is direct or indirect. Also, the fact that Izumi Seiichi, one of Akiba’s disciples, said that he “deeply respected” Torii (Terada 1975, p. 74) would suggest that Akiba was indeed influenced by Torii.

2. Akiba Takashi during the War

Akiba’s behaviour was particularly colonialist during the war. In an essay

entitled, "Kimi ga yuku" [You Go to War], which he wrote for *Chōsen* in 1943, he related the following story of a young Korean man from Chōllanam-do.

Brought up in a household consisting of just his mother and himself, in the remote countryside of Chōllanam-do, he went to Japan to study musical composition at the music school in Ueno. Shortly before graduation, however, he decided to enter a training school for volunteers. After this, he was attached to a company, where he was subordinate to his younger cousin. During his stay in Tokyo, he received news of his admission to the training school by telegram from his mother who understood him best and had filed an application on his behalf. From this, it would seem that his purity of heart was chiefly inherited from his mother. When a little drunk, he would demonstrate his talent as a singer who had studied at a music school. He would say, in a beautiful high-spirited voice, "I want to go to the front as soon as possible."

About a month later, as I was about to go out, H showed up. It had been a while since he had last visited. He had just dropped by to offer a greeting from the doorway, but I insisted that he come in for tea. Clad in a military uniform and affecting a rigid military posture, he offered me a bag of sweet roasted chestnuts, which I supposed he had bought near the station, thanking me for all I had done for him. Startled, I said to him, "Nothing is more auspicious than a present of *kachi guri* (lit. "victory chestnuts") from a brave soldier. If you should be sent to the southern front as you have been hoping, how about getting me some alligator skin as a souvenir? No. I have a better idea. Why don't I find you a good wife so that you can give her an alligator skin handbag?" Then I had my wife serve some *sake* and food as a sincere, although somewhat meagre, celebration. I proposed a toast, saying simply, "Mr. H. forever." He spoke as cheerfully as ever in his pleasant and innocent way about many things: that he had swum in the icy Hang-gang; that his new company commander, about his age and the youngest in the company, took good care of him; that his mother had sent him money to buy a military sword, but that he returned it, along with his savings, because he couldn't find one he liked. Then he proclaimed, as he used to, "I want to go to the front soon." I replied, "Let me do some magic that will get you to the front as quickly as possible,"

and asked my wife to get a national flag that I had bought. I wrote the following poem on the flag before giving it to him:

Be the imperial flag raised high, on the day you stand on the
islands of the South Sea.

Rejoicing, he exclaimed, "Because of your gift, I will get there! I will definitely get there! This is the happiest moment in my life. I will die an honourable death," and then he left. I never saw him again, perhaps because my magic worked. He must be at the front somewhere in the expanse of Greater East Asia. I can easily imagine the round, childlike face of that young man who will be twenty-two years old next year. His mother, who is in her sixties, must be praying for her only son's success in war from her home in the remote countryside of South Korea. One cannot help being deeply moved by the pure patriotic sentiment of that mother and son from Chöllanam-do province, a place once known as a hotbed of disturbing thought.

It seems that Akiba was loyal to Imperial Japan at that time. Izumi Seiichi wrote the following:

Five out of the six Korean students in Akiba's class who were eligible for the volunteer program volunteered, but one of them unexpectedly went into hiding. Together with the student's father, Akiba searched everywhere and visited newspaper offices with a letter to the student inquiring after his whereabouts. His letter concluded by saying that he was to blame for what the student did and felt infinite responsibility for his lack of love for his students. The missing student was soon inducted as a volunteer ... I once heard a shocking story from Yi Tu-hyŏn, a friend of mine. He told me that one of his classmates bore me a grudge because he was made to volunteer at my recommendation. I would like to meet that man, but have not yet had the chance. (*Izumi Seiichi den* [A Biography of Izumi Seiichi], p. 184)

1) Culture Common to Japanese and Korean Societies: Unification Based on the Japanese Spirit

What did Akiba think of the Korean people?

I came to Korea in 1937, and have been here seven years. During this time, I have asked the other Japanese people here various things about Korea. Although there are people who have a deep understanding of, and sympathy for, Korea, I get the feeling that, in many cases, I have heard nothing but bad things about Korean people. I would like to hear about things that make me feel respect for Korean people, such as their virtues, their good points, and aspects that would humble Japanese people. There are, however, hardly any Japanese people who will give me such a response. Although this may partly be because of the influence of the political relationship that currently exists between Japan and Korea, I have felt for some time that I would like to be able to view Korea from an unbiased standpoint. This is not because I would like to see a greater integration of policy between Japan and Korea that would enable the unilateral promotion of Japanese interests, but because I want to know the true Korea. (*Heiwa no tami* [A Peace-loving People], Guillemoz Collection no. Im. 11, pp. 102–3)

This illustrates Akiba's desire to view his field objectively. Akiba asserted the common racial and cultural identity of Japan and Korea in the following:

I feel that the Japanese people who come to Korea should not exhibit a narrow interpretation of the Japanese spirit or a small-minded ethnic consciousness. In a broader sense, Koreans are our brethren, with whom we share the same racial roots and culture. I believe that both sides have a responsibility to be more aware of this basic premise, and to become more familiar with each other. (ibid., p. 112)

In fact, there was a large cultural gap. Akiba advocated unification

that would transcend that gap.

There have been several cases where a culturally backward *minzoku* conquered another *minzoku* with a rapidly advancing culture and, thinking that it had gained full control, unknowingly became intoxicated with the culture of the people that it was ruling over, and ultimately perished. (ibid., p. 114)

In the following, he describes unification based on the Japanese spirit:

I believe that our approach should be one that eliminates the perception of nationalism and cosmopolitanism as being in absolute opposition to each other by increasing the assimilation capacity of the Japanese spirit so that it can consume and benefit from the cultures of the world. Small-minded nationalism can destroy a *minzoku* in the same way that an unbalanced diet can sap one's physical strength. We must increase our capacity for absorbing other cultures. I do not think there is any problem in an approach that would leave Japan and Korea in an 'undigested' state. (ibid., p. 114)

To summarize, then, Akiba asserted that he wanted "to view Korea from an impartial standpoint and see its true character" (ibid., p. 103), and criticized the tendency to exhibit a "small-minded ethnic consciousness" (ibid., p. 111). "If one considers Korea to be the product of the unique development of the Silla kingdom, which absorbed Chinese and Buddhist culture, then one cannot help feeling respect" (ibid., p. 105). "As a piece of pottery can incorporate the unique flavour of the Yi Dynasty, Koreans were the teachers of our ancestors" (ibid., p. 105). As Korea had never had anything like Japan's samurai era, Akiba felt that Koreans were a "peace-loving people" (ibid., p. 107). Many people spoke ill of Korea and it seems that Akiba thought that by identifying its good points and restoring some sort of balance, he could ensure overall fairness in the relationship.

Akiba defined *minzoku* in the following way: A *minzoku* is a group of people who share the same culture and aspire to the same ideals. Even if there are racial differences among such people, they are still members of

the same *minzoku*.” He said, “Koreans are our brethren with whom we share the same racial roots and culture ... From the peaceful sensibility of the Koreans, as well as their racial and linguistic characteristics, we can see that, in terms of race and culture, we Japanese have more in common with Koreans than we do with the Chinese” (ibid., p. 112). These quotations show that he drew a distinction between Korea and China, and they also illustrate the nature of nationalism. It seems that he thought of a *minzoku* as a “nation,” and thought that Japan and Korea formed part of a single *minzoku*. He felt that the small ethnic groups of several countries, including Japan and Korea, could form a single, greater *minzoku*, and this is what he wished for. In particular, he strongly disapproved of a small-minded nationalism promoting the Japanese spirit that existed among Japanese people. He thought of Korea as part of the Japanese *minzoku*. It seems that he wanted Koreans to be viewed as equals and Korea to be annexed on an equal footing.

2) Religion and the Oneness of Japan and Korea

In 1935, at a meeting of the Religious Policy Committee of the Central Board of the Government-General of Korea, Akiba gave a lecture on “Chōsen no koyū shinkō ni tsuite” (Original Beliefs of Korea) as a topic closely related to policy-making for cultural development and religious issues. It is recorded in *Chūsūin tsūshin* [Newsletter of Central Board Communications] (September 13, 1935, p. 29). In the lecture, he said that a new religion should not be created for the Koreans because Korea had its own original beliefs. Defining religion in terms of whether the concept of an immortal, absolute god exists, he spoke as follows:

Since ancient times, Korea has had many types of religion. For instance, a typical folk belief today centres on female shamans. Although this may be described as a superstition, it has certainly been an object of belief since ancient times ... As these religions are actually practiced in Korea today, our policies should focus on how to nurture them. The notion that we should suddenly create a new, idealistic religion for the masses, acting as a kind of apostle, seems slightly absurd.

Akiba divided the “history of Korean society” into three eras: the era of magical power (from ancient times to the Koryŏ Dynasty), the era of intellectual power (Yi Dynasty), and the era of financial power (the modern age). He said that in the era of magical power, “beliefs in shamans and Buddhism did not come in conflict, but rather tended to complement each other” (Guillemoz Collection no. Im. 8, p. 230). The era of intellectual power, he said, was characterized by the construction of a patrilinear society based on Confucianism; modern society was characterized by capitalism based on rationalism. He categorized modern society into three social strata. The first consisted of young people who were educated at school and who had assimilated the concepts of modern western civilization. The second consisted of elderly people who had assimilated traditional Confucian philosophy and education. The third consisted of people who were poorly educated and essentially dictated to by shamans. The third group was often targeted for abolition because it was regarded as a superstition. Regarding this, he said, “I do not think that simply destroying a superstition produces any good. We would have to offer a new, proper belief as a replacement. If those whose lives depend on faith in the female shaman are deprived of that faith, they are left without either superstition or authentic faith. Since any *minzoku* without faith simply perishes, I hope that we are kind enough to lead such people to an authentic faith as we go about destroying their superstition” (“Chŏsen shakai-shi” [History of Korean Society], Guillemoz Collection no. Im. 8, pp. 268–9).

In reference to the Korean belief in a heavenly god, he said, “This god is not relative, but infinite, with no beginning and no end. Their faith is not a narrow-minded one that is necessarily restricted to one *minzoku* or nation. With the proper guidance, it has the potential to lead to a global religious consciousness” (*Chūsūin tsūshin*, September 13, 1935, p. 34). He analyzed modern shamanism and ancient documents, and hypothetically reconstructed the original Korean belief in the absolute, universal heavenly god (Hananim), and said that the Korean people and their faith should be respected. “Since people must live their lives while retaining their personalities, we cannot do without religion... Modern human life should not be excessively individual-, family-, nation-, or state-oriented” (*ibid.*, p. 30). “We must abide by a philosophy of working for the welfare of the

entire human race. On the basis of this principle, I would argue that no religion has a bright future if it is overly family- or nation-oriented. It is therefore necessary to focus on a global faith centred on national life." He thus ascribed value to the primordial aspects of Korean life.

In "Dozoku oyobi shinkōjō yori mitaru naisen no kankei" [The Relationship between Japan and Korea as Viewed through Their Folk Customs and Beliefs] (Guillemoz Collection no. Ma. 9, handwritten note), Akiba assumed that Japanese and Korean faiths were almost identical, originating in the same line, and wrote, "Since Korea has been busy in its dealings with other parts of the continent, its original faith has had little chance to develop and remains very close to its primordial form. In contrast, the primordial Shinto of Japan has been nourished from abroad by such religions as Taoism, Buddhism, and Confucianism, with the result that primordial nature worship and beliefs based on spirit possession became extinct, and human worship directed towards the spirits of ancestors, guardian gods, and heroes developed. This was unified within a framework of emperor worship and worship of the founder of the imperial family, and has developed into a national faith where the imperial family is regarded as the head family of the entire nation and the founder of the imperial family is regarded as the nation's guardian god. This spiritual core has created Japan's world-leading national polity" (ibid., p. 17). In short, his position was that the Japanese and Korean faiths were essentially of the same nature and line, but the Korean faith remained largely in its primordial form.

He argued that the ideals of the "oneness of Japan and Korea" and "universal brotherhood" could be realized by creating a national spirit based on the original, primordial identities of Japan and Korea.

We must endorse the national faith of Japan. Although Japan and Korea started with similar religions, Japan's developed while Korea's did not. It is therefore quite natural for Koreans to strive to develop in a similar way. We must strongly endorse the national faith that has naturally grown to form the spiritual core of Japan's national polity, which is unparalleled in the world. This national faith is the spiritual core of the national character of each person. As long as we have a tight grip on this national faith, our spiritual core (rice), it does not matter if we believe in

Buddhism (*tempura*) or Christianity (beefsteak). Rather, such beliefs enrich our faith. If we locate the centre of our character in our original national faith, enrich it, draw on thought from around the world, and achieve the oneness of Japan and Korea through this enriched, empowered national faith, the Korean faith will be refined and the reach of the national spirit will deepen and widen. Thus united, Japan and Korea will form the centre of the Greater East Asia community, and provide the driving force for realizing the ideal of universal brotherhood. (ibid., p. 19)

Although he did not explicitly state what he meant by the “national faith that forms the spiritual core of Japan’s national polity,” he was probably referring to state Shinto, which developed from primordial Shinto. Essentially, his aim was to achieve the union of Japanese and Koreans through the Japanese national faith.

3) Society and the Oneness of Japan and Korea

In “Shūkyō to shakai” [Religion and Society] (*Senyū*, 269, Korean Faction Honganji Buddhist Missionary Department, August 1938 edition: 1–2), Akiba described the way society influences religion. Distinguishing between rural and urban social models, he characterized the religion of the former as natural, homogenous, and mysterious, and that of the latter as artificial, heterogeneous, and materialistic. Rural societies, he asserted, developed religions contained within relatively small spheres, whereas the new religion of *Taejonggyo* did not penetrate urban societies. “Large-scale religions do not flourish in rural societies because these societies themselves are of a small scale. In urban societies, however, global-scale religions often develop because these societies are linked to national and worldwide religions that transcend families and communities” (*Senyū*, 271, October 1938 edition: 1). Akiba contributed three articles on “Shūkyō to shakai.” The above quotation is from part 1, which appeared in issue 271. Akiba felt that Korean society was rural in character and argued that this was “the reason why Christianity failed to take root in Korea.”

He asserted that Korean society should be developed as a robust community as it was not as advanced as Japan. In a broadcast entitled “Gendai shakai no ryūdōsei” [Fluidity of Contemporary Society], which

was aired from 6:25 p.m. to 6:55 p.m. on 9 February 1937, he warned, “Korean society has yet to exhibit a high level of fluidity. As its commerce and industry seem to be on track for significant growth, however, we must expect that the wave of fluidity seen in modern profit-centred societies will reach the Korean Peninsula” (Guillemoz Collection no. Ma. 12, handwritten note: 13).

Pointing out the differences between communal and profit-oriented societies, he explained, “Past societies and rural societies were oriented towards community-based social solidarity, whereas modern societies and urban societies are oriented towards individual profit. Modern profit-oriented societies grew out of past communal societies, and urban societies grew out of rural societies. Figuratively speaking, the buds of profit-oriented societies grew out of the soil of communal societies, becoming large trees bearing the flowers of modern civilization. As a result of this, however, the soil has become poor and the trees of profit-oriented societies have taken root in it. The flowers of modern civilization have become infested with insects, and something needs to be done. This is the essence of modern societies. Marxism tells us to chop down the big trees of modern societies and plant new seedlings, but this is too extreme since the flowers would be killed along with the insects. It does not make sense to discard the flowers simply because of the insects. I believe we should try to revitalize the large trees of modern societies by ridding the flowers of insects, ploughing deeply and extensively the soil of communal societies, and pouring over them the refreshing water of communal spirit. This is what I believe constitutes a real social education movement. In this sense, the purpose of such a movement would be to overcome the differences that exist between communal societies and modern profit-based societies” (ibid., 2).

On the family, the basic unit of communal society, he commented, “Among social groups, the family is the least fluid. In modern society, however, fluidity is remarkably high, even with respect to the family” (ibid., 5). He seemed to hope that Korea would prosper while maintaining its traditional society and family system. In this sense, he seemed to believe that there was more hope for Korea than for Japan.

In a broadcast entitled “Hijōrigata no shakai keitai” [Social Structures Suited to Emergency Situations] (Guillemoz Collection no. Ma. 11,

handwritten note), which was aired from 7:40 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. on June 16, 1938, Akiba called for unity: "What I mean by a 'social structure' is a state in which people are united by some social connection" (ibid., 2). "The social structure at a time of emergency must be one where the people are focused on a fixed centre" (ibid., 11-12). As examples of united societies, he listed Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and China, which was resisting Japan under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek.

This principle gives focus to a society. Current examples of well-focused social structures include Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, which have clear-cut social centres in Hitler and Mussolini and are well-defined. If the focus is adjusted to an absurd level, however, disaster results, as in China, which mobilises resistance against Japan under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek. It goes without saying that thorough preparation, wise judgment, and a great deal of effort are required to adjust the focus. Japan is the only country in the world with a great constant centre that comprehensively connects all the people. In this sense, we can say that Japan is a well-focused society with a clear centre that is unparalleled among modern societies. We were not born Japanese because we calculated that being Japanese would be advantageous. The cord that binds us Japanese together is not something thin and flimsy that can be freely tied or untied like a telephone connection or a piece of clothing. Rather, we are tightly bound with an unbreakable cord that has united us continuously since the time of our distant ancestors. We are bound by strong, deep feelings of affection for, and pride in, our Japanese identity. In this sense, I believe that Japan has traditionally had a social structure that is suited to emergency situations. (ibid., 13-14)

Thus Akiba draws attention to patriotic sentiments saying, "We are bound by strong, deep feelings of affection for, and pride in, our Japanese identity." (ibid., 16). It seems that this type of ideology was quite popular at the time, and similar trends of thought could be observed among contemporary Koreans.

Akiba insisted that Japanese and Korean cultures shared the same roots and pointed out the similarities between them. His ideas concurred with, or were parallel to, the basic colonial policies of the time. Unlike the colonies of Western powers, whose societies had little in common with those of their suzerain states, Japan and Korea had a close historical relationship. It was quite natural for him to point out the numerous similarities. As Japanese and Koreans were racially and culturally similar, he must have had high aspirations for their unification as one nation and for the formation of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperty Sphere. Academically, he supported the theory that the Japanese and Koreans shared the same ancestry, and politically, he advocated the union of the two groups. Looking back from our current perspective, we cannot help repudiating this attitude toward Korea. By current standards, it would be considered dangerous. Akiba's attitude toward Korea, however, changed as time passed. In the beginning, as an anthropologist, he looked on Korea primarily as a subject of research, but his awareness of being a member of the *minzoku* that ruled Korea gradually grew. It may appear that he underwent a transformation from scholar to ruler and militarist. It is more probable; however, that he had the awareness of both a scholar and a ruler from the beginning. In "Chōsen minzoku no kenkyū ni tsuite" [Research of Korean Folklore], which he published in *Chōsen* (April, 1928) shortly after taking up his post at Keijō Imperial University, he wrote, "I earnestly hope that our brethren in various parts of Korea will conduct research in this field." This may have just been a courtesy, but his words suggest the idea that the Japanese should know more about the country that they ruled. They reflect the perspective of both an anthropologist and a settler. It seems that, for him, Koreans were both a source of information and a colonised people. This way of thinking can be seen in many colonial anthropologists from developed countries.

Akiba found employment at Keijō Imperial University in 1926, just after the university was founded. At this time, he was studying in Europe and did not take up his post until the end of the 1920s. In total, he spent nearly twenty years, throughout the 1930s and 1940s, conducting research in Korea. The era of cultural unification started in the 1920s and, in the 1930s, Korea became a stable colony. The 1940s saw the outbreak of war and significant changes in policies.

3. *Daitōa Minzokushi: Hoppō-hen* [Ethnography of Greater East Asia: The North](Chikazawa Shoten, 1944)

This work expresses Akiba's colonialism well. It was published as part of the Keijō Imperial University News Department's wartime science collection (1: Yamaga Shinji, et al. *Chōsen no kōgyō* [Korean Industry]; 2: Hoyanagi Mutsumi. *Daitōa chiri* [The Geography of Greater East Asia]; 3: This book; 4: Kobayashi Seijirō. *Chōsen no kiseichu byō* [Parasitic Diseases of Korea] 5: Mori Tamezō. *Daitōa no tansui gyorui* [Freshwater Fish of Greater East Asia]; 6: Yamashita Masayoshi. *Gakusei to hoken* [Students and Healthcare]; 7: Takai Toshio. *Nyūyōji no eiyō* [Nutrition for Babies]; 8: Tozawa Tetsuhiko. *Senden to bōryaku* [Propaganda and Deception]). In a message marking the publication of this collection, the head of the News Department wrote the following:

This wartime collection is being published in order to spread scientific information during a time of war. The chief aim of the publication of this collection is to make scientific learning that has often, in the past, been monopolized by universities available to a wide range of the general public so that it can form part of the common knowledge of citizens. I would be extremely glad if, in order to ensure victory in the Greater East Asia War, our offerings as a university could enjoy the patronage of learned individuals. (April 1, 1944)

In "Josetsu: Minzoku no bunrui to bunpu" [Preface: Classification and Distribution of Ethnic Groups], although the subject matter of *Daitōa minzokushi* should be the ethnic groups in the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere, the problem of defining the meaning and scope of the term "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere" arises. It is commonly accepted that "Greater East Asia" differs from East Asia in that it includes areas outside Asia, such as New Guinea and other areas occupied by the Imperial Army, and it also includes Manchuria and India. India is in the process of entering the co-prosperity sphere. This gives us a rough idea of the southern and western borders. In the north, the problem of Siberia remains. This is because of the neutral relationship with the Soviet Union

and the way that the war campaign is focusing more on the resource-rich southern areas.

However, the importance of Siberia, which lies just beyond Manchuria and Mongolia and is due north of Japan, must be stressed. Even if it cannot be included in the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere for some reason, it is important as a surrounding area. Dividing Asia into northern and southern halves centred on China comes at an important turning point in world history, with holy war being waged for the liberation of Asia under the leadership of Japan. In consideration of the concept of Greater East Asia and of the historical fact that the Sino-Japanese War transformed into the Greater East Asia War, it would seem appropriate to consider China as part of the northern territory. This is why I have treated the Chinese as one of the most important *minzoku* in the northern territory of Greater East Asia in this edition. He hopes for the development of a Greater East Asia that incorporates both the resources of the South and the ethnic superiority of the North.

Chinese civilization is one of the oldest civilizations in the world and has exerted a great influence over Japanese civilization. If we consider this civilization to be alive, in the same way that the *minzoku* comprising it is alive, we realize that one of our most important tasks, as the leading *minzoku* in Greater East Asia, is to grasp the essence of this culture as an objective expression of the ethnic character of the country and to try to understand the true nature of the Chinese *minzoku*. With this premise, Akiba's work offers Chinese civilization's characteristics as being (1) its large population, (2) its long history, (3) strong adaptability, (4) uniqueness, and (5) the conservativeness of the Chinese people. In a word, it is in a state of "Asiatic stagnation." And given that Japan represents a high standard of civilization, he writes, "Is it not the case that the English, though in small numbers among however many millions of Indians, for the most part do not become Indianized?" Further, "For us to free Asia, to construct a Greater East Asia, with all of those who vow to live together or die (*dōseikyōshi*) we must not stop in our earnest hope that the whole of the Chinese people will soon truly wake up to the general trend of the world." "The Manchurian people are one of the major peoples in our ally Manchūkoku. They were absorbed into the Chinese people" (*Daitōa minzokushi*, pp. 41–42).

We do not know when or from where the Yamato people (the leading people of Greater East Asia) came to these islands. Everyone knows that, at the very least based on what history we know of, that they were on these islands from the start and, as an imperial people who developed a spirit of imperial reverence from the start of historical time, have been graced with an imperial court that goes back thousands of generations and exhibit a national characteristics of loyalty and bravery. (ibid., p. 53)

I believe (this people's) image in the face of the destruction of its British and American enemies is the incarnation of Japanese spirit with Western learning. (ibid., p. 54)

The image of the Japanese *minzoku*'s embracing a wide variety of racial elements while having created a harmonious and pure, unadulterated nation state is beautiful and nobility itself. However, we should not expect such great labors by a people to produce something without any effort. It goes without saying that mutual effort will be necessary in the process of blending the so-called newly added *minzoku* in with the Japanese *minzoku* as Imperial subjects. (ibid., p. 56)

During the Greater East Asia War, the Korean people in the process of hurriedly Japanizing as Imperial subjects. (ibid., p. 56)

[A]n apprentice officer from among the leaders of Greater East Asia, as a new Japanese *minzoku*. (ibid., p. 60)

Regarding today's Koreans, many of the younger generation who should be the hope of the future have already received a modern Japanese-style education in place of the formal Confucian one of the past. They are extremely fine in body and mind, but there is one thing—and this is the most important thing of all—they could become a magnificent Japanese *minzoku* if they were to

acquire Japanese-style emotions. I believe that this will develop surprisingly quickly during this war, particularly in conjunction with the implementation of the draft. No, I know of Korean youths who have turned completely into a magnificent Japanese *minzoku* and are fighting bravely on the frontlines of Greater East Asia from behind the gun. There are those who have offered their lives for this royal land and are worshipped at Yasukuni to become a truly glorious Japanese *minzoku* without a single Korean remaining. (ibid., p. 62)

The Japanese *minzoku*, Akiba says, are a *minzoku* who possess a quality of excellence in comparison to the multitudes of China's population. "Once again, feeling the limitless pride in each and every one of this *minzoku* and stirring sentiment about 'my Japan' is something that cannot be suppressed," he writes in conclusion (ibid., p. 63). To summarize, Akiba argues that, given that the Japanese *minzoku* are an excellent people who possess and have nurtured purity and are the leaders in the holy war that was the Greater East Asia War, the Korean people should blend in to the Japanese *minzoku*. "I know of Korean youths who have turned completely into magnificent Japanese *minzoku* and are fighting bravely on the frontlines of Greater East Asia from behind the gun" likely alludes to the aforementioned "Kimi ga yuku" [You Go to War].

There were fiercely patriotic Korean nationalists who became part of the "pro-Japan" faction during the war. Such eminent figures as historian Ch'oe Nam-sŏn and writer Yi Kwang-su were nationalists at first but praised the Greater East Asia War in the 1940s as a "holy war" and justified Japanese-Korean unification. Why did this sort of pattern of what might be called "apostasy" exist among some scholars? It cannot be understood simply as just the result of external pressure. Yi Nŭng-hwa and Ch'oe Nam-sŏn are said to be of the pro-Japan faction. More than favoring colonies, they were drawn in the way Akiba was by the appeal and logic of the "anti-Western Asianism" of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere.

In 1927, both Ch'oe and Yi Nŭng-hwa published articles in *Kyemyŏng* issue 19. Ch'oe referred to Torii's works in his piece, "Salman'gyoch'agi" [Records on Shamanism], quoting large passages of *Nihon shūi minzoku no*

genshi shūkyō [The Primitive Religions of Peoples Neighboring Japan] and *Jinruigaku jō yori mitaru waga jōdai no bunka* [Ancient Japan in the Light of Anthropology]. Yi Nūng-hwa's article, "Chosŏn musokko" [On the Korean Shamanism] was highly praised for its handling of written sources. Akiba esteemed Yi Nūng-hwa's research on the whole, citing it and developing a personal connection with him, but did not appear to have any personal or research connections with Ch'oe. The two Koreans were affiliated with an organization that carried out policy and research activities for the Government-General, and became part of the "pro-Japan" faction during the war.

Why was Akiba steeped in colonialism? There are many aspects from which that can be considered. One is that he may have been influenced during his European studies by the interest in colonies by functionalists of English social anthropology, especially Malinowski. Akiba Takashi likely had contact with the theories and works of various social anthropologists during his two years of study at the University of London. For him, with a job awaiting at Keijō Imperial University, he probably wanted to come home having seen more of the world for the sake of future research. His route home took him through America, among other places. He went around to museums on the journey home from his study sojourn. In short, the trip was like a museum pilgrimage. The reason he did that was because museums are places that effectively display the culture of different peoples and societies. Western museums display them particularly effectively, and one can also understand such things as the attitude of Westerners toward indigenous peoples from them. Akiba recognized those points and saw them as important.

Second, because he went into the field in Korea, where of all the varied peoples in the Japanese colonial territories there lived a people who were the closest of all to Japan's, it was easy for him to approve of the absorptionist "*naisen ittai*" (unification of Japan and Korea). Governor-General Saitō Makoto championed "cultural policy" and engaged in the debate over a Korean standard of benevolent rule. In short, he argued for the "harmonization of Japan and Korea" that would see the two peoples befriend one another and reconcile. It was an integration policy in which military force lay behind cultural policy. Aoyagi said, "We should not call for transplanting and implementing the Japanese system

directly to Korea. Rather, we must create laws that take into account economic and other conditions based on the character, customs, traditions, codes, and precedents of the Korean people” (Aoyagi 1923, p. 84). “To unite the mother country with Korea, fuse the two, and maintain a satisfactory social intercourse between them, we must first study their national character and the appropriate authorities should become well-versed in Korea’s history,” he wrote. (ibid., p. 86) Japanese-Korean unification in short was the slogan for an integration policy that would force Koreans to be absorbed into the Japanese people (Kasuya 1992, pp. 125-26). Akiba’s active cooperation with the “unification of Japan and Korea” during the war came about against the backdrop of such trends.

Third, the “Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere” concept was likely easy to endorse as anti-Western pro-Asianism. Not just Japanese but many Koreans were complicit in their support of it and became part of the “pro-Japan” faction. At the time, they may have thought that offered the possibility of a justification that differed from Japan’s aggression toward and colonizing of Asia. That is to say, it contained an element that intellectuals could logically and easily accept. That’s because, even if there were problems with the method, its name possessed a logic with which they could agree.

It is easy to criticize prewar colonialists today and doing so might seem unfair from the perspective of people who lived through that era. There do not appear to have been people who criticized them at the time in either Japan or Korea. Perhaps those who today would criticize that era are keeping with the times, riding the trends of the day. But this is not to affirm Akiba’s actions. We can suppose that it was not at all easy to oppose the imperialism of Imperial State Shinto. Yet there were those who in those conditions opposed colonies and war. Yanaihara Tadao held Christian beliefs and on certain occasions engaged in opposition activities. It would be of great interest for this study to see through his scholarship how he as a Christian and individual on the control side of the colonialists understood the colonies, and how he lived. I have been cognizant of the fact that Akiba was a Christian and paid attention at the least to how Christian justice manifested itself. It is really unfortunate that it was nowhere to be found and instead occasional statements endorsing the holy war turned up.

His imperialism rode heavily on Greater Asianism. At the time the

construction of a Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere was a logical thing that called for the unification of Asia in an age of anti-Westernism and opposition to Western aggression. We can imagine its persuasiveness at the time for not just Japanese but many Korean intellectuals, too. Because the Greater East Asia War was not a war of aggression but rather one meant to protest the East, it was treated as a holy war. In that sense, the *Daitōa Minzokushi* is the most straightforward expression of his thought.

An Akiba Takashi Chronology with Emphasis on Imperialism

- 1888 Born in Chiba Prefecture.
- 1926 Associate Professor (Lecturer in sociology), Keijō Imperial University.
- 1927 Councilor to the Literary Studies Society, Keijō Imperial University, and Director to the Japan Sociology Society; publishes “Kanban” [Signboard], *Chōsen shimbun*; “Minzoku no chōsa ni tsuite” [On Investigations of Folklore], *Keijō nippō*; “Hakubutsukan junrei” [Museum Pilgrimage], *Minzoku*, 2: 6, 3: 1, and 3: 2.
- 1928 Professor, Keijō Imperial University; publishes “Chōsen minzoku no kenkyū ni tsuite” [On Research into Korean Folklore], *Chōsen*, April, p. 155; “Hakubutsukan junrei,” *Minzoku*, 3: 6.
- 1930 With research support from the Imperial Academy, conducts joint research with Akamatsu Chijō.
- 1931 Ordered to Chejudo Island in October by Keijō Imperial University. Publishes “Jōzan no go” [The Language of Jōzan], *Keimu ihō*; “Ōrokkō” [Yalu River], *Hōritsu shunjū*; “Chōsen fuzoku ni okeru dyuarizumu” [Dualism in Korean Shamanism], *Chōsen sōran*; “Kobunka to shinhōritsu” [Ancient Culture and New Laws], *Hōritsu shunjū*.
- 1932 “Odoru miko to odoranu miko: Chōsen ni okeru miko no ichibunrui” [Shamans Who Dance and Shamans Who Don’t: A Shamanic Priestess Type in Korea], *Keijō teidai shigaku kaihō*, no. 1; “Saishūtō no shinwa” [The Myths of Chejudo Island], *Ryokujin*, no. 3; “Manshū Satsumankyō (Salman’gyo) no iematsuri” [Home Festivals in Manchurian Shamanism], *Shūkyō kenkyū*, New 1: 1; “Nihon shinwa no kenkyū” [Research on Japanese Myths], *Seikyū*

gakusō, no. 10.

- 1933 “Manshū to Chōsen no Satsumankyō ni tsuite” [On Shamanism in Manchuria and Korea], *Manmō*; “Ōdō kokkaron” [Discourse on Nations of the Kingly Way], *Seikai ōrai*; “Manshū Satsumankyō iematsuri” [Manchurian Shamanic Home Festivals], *Manmō*, 14: 2.
- 1934 “Chōsen no shakai to minzoku” [Korean Society and Folklore] (Lecture to the Keijō Imperial University Literary Studies Society); “Manshū shaman kengaku memo” [A Note on Observing Manchurian Shamanism], *Dorumen*, 4: 7; “Manshūjin no bunka to shakai” [The Culture and Society of Manchurians], *Chōsen*, January; “Chōsen no akimatsuri” [Korea’s Autumn Festivals], *Keimu ihō*.
- 1935 Travels and conducts folklore research from August 16–20 from Mokpo City in Chōllanam-do to the islands of the western sea together with members of Shibusawa Keizō’s Attic Museum. Publishes “Satsuma no fusai to Daisen no fujutsu: Manshū fuzoku tōsa hōkoku” [Shamanic Festivals in Salma and Divination in Daisen: Field Investigation into Manchurian Shamanic Customs], *Minzokugaku kenkyū*, 1: 2; “Chōsen minzoku no tenjin sūhai” [The Worship of Heavenly Gods among the Korean People], *Dorumen*, 5: 5; “Chōsen miko no kenkyū” [Research on Korean Shamanic Priestesses], *Mansen kenkyū*, 8: 5; “Kindai shakai no ichikeikō” [A Trend in Modern Society], *Ryokujin*, no. 1; “Eiga no miryoku” [The Attraction of Film], *Ryokki*.
- 1936 “Daikōanrei tōsa no tabi” [Daxinganling Fieldwork journey], *Chōsen*, no. 250; “Shima no shizen to josei: Tatōkai junkōki” [Nature and Women of the Islands: Records of a Journey of Many Islands and Seas], *Chōsen*, no. 256; “Orochon tōsaki” [Records of Oroqen Fieldwork], *Manmō 17-nen*, 7: 9; “Daikōanrei tōhokubu Orochon zoku tōsa hōkoku” [A Report on Fieldwork among the Oroqen of Northeastern Daxinganling] (1), *Bungakukai ronsan*, Keijō Imperial University; “Orochon shamanizumu” [Orochon Shamanism], *Minzokugaku kenkyū*, no. 2; “Chōsen no minzoku ni tsuite” [On Korean Folklore], *Chōsen bunka kōkai kōza*; “Mōko no aki”

[Mongolian Autumn], *Jōdai gakuyūkai kaihō*.

- 1937 “Orochon mingu kaisetsu: Daikōanrei tōhokubu Orochon zoku tōsa hōkoku III” [Explaining Oroqen Folk Crafts: A Report on Fieldwork among the Oroqen of Northeastern Daxinganling, pt. 3], *Minzokugaku kenkyū* 3: 1; “Mōkojin to kanbunka: Bunka denpa no ichitōkei” [Mongolians and Han Culture: Mapping the Lineage of Cultural Transmission], *Seikyū gakusō*, no. 27; “Chōsen no minzoku ni tsuite” [On Korean Folklore], *Chōsen bunka no kenkyū*, Keijō Imperial University; “Gendai shakai no ryūdōsei” [The Fluidity of Contemporary Society], *Shakai kyōka shiryō*, no. 18; “Minzoku to tōsei” [Folklore and Regulations], *Dokusho*.
- 1938 “Senman no shōgatsu minzoku o kataru zadankai” [A Roundtable on New Year’s Customs in Korea and Manchuria], *Chōsen*, no. 272, January; *Manshū minzokushi*, Manchuria-Japan Culture Association; “Kawayamon ni tsuite” [On Toilet Doors], *Chōsen*, no. 286; “Yūbokumin no kōbai kon’in ni tsuite” [On the Paid Marriages of Nomads], *Shakaigaku zasshi*, no. 7; “Kaikaikyō to seimei no mizu” [Islam and the Water of Life], *Keijō nippō*; “Nōson seikatsu to kyōdo kenkyū” [Farm Village Life and Studying One’s Homeland] (lecture); “Hijōjigata no shakai keitai” [Societal Forms in Times of Crisis], *DK hōsō*.
- 1939 “Manshū no kaikyō ni tsuite” [On Islam in Manchuria], *Rajio kōen kōza*, no. 12; “Tofu seishi o otonau” [Visiting Relic of Municipal Building], *Fukuoka nichinichi*; “Genshi shakai” [Primitive Society] (book review), *Teikoku daigaku shimbun*.
- 1940 “Obō to jōkō” [Obo Shrine and Castle Moats], *Shomotsu dōkōkai kaihō*, no. 9; “Obō tōsaki” [Records of Fieldwork in Obō Shrine], *Tairiku*; “Keijō yori” [From Keijō], *Minami-Takanawa shōgakkō dōsōkai shi*.
- 1941 *Manmō no minzoku to shūkyō* [The Folklore and Religions of Manchuria and Mongolia] (co-authored with Akamatsu Chijō), Ōsakayagō Shoten.
- 1942 Chief Curator, Exhibition Hall of Keijō Imperial University. An expedition during the summer vacation, with Akiba as Leader, Suzuki Eitarō as Advising Professor, and three students. “Saishūtō no minzoku” [The Folklore of Chejudo Island], *Bunka Chōsen*, 3: 4;

- “Nanpō kyōeiken no shominzoku” [Peoples of the Southern Co-Prosperity Sphere], *Kaitaku no tomo*, 1: 1.
- 1943 “Tunsan buraku no shakaigakuteki kenkyū: Nansen nōson chōsa hōkoku” [Sociological Research on Tunsan Hamlets: Reports on Investigations into Southern Korean Farming Village] 1: 3, *Chōsen*, nos. 338–340; “Shinpen shiwa” [Personal Talk about Myself], *Jōdai gakuhō*; “Kita-Ajia no minzoku” [Northern Asia Folklore], *Tairiku bunka kenkyū*; “Minzoku no dōka tohi no kankyō” [The Urban and Rural Environment for Absorbing a People]; “Senman minkan shinkō” [Private Belief in Korea and Manchuria]; “Kimi ga yuku” [You Go to War], *Chōsen*, no. 333; “Sōshutsujin no kenkyūshitsu” [The Research Laboratory for Total Mobilization], *Chōsen*, no. 343; “Senman shinkō” [Belief in Korea and Manchuria], *Nihon no bunka*, no. 23.
- 1944 Chair of the Literary Studies Society, Keijō Imperial University. Publishes *Daitōa minzokushi: Hoppō-hen* [Ethnography of Greater East Asia: The North], Chikazawa Shoten; “Dōzoku buraku to wa nanika” [What is a Tribal Hamlet?], *Chōsen*, nos. 349 (pt. 1) and 351 (pt. 2); “Nōmin goraku no mondai” [The Problem of Agrarian Entertainment], *Nikkyō*; “Chōsen no konjaku o kataru” [Talking of Past and Present in Korea] (roundtable), *Naisen ittai*, July; “Orochon zoku no shakai to bunka” [Oroqen Society and Culture], *Nenpō shakaigaku kenkyū*, no. 1; “Sansō o tazunete” [Visiting a Mountain Village], *Naisen ittai*, August.
- 1945 Member of the foundation committee for the Continental Materials Scientific Research Institute, Keijō Imperial University, and President of the Korea Welfare Society. Publishes “Yuki no nōson o tazunete” [Visiting a Snowy Agrarian Village], *Kōa bunka*.
- 1948 Lecturer, Faculty of Law and Arts, Kyūshū Imperial University. “Sandaigi” [Pyolsandae Mask-dance], *Nihon minzokugaku*, no. 9, *Nihon minzokugaku no tame ni* [For the Sake of Japanese Folklore Studies], no. 9, Minkan denshō no kai; “Amerika no shakai” [American Society], *Nihon kōron*, 3: 2; “Nansen hokuman” [Southern Korea, Northern Manchuria], *Kyūdai shimbun*.
- 1949 Leaves from Kyūshū University, becomes Professor and Director, Faculty of Letters at Aichi University. Publishes “Kannnagi to hi”

[Shamanic Priestesses and Fire], *Minzokugaku kenkyū*, 14: 1; “Tong sangye,” *Gendai shakaigaku no mondai* (Festschrift Volume for Toda Teizō); “Chōsen fuzoku no iematsuri” [Family Festivals of Korean Shamanism], *Shakaigaku kenkyū*, no. 1, Tokyo Sociological Society.

1954 Passes away suddenly at home cause of a heart attack.

1955 Posthumous publications: “Kita-Ajia no genshi shūkyō” [Primitive Religions of Northern Asia], *Ajia mondai kōza: Tairiku bunka kenkyū*, no. 9; “Shūzoku no gainen” [The Concept of Folkways]; “Mikai shakai no shūzoku” [The Folkways of Primitive Society].

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Japanese Sources:

Aoyagi Kōtarō. *Chōsen tōchiron* [Discourse on Ruling Korea], Chōsen kenkyūkai, 1923.

Akiba Takashi. *Daitōa minzokushi* [Ethnography of Greater East Asia: the North], Chikazawa Shoten, 1944.

Ch'oe Kil-sōng. *Nihon shokuminchi to bunka henyō* [Japan's Colonies and the Changing Face of Culture], Ochanomizu Shobō, 1994.

Fujimoto Hideo. *Izumi Seiichi den* [A Biography of Izumi Seiichi]. Heibonsha, 1994.

Im Sōk-chae. “Chōsen no setsuwa” [Korean Tales], *Chōsen*, no. 272, Korean Government-General, 1938.

Imamura Tomo. *Chōsen fūzokushū* [A Collection on Korean Customs], Keijō:Shidōkan, 1914.

Itō Abito. “Akiba Takashi” in *Bunka jinruigaku gunzō* [Portraits in Cultural Anthropology], Akademia Shuppankai, 1988.

Iwasaki Tsugio. “Chōsen minzoku gakkai no tenbō” [The Outlook for Korean Folklore Scholarship], *Dorumen*, 2: 4, 1933.

Izumi Seiichi and Muratake Seiichi. *Nihon minzokugaku no kaiko to tenbō* [Reflections on and Prospects for Japanese Folklore Studies], Nihon minzokugakkai, 1966.

Kang Sang-jung. *Posutokoroniarizumu* [Post-colonialism], Sakuhinsha, 2001.

Kasuya Kenichi. “Chōsen sōtokufu no bunka seiji” [The Cultural Politics of the Korean Government-General] in *Kindai Nihon to shokuminchi*

- [Modern Japan and Its Colonies], vol. 2, Iwanami Shoten, 1992.
- Kawamura Minato. "Chōsen minzokugaku ron" [Discourse on Korean Folklore Studies], *Shisō*, no. 839, 1994.
- Mark R. Peattie, et al., trans. by Asano Toyomi. *Shokuminchi* [The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895–1945], Yomiuri Shimbunsha, 1996.
- Mishina Shōei. "Chōsen minzokugaku—Gakushi to tenbō" [Korean Folklore Studies:History and Outlook] in *Nihon minzokugaku taikai* [A Survey of Japanese Folklore Studies], Heibonsha, 1960.
- Murayama Chijun. "Chōsen no fugeki" [Korean Shamans], *Chōsen*, August, 1932.
- Murayama Chijun. *Chōsen no fugeki* [Korean Shamans], Korean Government-General, 1932.
- Nakao Katsumi. "Shokuminchi shugi to Nihon minzokugaku" [Colonialism and Japanese Folklore Studies], *Chūgoku—Shakai to bunka* [China: Society and Culture], 1993.
- Nussbaum, Martha C., et al., trans. by Tatsumi Shinji and Nogawa Motokazu. *Kuni o aisuru to iu koto* [For Love of Country], Jimbunshoin, 2000.
- Tabata Hisao. *Minzokugakusha Torii Ryūzō* [Folklorist Torii Ryūzō], Kokon Shoin, 1997.
- Terada Kazuo. *Nihon no jinruigaku* [Anthropology in Japan], Shisakusha, 1975.
- Torii Ryūzō. "Chōsen fugeki" [Korean Shamans] in *Nihon shūi minzoku no genshi shūkyō* [The Primitive Religions of Peoples Neighboring Japan], Oka Shoin, 1924.
- Yamabe Kentarō. *Nihon tōchika no Chōsen* [Korea under Japanese Rule], Iwanami Shoten, 1971.
- Yamaji Katsuhiko and Tanaka Masakazu, eds. *Shokuminchi shugi to jinruigaku* [Colonialism and Anthropology], Kansei Gakuin University Press, 2002.
- Yang Yōng-hu. *Chōsen minzokugaku no kunan* [The Trials of Korean Folklore Studies], *Sanzenri*, 1980.
- Yi Tu-hyōn, et al., trans. by Ch'oe Kil-sōng. *Kankoku minzokugaku gaisetsu* [An Outline of Korean Folklore Studies], Gakuseisha, 1977.

Korean Sources:

- Ch'oe Kil-sōng. "Ilcheshidaewa minsoksa yōn'gu" [On the Ethnic History in the Japanese Rule] in *Yi Yōng-gu paksu hwagap kinyōm nonch'ong* [Commemoration Collected Works of Dr. Yi Yōng-gu's Sixtieth Birthday], 1991, pp. 649–66.
- Im Tong-gwōn. "Akiba Takashi ūi Han'guk musok yōn'gu" [Research of Dr. Akiba Takashi's Korean Shamanism], *Korean Studies*, Chung-ang University Publishing, 1976.
- In Kwon-hwan. *Han'guk minsokhaksa* [History of Korean Folklore], Yōrhwadang Publishing Co., 1980.
- Pak Hyōn-su. "Chosōn ch'ongdokpu chungch'uwonūi sahoewa munhwa" [Central Board of the Government-General of Korea Society and Culture], *Han'guk munhwa illyuhak* [Korean Cultural Anthropology], no. 12, 1980.
- Pak Kye-hong. *Han'guk minsokhak kaeron* [Introduction to Korean Folklore], Hyōngsōl Publishing Co., 1983.
- Yi Nūng-hwa. "Chosōn musokko" [On the Korean Shamanism], *Kyemyōng*, no. 19, 1927.

Western Language Sources:

- Barlow, Tani E., ed. *Formations of Colonial Modernity*, Duke University Press, 1997.
- Dirks, Nicholas B., ed. *Colonialism and Culture*, The University of Michigan Press, 1992.
- Guillemoz, Alexandre. "Manuscripts et Articles Oubliés d'Akiba Takashi," *Cahiers d'Extreme-Asie*, no. 6, 1991–92, pp. 115–49.
- Loomba, Ania. *Colonialism/Post-colonialism*, Routledge, 1998.
- Thomas, Nicholas. *Colonialism's Culture*, Polity Press, 1994.
- Bremen van, Jan and Shimizu Akitoshi, eds. *Anthropology and Colonialism in Asia and Oceania*, Curzon, 1999.
- Wolfe, Patrick. *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology*, Cassell, 1999.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This article is based on a presentation given at the conference "Anthropology in Asia and Oceania during Japan at War" (chair: Shimizu Akitoshi) held December 20–22,

1999, at the National Museum of Ethnology, taking into consideration discussion and comments. I extend my thanks to all the participants. I also wish to thank Prof. Alexandre Guillemoz, who teaches Korean studies at University of Paris 7. Akiba was said to have entrusted his manuscripts immediately after the war to Song Sŏk-ha. Song in turn entrusted them to the chief of educational affairs at Posŏng Junior College (now known as Korea University), who put them in the library, but they were said to have been lost during the Korean War. However, they recently turned up in Paris. Even more recently and to my great pleasure, I was able to get a hold of Akiba's old manuscripts. I had heard about an article written in French on Akiba from a Frenchman doing research in Japan named Barton, and I immediately asked for a copy. Happily, it turned out that the finder of Akiba's manuscripts was Guillemoz, with whom I had conducted research in Korea from the late 1960s through the early 1970s. I promptly wrote a letter to Paris. Shortly thereafter he sent me a copy of both his article and the manuscripts. It was about thirty pieces in all, including handwritten manuscripts and notes from lectures and broadcasts. There are copies of unpublished manuscripts that I have yet to look at, but the most precious items are his broadcast and lecture notes. They are an important resource for knowing how he viewed his times. I was able to offer much of that material in the present work. Finally, I would also like to thank Prof. Muratake Seiichi and Prof. Kawamura Minato, who sent me materials including *Daitōa minzokushi* and *Manshū minzokushi*.

Summary

The Ethnology and Folklore of Colonial Korea

Japanese ethnologists and folklorists working in Chosŏn in the first half of the 20th century were not directly involved in the policy making of the Japanese colonial government in Korea. It seems that such a situation was caused not by the Japanese scholars' unwillingness to play a major role in establishing colonial policies, but by the colonial government's ignorance of the usefulness of the disciplines. It was, one may conclude, more closely related with the colonial policies than with the attitudes of the scholars. That is why ethnology in Korea under colonial rule was able to avoid its role as a maid, unlike in the colonies established by Western powers.

This thesis is focused on the works of Akiba Takashi, a Japanese ethnologist who had his most prolific years in the Pacific War period. As a Christian who studied ethnology in the West, Akiba began to lead an energetic and productive life as an ethnologist, maintaining a healthy distance from the colonialist government. He then abruptly gave up his political neutrality during the Pacific War, actively involving himself in the colonial war. It was a period in which not just Japanese but Korean intellectuals collaborated with the Japanese imperialists. What made them turn into enthusiastic supporters of the fascist movement? The answer might be that the propaganda of the Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere sounded distinctly plausible to them. I hope that the relationship between the Christian conscience and the colonialism of that time, an issue not dealt with in this thesis, will be treated by other scholars.