

The Concept of **GongGong** (The **PPublicity**) in Traditional Korea  
And Its Modern Transformations

Lee Seung-Hwan  
Department of Philosophy  
Korea University

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to analyze the categorical dimensions and conceptual meanings of **gonggong** (~~roughly translated into 'publicity'~~) which has had a pervasive presence in traditional Korea and ~~the Orient~~Asia until the dawn ~~of of the~~ modern period. (For the purposes of this paper, ~~the Orient~~Asia is limited to countries utilizing Chinese characters in their written language: ~~in their language such as~~ Korea, Japan and China.) Through the analysis of **gonggong** as imbedded in Korean ~~Neo~~Neo-Confucian thought, ~~I will illustrate the~~ three different but mutually dependent meanings implied in ~~the this~~ concept ~~of gonggong is illustrated~~. I explore ~~Namely~~, **gonggong** as the domain of political dominion; **gonggong** as the universal moral principle; and **gonggong** as the integration of the mass' interests and opinions of the masses. Furthermore, this paper ~~will discuss~~ the severance of **gonggong** as the domain of political dominion brought on by the transitional period of modernity, and. ~~In other words~~, the role of **gonggong** as domain of political dominion in the inevitability of social and political development geared toward building a strong nation.

Key Concept: **gonggong** (public, publicity), *sa* (private), tradition, modern, ~~Neo~~Neo-Confucianism

Lee Seung-Hwan (Yi, Seung-hwan) is Professor of Philosophy at Korea University. He received his Ph.D. in philosophy from the University of Hawaii in 1991. His publications include Yuga sasang-ui sahoe cheolhakjeok jaejomyeong (Understanding of Confucianism from a Social Philosophical Perspective) (1998). He is presently a member of Korea Journal's Editorial Board. E-mail: kulee@mail.korea.ac.kr

서식 있음

변경된 필드 코드

## I. Why Is The Importance Of Research On the Concepts The Traditional Concepts Of GongGong and Sa Necessary?

Political journalists have noted ~~Those in the press who monitor Korean politics have criticized that for Koreans in Korea, “the distinction between “gonggong (public) and sa (private) hasve been diluted” or that “what should be a “public” politics has been “privatized.”~~ Most analysts ascribe this lack of distinction between public and private ~~indistinct separation of gong and sa~~ to Confucian culture, particularly the to that of NeoNeo-Confucianism, of the Choson Period, which has been perpetuated for more than was the ruling ideology for over 500 years. Namely, Analysts explain ~~Joseon period, which was the ruling ideology for over 500 years.~~ Analysts explain that this lack of ~~that the the lack of distinction between public and private indistinct separation is a natural consequence of a Confueiin a us~~ culture that has favored *in-chi* (rule byof personople, (人治)) and *deok-chi* (rule byof virtue, (德治)) over *beopchi* (rule byof law, (法治)). In Confucian culture, for example, theand has identified, from the perspective of internal relations within both relationship between the continuity between family and the Sstate waiswere extremely isomorphicquite similar ~~close, that andwith the State was regarded as an extension of the man’s family affairs and law are seen as extension of law within a family as the same as a nation’s governance laws.~~

However, in the writings of many NeoNeo-Confucian scholars of traditional Korea, ~~we can discover there are~~ many assertions that emphasize a strict separation between *gonggong* and *sa*. For example, “Be just and impartialobjective without bias.” ~~—(daegongmusa 夫公無私), “ Be just and impartialobjective with an open mind.”~~ (*gwakyeondaegong 廓然大公*), or “ Support justice and impartialityobjectivity and eliminate selfishness.” ~~—(bonggongmyeolsa 奉公減私).~~ Considering the extent to which Neo-Confucianism the made a strict separations of betweenneo Confucianism-cheolli (chon-li (Heavenly Principle) natural law, (天理) = gonggong (public, (公) and in-yok (human desireselfishness, (人欲) = sa (private, (私) -- with a particular emphasis on implementing equating ~~was invoked to implement the equality of~~

Heavenly Principle *chon li* (or and *gonggong*) <天理 = 公> in the field of politics, it seems unpersuasive to ~~broadly~~**boldly** state that ~~the traditions of~~ Confucianism ~~is~~**are** the cause of the indistinct separation between *gonggong* and *sa*.

In order to examine the cause of the disappearance of the concepts of *gonggong* and *sa* among contemporary Koreans, we must first examine the characteristics of the traditional concept of *gonggong* and *sa*, particularly ~~that in of~~ the ~~neo~~Neo-Confucianus ~~concept~~context, and evaluate the ~~cultural affect~~**effects of such cultural facets on** contemporary Koreans. Although it will be discussed ~~hereafter~~**later**, it is important to mention that ~~during the time when~~ ~~neo~~Neo-Confucianism was the tenet of governance, ~~there was a prominent distinction between~~ ~~standard of separating~~ *gonggong* and *sa* ~~had a dominant presence~~. -It is safe to say that without such ~~a presence of the~~**dominant** a separation of ~~between~~ *gonggong* and *sa*, it would have been difficult to maintain a system of governance for over 500 years. Accordingly, it is important to first understand the conceptual characteristics and categories of *gonggong* and *sa* as they existed in traditional Korea and how they impacted Koreans, ~~who had been~~ experiencing a chaotic transitional period, before we can elucidate the intricate concept of *gong* and *sa* imbued in contemporary Koreans.

Modernization of Korea ~~was not and~~ ~~did not come about from internal pressures, but~~ ~~internal creation~~. -It was a creation resulting from external catalysts. After 36 years of Japanese colonial rule, the Korean War, and over three decades of military dictatorship, Korea, without a proper ~~legal or governance~~ systems of ~~legal or governance~~, was on a path of ~~h~~"Hasty ~~m~~Modernization" with ~~the~~ singular goal of enhancing national wealth and military might. ~~In this environment~~**Under such chaotic circumstances of chaos and disorder**, ~~Koreans~~**we** were unable to preserve ~~the~~ positive aspects of the traditional understanding of *gonggong* and *sa*, nor were ~~we~~**they** able to properly adopt ~~the~~ positive aspects of Western culture. ~~Korea was able to only~~**We were only able to** perpetuate a culture of self-centered, family-centered, unprincipled egoism. ~~Because of the aforementioned~~ ~~inabilities~~**Thus**, *gonggong* and *sa* ~~and ideals of~~ ~~of~~ ~~free~~ ~~democracy~~ ~~was~~ ~~were~~ ~~not~~ ~~unable~~ to take root in ~~Korea~~**our reality**. -Instead, certain aspects of ~~the~~ traditional ~~concept of~~ *gonggong* and *sa* ~~was~~ ~~were~~ negatively enhanced and amplified and ~~was~~ ~~became~~ the inertia of culture. Perhaps, in the chaotic environment of the transitional period, ~~when in which~~ ~~generation~~**generations s**

~~disagreed~~ and cultures clashed, such unprincipled egoism was unavoidable. Although, the disorder of values and ethos in contemporary Korean society could be attributed to the turbulent process of transitioning from a traditional society to a modern society, the effects of over three decades of military dictatorship cannot be overlooked. The military regime neglected “basic principles” and “ethos” and adopted ~~all sorts~~ various “shortcuts” and “tactics” to safeguard its powers and propel economic development. The ~~label~~ slogan, “Modernization of ~~One~~ the’s Motherland”, ~~rationalized~~ justified the ensuing multifarious corruption and social evils. This type of unprincipled ~~ethical~~ developmental ~~drive~~ ~~drive~~ contributed to the propagation of favoritism and nepotism ~~along with corruption and social evils.~~ It was also a factor in spreading such a distorted understanding of ~~the intricate~~ gonggong and sa ~~to~~ in contemporary Koreans.

~~In certain aspects,~~ In some ways, ~~it~~ is understandable why leading intelligentsia contemplating the future of Korea ~~and her people~~ and Koreans point to blame tradition (Confucianism) as the cause of ~~the~~ distorted gonggong and sa ~~of~~ in contemporary Korea. ~~However,~~ to explain such distortions, an objective and detailed understanding of the causes is required, rather than a broad admonishment and reproach of tradition. ~~Accordingly, in This paper, we~~ will first highlight the main characteristics of gonggong and sa in traditional Korea and how distortions and variations of those characteristics spread among Koreans. Then, it will propose necessary steps to facilitate the establishment of a new concept of gonggong and sa.

## H. The Meaning of GongGong and Sa in the Traditional OrientAsia

The concept of gonggong ~~of~~ in the traditional ~~Korea or the Orient~~ Asia (For the purposes of this paper, ~~the I limit the OrientAsia is limited to~~ Korea, China, and Japan, countries that use Chinese characters in their written language-) cannot be equated to the concept of “public” in English because ~~it both concepts~~ originated and ~~and~~ evolved, experiencing a change in meaning, in separate and unique histories and cultures. The ~~concept of Oriental gonggong in particular~~ was defined and interpreted differently ~~depending on generational changes in each historical stage; generation, and gong in each individual countries of~~ and ~~had~~ defined gong in Korea, China, and Japan

~~their~~ ~~their~~ own ~~negligible~~~~different~~, but significant ~~differences~~~~ways~~.<sup>1)</sup> Hence, the identification of the differences in definitions of ~~the Oriental~~ ~~gonggong~~ and the investigation of the process of their distortion and variation is essential to the explanation of the political state and the framework of consciousness of contemporary Koreans. -The differences in the meaning of ~~gonggong~~ in Korea and the ~~Orient~~~~Asia~~ can be organized into ~~the following~~ three categories: ~~Gong in rule or ruling Power~~, ~~Gong as the universal code of ethics of justice and impartiality~~, and ~~Gong as of many the opinions and interests of the masses~~~~benefits and opinions~~.

### 1.1. GongGong in the Scope of Rule or Ruling Power

서식 있음: 글머리 기호 및 번호 매기기

~~It can be said that~~~~Perhaps~~ t-the most important meaning of the traditional ~~Orient's~~ concept of ~~gonggong~~ is the one that implies ruling power or ruling domain. This definition ~~that implies ruling power or ruling framework~~ first appears in ancient ~~Confucian~~~~Chinese~~ texts such as *The Book of Changes*, *Shujing (The Book of Documents)*~~The Book of History~~, and *Shijing (The Book of Songs)*~~The Book of Odes~~. - For example, a passage in *The Book of Changes*, states "~~gonggong~~ pays tribute to a divine ruler; a commoner cannot." <sup>2)</sup> Here ~~gonggong~~ refers to ~~aa~~ lord of a feudal ~~statenation~~ ~~who pays tribute to a divine ruler~~. - ~~In In~~ ~~Wang Bi~~~~Hwang-pil's~~ interpretation of this ~~tria-gram~~, he states that "~~"~~the magnificence of power and authority cannot be more than this,"<sup>3)</sup> and that ~~gonggong~~ signifies a political figure with absolute power and authority. ~~Lou Yulie~~ -~~Ru Wu Yeol's~~ (樓宇烈) more specific interpretation is that "~~"~~~~gonggong~~ refers to feudal lords and nobles."<sup>4)</sup> - ~~Gong appears six times in~~ - ~~Gong appears six times in~~ ~~The Book of Changes~~, - and each time it is used to convey the title or rank of ~~authoritative~~ political ~~authority~~ figures who are second in rank to the ~~sovereign~~~~divine ruler~~.

The concept of gong in ~~The Book of History~~~~Book of Documents~~ is similar to that found in the ~~Book of Changes~~.  
~~The examples of the usage of the concept of gong in The Book of History similar to that found in The Book of Changes.~~ - In seventy-five illustrations of the usage of the character ~~gonggong~~ (公) in ~~The Book of History~~~~Book of Documents~~, thirty-five of them ~~were used to~~ constitute reference terms of individual political authority figures such as ~~Zhougongju~~ ~~gonggong~~ (周公), a ~~reference~~ term for someone of higher rank, ~~or one~~

you serve) or *so gonggong* (蘇公 *sugong*). ~~E-avenn~~ ~~even~~ when used independently, *gonggong* (公) referred to *Zhouju gonggong* and other lords in ~~the a~~ feudal system. ~~However, compared with the meaning in these two books, T~~ the concept of *gonggong* in ~~The Book of Odes~~ *The Book of Songs* has more expansive meaning. ~~in comparison to The Book of Changes or The Book of History.~~ Although most of the ninety-five illustrations of *gonggong* in ~~The Book of Odes~~ *The Book of Songs* ~~The Book of Odes~~ are political reference terms such as *Zhou gonggong* (周公) *zhougong* and *Soo gonggong* (召公), ~~it is also used to~~ ~~gong also~~ refers to blood relatives or ancestors of authoritative political authority figures and even to political systems and ~~to~~ the sphere of governance in general. Interestingly, ~~What is interesting about the illustrations of gonggong in The Book of Odes~~ *The Book of Songs* is the concept of *gong* is used to describe affairs of the state and the space in which those affairs are carried out. The term *gonggong-sa* (public affairs) that appear in the *Daya Zhanang* volume of ~~The Book of Odes~~ *The Book of Songs* refers to *gong-saguoshi* (State 國事, matters of the State) (國事) or political affairs that a feudal lord carries out as a political ruler. ~~Furthermore,~~ *gonggong*, found in a line from a *song poem* in the *Zhaonan Xiaoxing* volume of ~~The Book of Odes~~ *The Book of Songs*: “hurriedly walk the streets of the night, work in *gonggong* day and night”,<sup>2</sup> also refers to a space where “public affairs” are carried out. In other words, it refers to a government or “public” office.

서식 있음

서식 있음

서식 있음

As seen in ~~the these aforementioned~~ ancient ~~Oriental Classic~~ *Chinese literature works*, *gonggong* is consistently used to signify political rulers, ~~and~~ the power to rule and the framework and ~~the~~ domain of rule. As political structures and systems gradually began to take shape, the development of ~~an an~~ opposing relationship ~~a~~ ~~clash~~ between ~~the gonggong~~ of “ruling power and sphere of rule” and ~~the sa~~ of “a domain free of rule implied in *gonggong*”, ~~give-gave~~ rise to the conceptual partners of *gonggong* and *sa*. ~~Even among words of their the Joseon period,~~ ~~Choson Era,~~ when the character *gonggong* was frequently used to construct words, ~~most~~ definitions of *gonggong* ~~that implied imply~~ a ~~domain of the St~~ *nation’s domain* and framework of rule ~~was overwhelming in number.~~ ~~For example,~~ *gonggong-gok* refers to grains stored by a nation or a government office, *gonggong-nap* refers to taxes that go to a national treasury and *gonggong-yeok* refers to national orders or duties such as military service or compulsory labor. As it is evident here, *gonggong* refers to the domain of political rule of the nation ~~controlled by a nation~~ and *sa* refers to affairs of an individual or a family that ~~is is~~ free of ~~the this~~ rule ~~implied by gong~~. For example, *sa-*

*geol* refers to privately held land such as farm fields and *sa-no* refers to male servants of a private household. However, when *sa* is used in a negative connotation, it can refer to criminal acts of deviating from the order of public rule. For example, *sa-do* refers to the slaughter of farm animals such as cows and pigs without a permit from (the regulating) government office and *sa-byeong* refers to a militia privately trained and established by an individual of power and influence. Also, *sa-mu* refers to the act of selling and purchasing of goods banned by law and *sa-su* refers to the crime of misappropriating taxes or grains collected by a national treasury or a government office.

## 2-2. 'Gonggong' as the Universal Code of Ethics of 'Justice and Impartiality'

In addition to *gonggong* of implying "ruling power and sphere of rule" in Confucian Classics ancient Oriental literature, *gonggong* also implies ethical principles such as *gong-zheng* (justice) and *gonggong-ping* (impartiality). A dictionary of Chinese characters dated around 1 AD, *Shuowen-jiezi*, defines *gonggong* as "ping-fen" (equal division).<sup>91</sup> Xunzi, emphasizes that "if a sovereign is not just, his subjects will not be loyal"<sup>92</sup> and that "there must be impartiality in judgment"<sup>93</sup>. Lu Buwei, a political philosopher of the Qin Dynasty wrote, "long ago, when a sage king reigned over the world, he made impartiality a priority in during his rule. As impartiality is conducive to brings about ruling over the world, impartiality begets rule... (공평하게 되면 천하는 다스려지게 되니, 다스림은 공평함으로부터 얻어진다.) a world does not belong to one person but to all who inhabit that worldit".<sup>94</sup> However, an interesting aspect to point out here is that the contrasts between *gonggong* and *sa* are not limited to a simple division of the sphere of activities. They also include ethical contrasts such as fairness and unfairness, and even righteousness regular and unrighteousness irregular. These contrasts indicate the deep-rooted nature of the principles and ethics of the Orient Asia's concept of *gonggong*.

It is unclear how the *gonggong* of "ruling power and sphere of rule" underwent a change in meaning to also connote include a code of ethics such as impartiality and justice. How did these two meanings of no obvious connection included in the single character *gong*? It is possible that The answer may be that in times when rule by an absolute sovereign or by a single person was accepted, matters

decided by and executed by the individual that sovereign with political power were considered “public matters of public (*gonggong*),” and justice, and impartiality and the moral expectations inherent in such functions of political authority, were required of that sovereign. Consequently, a *gonggong* that implying ruled power or sphere of rule naturally overlapped with the ethical and moral meanings of *gong* to display a relational meaning.

*T'ien-Cheonda* (the Way of Heaven), a Daoist concept of Taoist thought, played a significant role in the evolutionary process of the concept of *gonggong*. The Way of Heaven refers to the law of nature and the universe, to a natural order of *wu-wei* (non-striving) that does not strive towards any particular goal or deliberate movement. In this aspect, the Way of Heaven reflects a characteristic of *gonggongjeong musa* (justice without selfishness), which implies the equality of all things under the sun. Annotations by Ch'eng Xuan-ying (중국사람?) on a verse from the Zeyang volume of the *Book of -Zhuangzi* - “The Way is just and impartial.” explains that the Way of Heaven *cheondo* unifies all things and oversees life, and as such conferral is *musa* (impartial) or *gong*.<sup>10</sup> Guo Xiang, a Daoist philosopher of the Qin period, distinguishes between *gonggong* and *sa* based on whether or not feelings or desires are an innate part of nature: as he explains “living in accordance with human nature is *gonggong* and attempts to self-manipulate human nature is *sa*.”<sup>11</sup> 任性自生, 公也; 心欲益之, 私也 (각주 11 로 이하 각주번호 +1 씩)

The correlations correlation among between the Daoist thought understanding of the Way of Heaven, justice and impartiality, and *gonggong*, had a significant influence on the correlations of between Neo-Confucianus thought understanding structure of Heavenly Principle *cheolli, daegong-musa* (대공무사 영문풀이/ 무슨 뜻인가요?), and impartiality (*gonggong*). Ch'eng Ming-dao of the Northern Sung dynasty elucidates in the *Dingxingshu* that “Heaven and Earth is are constant for it is they are everywhere, thus disinterested; the Sage is constant for his feelings agree with everything, thus indifferent. Accordingly, the virtuous man’s knowledge is vast in its greatness and impartiality, with the greatest virtue in responding to things as they are.” Neo-Confucianus scholars derived the moral principle of impartial justice (*musa-gongjeong*) from the indeliberate motion of the universe, and with its application to humanity, adapted it as ethical principles necessary for a righteous society.

<sup>11</sup> 任性自生, 公也; 心欲益之, 私也

서식 있음

서식 있음

The concept of justice and impartiality implied by the character *gonggong*, together with the Confucian ~~in addition to the expansion of the~~ *deokchi* ideal of rule by virtue (*deokchi*) ~~ology of Confucianism~~, played a central part in the concept of *gonggong*. Particularly, ~~the concept of~~ *cheon-li* (the ~~p~~ Heavenly Principle Principles of ~~N~~ nature), ~~which can be described as~~ the essence of ~~neo~~ Neo-Confucian philosophy, ~~is was~~ interpreted as *gonggong* based on its ~~connotation~~ basic elements of justice and impartiality, ~~and its~~ ~~and~~ emphasized as ~~on~~ the universal morality ~~that must be adhered to by~~ ~~which~~ ~~that~~ all members of the ruling class, ~~such as a~~ sovereign, ~~or~~ ~~and~~ high government officials, ~~were bound to follow.~~<sup>11</sup> The contrasting ~~Neo~~ Neo-Confucian concepts of *gonggong* and *sa* are intrinsically linked to the Confucian ~~ideology of the~~ philosophy of ~~principles of~~ ~~N~~ nature and selfishness (Heavenly Principle ~~cheon-li~~) and selfishness, and *inyok* (~~chinese?~~) and ~~this connection~~ parallels the contrasting concepts of impartiality and partiality (*jeong* vs. *pyeon*), right and wrong (*jeong* vs. *sa*), and good and evil. Consequently, the principles of ~~N~~ nature equals ~~is equivalent to~~ an inherent state of righteousness, ~~which equals~~ ~~or~~ *gonggong*, which in turn equals ~~signifies~~ ethical correctness. ~~And,~~ selfishness, ~~by contrast,~~ equals ~~is~~ an artificial state created by willful desire, ~~or~~ ~~which equals~~ *sa*, which in turn equals ~~signifies~~ moral impropriety. Zhu Xi asserts:

서식 있음

서식 있음

“On the whole, there are two beginnings in any activity. The righteous ~~one~~ beginning is ‘justice of Heavenly Principle’ ~~natural law~~’ and the improper ~~one~~ beginning is ‘a private matter of selfishness.’”<sup>12</sup>

Zhu Xi’s ~~Jun-hee’s~~ viewpoint epitomizes ~~the~~ ~~the illustration of Confucius~~ Confucian principles and moral characteristics implied by the ~~neo~~ Neo-Confucian ~~Confucian~~ Confucians concept of *gonggong*. Even ~~in~~ during the Joseon dynasty, ~~which was~~ a society dominated by ~~neo~~ Neo-Confucianism, *gong* was commonly understood ~~to be as it was common to accept gong,~~ the just and impartial ~~virtue~~ benevolence (*in* 仁), ~~as~~ the basic principle of morality ~~or~~ ~~and~~ Heavenly Principle ~~natural law~~. In Yi Hwang’s *Seonghak sipdo* (Ten Diagrams of Sage Learning), presented to King Seonjo, he states:

서식 있음

서식 있음

Gong is a method of achieving benevolencevirtue (*in*), hence “~~it is benevolence~~ isvirtue you rediscover in ~~overcoming selfishness~~ and returning to propriety.” Generally, if one can achieve *gong*, then one can arrive at benevolencevirtue and thereby, love. Confucius’ assertion, that “...benevolencevirtue is overcoming selfishness and returning to proprietythe way,” (예?) implies that one can return to the Heavenly Principle principles of nature (*cheonli*) by overcoming personal desires. Thus, one’s true feelings will be preserved and ~~all~~ its functions will be carried out.<sup>13)</sup>

Yi Hwang presented the *Ten Diagrams of Sage Learning* to King Seonjo ~~in the~~ hoping that hopes that the he would impart virtue (*in*) on his people through justice and impartiality. As illustrated in ~~the writings of Yi Hwang~~ Yi Hwang’s works, *gonggong* refers to ~~the Confucian~~ principles of justice and impartiality of Confucianism, and is a method of bestowing benevolencevirtue. ~~Furthermore,~~ in its mindfulness of justice, ~~gonggong with its mindfulness of justice~~ is analogous to the Heavenly Principleprinciples of nature (*cheon li*). ~~In this work he~~ notes that the inimitable ~~neo~~ Neo-Confucianus concept of *gonggong* is highlighted by the correlations ~~among of~~ the principles of nature and justice, and and the Confucius principles of justices and impartiality.

Neo-Confucian ideology, which sees Heavenly Principle as the ethical principle of impartiality or gong functioned as ~~the~~ a foundation of the social structure ~~of during~~ the Joseon ~~Period dynasty~~ for more than over five centuries, up to and continued as such until the eve introduction of modernity. Yi Hang-ro (李恒老), who established the fundamental ideology behind the theory of defending orthodoxy and rejecting heterodoxy of the end of the Joseon ~~Period dynasty~~, states: “The Heavenly Principleprinciples of nature (천리) is one of justiceequivalent to gong. ~~If gongjustice~~ is pursued, then unity will follow. ~~Human desire is~~ one of evils. ~~If saevil~~ is pursued, ~~then~~ we will be divided in ten thousand ways. ~~If gongjustice~~ is pursued, people will help each other; if *sa* is pursued, ~~then~~ people will quarrel.<sup>14)</sup>

The Neo-Confucian thought, which considers gong as the Way of Heaven and sa as selfishness, ~~The purpose of gonggong and sa of neo-Confucius thought~~ was intended as a tool to enable members of the ruling class to overcome personal desires

and exercise develop a just and moral character that all befitting public officials should possess. In an The era was described by plagued by factional politics, and power struggles among different political parties took place within this framework of the neo-Confucius concept of gonggong and sa. In the latter half of the Joseon period when Confucian literati (scholar-officials) the nobility (사대부 엘리트 elite scholar-official?) had held political power, gonggong was not considered a 'first rank' person's moral character required only of the king, but it was demanded and expected of all literati nobility (elite scholar-official?). In contrast to the Confucius concepts of justice and impartiality that neo-Confucius thought of gonggong signified, sa represented a violation of Confucius Confucian principles and signified in unjustice and immorality acts. This representation is evident in concepts words commonly used in the Choson Period. For examples such as, sageo, or referred to unfair recommendations based on personal feelings, or, sadomok, or described the as the act of securing a government position through personal connections<sup>15</sup>. Such linguistic representations concepts can exist even be found used in contemporary society today, for example. The word satong, meaning describes adultery or infidelity.

(이하 과관부분 discussion 부분/ 빨간 부분 피자 질문 부분)

### 3. "The "3. GongGong" as the Common Opinion and Interests of the Masses of Many Benefits and Opinions

In addition to the two definitions of gonggong as implying both ruling power and universal moral principles, another definition of gonggong also implied commonality implying, togetherness, cooperativeness, and collectivity of the masses multiplicity was also used in traditional society. A representation of these implications of gonggong of commonality is are evident, for example, in in such social traditions as "items for communal use" and "public gathering places". And this notion can be seen as the legacy of the ancient community. The concept of gonggong implying a meaning of as commonality is first found in the Liji (The Book of Rites) an ancient Chinese manuscript of on etiquette. In it, The Liyun volume of Ye Gichapter (편?) describes the the ideal political state of ancient old society/city of datong (Grand eat Harmony er Community) and introduces the expression notes, "When the g Grand course was pursued, a public and common spirit ruled all under the Heaven

~~sky~~(tianxia weigong).” (~~천하위공 뜻풀이? 천하는 공으로 간주된다?~~). Zhengxuan, an annotator of the Han dynasty, ~~interpreted the gonggong in this expression to mean gong of as~~ commonality. ~~This expression implied that~~ ~~As the~~ ~~the~~ position of king ~~is was~~ bestowed upon the wise, ~~and it is was~~ not a position ~~that can~~ ~~ould~~ ~~to~~ be inherited ~~within a family.~~<sup>16)</sup> ~~and that a~~ ~~n other words, the position of king is not a consumer product to be bought at a store.~~ ~~Anyone who possesses the with~~ morals ~~that a~~ ~~befitting a ruler should have~~ ~~can~~ qualify ~~ies~~ to be king. ~~This clarification is an important turning point in the evolution of the concept of gonggong.~~

Another example of ~~the communal meaning of gonggong of commonality is~~ found in ~~the Tianyun chapter of the Book of Zhuangzi~~ (~~장자풀이?~~)’s ~~장자莊子~~ ~~天運~~ chapter: “~~Laontan~~ ~~老聃~~ ~~聘~~ ~~問~~ (~~한자 알려주시기 바랍니다. 인명?~~) states, as fame and wealth is communal in character, one must not try to possess too much of it.” <sup>17)</sup> The meaning of commonality is emphasized by Guoxiang, ~~from the Wei-Jin dynasty~~, ~~who~~ ~~interpretation of~~ the previous phrase ~~as~~: “~~since~~ ~~as~~ fame and wealth should be shared among all people, excessive pursuit of profits ~~will lead~~ ~~leads~~ to quarreling, ~~which will~~ ~~cause~~ ~~ing~~ havoc under heaven.” ~~Another~~ noted annotator of Tang dynasty, Ch’eng Xuan-ying ~~interprets gonggong in this phrase to mean impartiality;~~<sup>18)</sup> ~~or~~ that the opportunity for fame and wealth is ~~impartially~~ available to ~~everyone~~ ~~anyone~~. In ~~the Chapter of Zhangjiuling (Biography of Zhangjiuling) of the Jiutangshu (Historical Documents of Old Tang~~(~~jiu tang shu~~ (구당서 풀이)), ~~the Zhangjiulingchuan, statement in the Book of this Zhuangzi’s line in “장자” statement~~ is reinterpreted as ~~saying that~~ “~~Positions of rank are public instruments under heaven.~~”<sup>19)</sup> It expresses the political ideal ~~of that~~ the opportunity to earn a position of rank be equally open to all people.

The assertion that anyone could gain a position of power ~~or power itself~~ was ~~actually~~ unrealistic in a pre-modern society. However, towards the end of the Qing dynasty, revolutionary thinkers, critical of ~~the previous era’s~~ absolute monarchy, emphatically called for the “publicizing” of political power. Revolutionary factions criticized the ~~previous era’s logic of~~ social structure that regarded the emperor and his court as ~~gonggong~~ and argued that the emperor and his court, ~~being as members~~ of the same family with the same family name, ~~was were~~ ~~nothing~~ but signifiers of *sa*. These factions believed that ~~in while comparison to the~~ private *sa* characteristics ~~were~~ inherent in absolute power, ~~gong included~~ ~~min~~ (the people) (民) ~~with its~~ ~~and~~ implied ~~meanings of~~ multiplicity and wholeness ~~represented gong~~. ~~Consequently, the~~

<sup>19)</sup> 官爵者，天下之公器.

서식 있음

서식 있음

서식 있음

서식 있음

서식 있음

서식 있음

Emperor and the Royal Court became targets of a coup d'état because they signified ~~they were the symbols of~~ minority interests and selfishness~~absolutism, or -sa,~~ that destroys the interests of the people, ~~or the min. (the people)~~ Kang You-wei Gang (1858-1927), through in his reinterpretation of the phrase "tianxia weigong" notes that gong "chon ha wi gong" in the Ye Un volume of Ye Gi, assumes in the definition of gong implies equality without any difference between nobles and commoners ers or a gap ~~between the~~ rich and poor. Also through a reinterpretation of "tianxia weigong," Sun Wen Sen (1866-1925) explores the political ideals of Grand Harmony (datongism). Mizoguchi Yuzo asserts that such these two reinterpretations became the stepping stones of the development of the system of communal ownership within the concept of the people's gonggong and sa, which grew and advanced~~developed~~ based on~~into~~ China's socialism.<sup>19)</sup> In other words, the evolution of the concept of gonggong of as commonality, from its first appearance in *Liji* to its reinterpretations by various scholars including Yuwei Gang and Mun seon, is presumed to be the ideological womb root of Chinese socialism.

서식 있음

The concept of gong went through stages of evolution in its meaning, ~~F~~from its political meanings implication of ruling power and ruling domain to moral concepts of justice, and impartiality, and eventually to a definition of commonality implying togetherness, cooperation~~veness,~~ and collectivity~~multiplicity~~ the concept of gong went through stages of evolution in its meaning. The three meanings implied by gonggong in traditional society are individually distinct. However, they share one, maintain a common denominator that facilitates a representation of an all-encompassing meaning. In sum, According to, ~~In other words, in the Oriental~~ concept of gonggong, ruling power has to be one of justice~~to be just~~ and impartial, ity and everyone anyone with the such~~the~~ proper (moral) qualifications should be allowed to participate in rule. In this sense, the Orient's Oriental concept of concept of gonggong in the Orient~~Asia~~ is not a simple idea, but rather is a complex idea conflation of ruling power, justice, and impartiality, and commonality. —

### III- Principle Characteristics of GongGong and Sa in Traditional Korea

#### 1. 4- Emphasis of Morality and Commonality in Ruling Power

서식 있음: 글머리 기호 및 번호 매기기

The concept of *gong* in the Joseon period implies the three meanings mentioned above. ~~The concept of *gong* in the Choson Period is preserved. For over 500 years~~ Neo-Confucianism maintained its position as the foundation of political ideology ~~for over 500 years of the Choson Period. This ideology emphasized the m~~ As such, it strongly reflects the moral importance of ~~the existence of~~ justice and impartiality in ~~*gonggong* of in~~ ruling authority. ~~I-Particularly,~~ the importance of ethics and morality in ~~ruling authority of~~ *sarim* (Confucian scholars) politics in the mid-Joseon period was more intensely expressed than it was in China or Japan. *Sarim* politics ~~describes-defined~~ a political system of ~~dividing governance by~~ appointing ~~learned~~ men of scholarly achievement and high moral character who were out of government office ~~thereby dividing governance. During the the Joseon~~ ~~Choson period's Samsa (Three Offices of Law) period, -a comprehensive term for~~ ~~the~~ three government agencies (~~Saheonbu, Saganwon, and Hongmun-gwan~~ managed records of criticisms and opinions (Saheonbu, Saganwon, and Hongmun-gwan), ~~each managing~~ that managed records of criticism or demands of impeachment of government officials, admonitions of the king and general political criticisms, and official government documents and literature, respectively ~~as agencies that managed records of criticisms and opinions. These three agencies~~) fostered public opinion and discussions (~~*gonggongnon*~~) among the intelligentsia in order to promote moral politics and manage ~~the function~~ government officials) in order to maintain a system of checks and balances on ~~the a~~ sovereign's ~~independent~~ judgments and decisions. To this end, ~~the method of~~ *hapsabokhap*, ~~was~~ employed. This method, ~~a predecessor to modern day sit-in demonstrations,~~ is one in which all the officials of these agencies would prostrate themselves in front of the palace gate to appeal to the sovereign to approve their proposals. ~~The following In a~~ letter of appeal ~~written~~ by Yi I ~~reflects two get a sense of the mood of environment in an era~~ of ~~*sarim*~~ politics that emphasized the importance of public opinion and discussions:

—

“Public opinion and discussion is the spirit and energy of a nation. When public opinion and discussion is facilitated and reflected in government, a nation can be governed. However, when public opinion and discussion is not facilitated and relegated ~~to~~ ~~and degenerates into~~ mere ~~street~~-gossip

~~on the streets~~, a nation will be in havoc. If there is no opinion and discussion between those who rule and the masses, then ~~a the~~ nation will surely be destroyed.— Because ~~a ruler's inability to instigate public opinion and discussion surely brings there is no precedence in which a nation did not meet to an its~~ end ~~due to a ruler's inability to instigate public opinion and discussion and, in his~~ fears ~~of the existence~~ public opinion and discussion among the masses, ~~and therefore triesing~~ to prevent it and treat~~ing~~ it as a crime.<sup>20</sup>

~~Whose opinion, then, does public opinion and discussion refer to?~~—Yi Li claims that ~~public opinion is exactly what the hearts of the everything our people's hearts~~ (*insim*) ~~tells us~~ ~~essay is~~ right (~~인심이 옳다고 하는 것~~) ~~is public opinion and discussion and that the principle of state administration guksi (guksi principle of state administration) should be based on public opinion. is an aspect of national philosophy (guksi) 공론의 소재를 국시라고 하는 것?? 국문 뜻풀이?~~—The principle of state administration ~~National philosophy (국시?) Gook-si~~ describes a condition in which all people ~~of~~ in a nation ~~is are~~ in agreement ~~to over~~ the ~~rightness righteous~~ of something without having to discuss it; it is not ~~an opinion formed something by out of the~~ tempt~~ationed by of~~ personal gain or ~~something scared by by threats threats, but it is~~ something that even a ~~mere~~ child will know is right.” <sup>21</sup> Y-Here-i Li explains ~~that~~ public opinion ~~to be an opinion is one~~ that everyone in a nation considers ~~to be~~ right. ~~Of course, In in~~ reality, the only entity that could state political opinions and have ~~gonggong non~~ at the time would have been the judiciary body—Samsa (~~네모를 samsa 로?~~). —However, the purpose of Yi-~~Li's~~ assertion that public opinion is “the opinion of all people of a nation” was to reemphasize commonality and morality in political authority. Hence, ~~Li~~-Yi's concept of *gonggong* implies not only ethical morality, but also the will of the masses.— The efforts of the nobility to transform ruling authority into one rooted in morality on the foundation of the ~~aforementioned~~ will of the masses represent a distinctive characteristic of political thought in the Joseon (particularly, mid-Joseon) period.

The ~~neo~~Neo-Confucius Confucian idea, ~~in the Choson Period,~~ that a ruling authority should respect the will of the masses and be ethically and morally just,

~~experiences~~ was significantly advancement in the hands of the realist and enlightenment thinker Yi Gi (1848-1909) ~~towards~~ who lived at the end of the Joseon~~Han~~ dynasty. Yi Gi was critical of the absolute governance of the previous era and called for the implementation of a republic. —He declared that absolute governance ~~to be~~was unrighteous because it ~~is a political system that~~ privatizes a government that should be public. ~~And~~R, ~~republicanism that~~ stresses a general principle and consensus ~~is as~~ the political system that can truly put the gong ideals of gong into practice ~~the ideals of gong~~. — In a letter of appeal ~~he~~ presented to the king in 1905, he proclaimed that “the deities of soil and grain and seeds and seedlings are not for His Majesty alone.” —사직과 종묘? asH he urged the awareness of commonality in national governance,<sup>22</sup> while supporting a system of public farmland centered on communal ownership ~~of land~~. —Yi Gi’s political philosophy exemplifies the characteristics of the neo-Confucius concept of gonggong.

## 2.2 ~~Concentric Circle of Relativity and Continuity of GongGong and Sa~~

서식 있음: 글머리 기호 및 번호 매기기

In reference to the Chinese conception of gonggong, Fei Xiao-tong ~~once~~ used the phrase “ripple of concentric circles.” 동심원적 파문? 23 The implication of this term is that an individual is in the center of the social circle and through the individual’s interaction with what ~~the~~ her surroundings ~~him~~, such as his kin ~~his family~~ and neighborature, human relationships gradually multiply like ripples. ~~In accordance with the logic of this relational theory~~ Therefore, the ~~closer you are~~ closer you are to the individual (the center), the more intimate ~~closer~~ the relationship; the farther further from the individual, you are the more distant the relationship. —Accordingly, the distinction between gonggong and sa is simultaneously both relative and continual. —In other words, when looking outward from the center, the closer relationship is recognized as sa and the farther relationship is recognized as gonggong. —~~In this relational web, gonggong and sa are both relative and continual.~~ 사제? Simply, G-gonggong signifies the wider scope of a concept that always encircles the smaller scope ones, while. —Whereas, sa signifies the narrow scope of a concept that is encircled by the larger scope. On such an intertwined this foundation, the social and political dichotomy in which gonggong equals the state, which equals and

political domain, ~~with and~~ *sa* equals equaling the family ~~and, which equals~~ economic domain, found in ancient Greece, cannot be firmly established.

The main characteristics of the relationship between *gonggong* and *sa* of the Choson—Joseon Period are evident in the Chinese ~~variation's characteristics~~ variations' characteristics of continuity and relativity. ~~In the Joseon dynasty,~~ the scope of *gonggong* and *sa* ~~of the Choson Period was not divided to facilitate its expansion, rather, it was~~ always flexible and free-flowing. When viewed from the perspective of the wider scope, the narrow scope signifies *sa* and from the perspective of the narrow scope, the wider scope signifies *gonggong*. Many interesting ~~cases~~ words can be found in the ~~traditional word~~ commonly used Chinese characters of the Choson Period illustrating the relationship between the wide and narrow scopes. ~~For example, Sadaedong does not refer to law established by the national government, but to thea law called Daedongbeop (Law of Uniform Land Tax), which changed tributes to the government from material goods to rice, by the regional government.~~ For example, ~~Ssadaedong does not refer to law established by the national government, but to to thea~~ local practice of ~~called Ddaedongbeopbeop (Law of Uniform Land Tax Law) ㉔,~~ which were established by local government offices ~~and~~ not by ~~the~~ state. (네모를 파랑부분으로?) 사대동이란 국가에서 제정한 것이 아니라, 지방관청에서 제정한 대동법을 말한다. From ~~todaya~~ modern's perspective, tax policies and other ~~duties policies carried outenforced~~ by a regional governments is ~~definitively~~ considered ~~to be acts of gonggong,~~ but ~~considering~~ the sheer size of the national (government), the regional government itself was deemed to be within the narrow scope of *sa*. Similarly, *sadohoe* refers to an examination given by the local magistrate, ~~and or yuusu,~~ (a government official in charge of other important regions outside the capitol) ~~to~~ Confucian students. Also, ~~the word sajin~~ describes the act of ~~the local governmentnor to distributing his owna private supply (자체적으로?) of grain to~~ relieve the ~~population of~~ hunger resulting from a bad harvest. In contrast to *gongjin* 賑, a national relief system, the local relief system was identified as *sajin*. This is not a reflection of *sa*'s meaning of "individual" or "illegal." Rather, it is a reflection of the influence of the linguistic custom of self-deprecation in contrast to anything of higher authority. ~~Thus, aThe~~ ~~spects of~~ relativity and continuity implied in the relationship of *gonggong* and *sa* can again be verified in ~~the~~ linguistic examples ~~of the Choson Period~~ from the Joseon ~~dynasty.~~

서식 있음

서식 있음

3.3. Conflict and Opposition of "Private" and "Public" Duties

서식 있음: 글머리 기호 및 번호 매기기

Neo-Confucianism considered *chinchin* (親親) (duty to one's blood-kin, as) the main moral principle in human relations and considered *chin-chin* 'law of nature'. To achieve the Sagehood of kingship, kings of the present age were expected to expand of the duty of 'chinchin' to and spread virtue among his people was considered to be the politics of the Sage King. The developmental steps from *chinchin* to a benevolent government (*injeong*) are continual and consistent-similar to the developmental sequence of found in the *Da Xue* (Great Learning) that tells us to cultivate the person, regulate the family, govern the state well, and bring peace to the world. self-cultivation, regulation of family management, ordering the State governance, and tranquility under the Heaven (수신제가치국평천하?) found in the *Da Xue* (Great Learning). Yi Hwang illustrates the continuity in the expansion of 'the "private sphere"' into one of 'the "public sphere"' in the next passage thusly:

*Li* (principles) may differ in ten thousand ways while singularly connected, and although the extent of love and affection is subject to the degree of intimacy (*chinsu*) and differences exist in social rank and status (*gwicheon*), *li* it is not bound by 'personal matters of one's own benefit'. This is the essence of the Western Inscription (Seoseomyeong) by Chang Tsai (張載) (영어폴이). He (Chang tsai) wonderfully illustrated the great wisdom, in which, one must Considering the cultivated on of 'the impartiality righteousness of no-self-deprecation' (무아의 공정성) on the basis of consequent of loving hisone's own parents, *Chinchin's* and one must sincerely piety and the revelation of the 'duty of serving the Heaven by extending the that sense of spirit of serving', a derivative of the dedication of attending to one's his own parents filial piety. In his illustration, we can clearly see that 친친의 후함을 미루어 무아의 공정성을 기리고, 여백이 섬기는 정성으로 말미암아 하늘 섬기는 도리를 밝힌 것을 보면? (뜻풀이 알려주시기 바랍니다.) various ethical principles in our ordinary life there is no incidence of division not leading finally lead to one one truth ultimate Truth principle. (一理?)..25)

서식 있음

서식 있음

서식 있음

서식 있음

서식 있음

Yi Hwang describes the logical structure of *Seomyeong* that illustrates expansion of the moral category of *chinchin* into the 'public' moral character of 'self-deprecation', as a metaphysical theory of continuity called "From a diversity of principles to one ultimate Truth/Reason" (一理?). Although, within the context of Neo-Confucianism, the moral category of *chinchin* had a natural connection to the 'public' moral characteristic of *no-self-deprecation* (무아), this connection was not so easily made in reality. The "'personal duties'" of *chinchin* (love of parents) conflicted and had frictions with the 'public duties of *jonjon* (respect of the high authority). We can see evidence of such conflicts and friction between private and public moral duties during the reign of King Hyeonjong. The During this King's reign, there was a development of the disputes between private and public or (moral) duties at that time are as follows: In 1663, the fourth year of Hyeonjong, it was customary for the Joseon King of Choson to receive the envoy/envoys from China at the *Mo-hwa-gwan*, a designated location, Mohwagwan where envoys from China were received. This The duty of receiving the envoy accompanying the King Hyeonjong (내모를 파관부분으로) was assigned to a high-ranking official, *Kim Man-gyun*, named *Mangyun Kim*. However, he submitted a letter of resignation rejecting the assignment on the basis of the "moral duty of vengeance" <sup>26)</sup> for his grandmother who had committed suicide to protect her chastity when the Chinese invaded Choson in 1636. *Seo Pil-won-Seo*, the *Wu Sung-Gi*, a high-ranking official in charge of all matters related to protocol, responded by ordering *Kim Man-gyun Kim* to put aside personal feelings in order to fulfill his public duty of receiving the Chinese envoy. However, *Song Si-yeol Song* asserted that seeking vengeance for a blood-relative is a major moral principle and appealed to the King to accept *Kim Man-gyun Kim*'s personal circumstances. Consequently, a *hardnosed-hard* dispute over "'personal duties'" to blood relations and "'public duties'" to the nation and the king intensified among Confucian scholars. Later historians would come to describe this dispute as "the dispute of vengeance and obligation." <sup>27)</sup>

'Chinchin' falls under the private (sa) sphere as it refers to the duty to one's family. However, and 'jonjon,' a the duty to one's nation, falls under the public sphere (gonggong) sphere. Although, While from a political standpoint, duty to one's family

서식 있음

or blood relations falls under the concept of *sa*, from ~~the a Confucian moral~~ perspective ~~s of Confucius morality standpoint~~, familial duties is an aspect of ~~the~~ universal moral principles; of ~~Heavenly Principle~~ *cheolli*, which transcends *sa*. Hence, the dispute between ~~Seo~~ Pil-won ~~Seo~~ and ~~Song~~ Si-yeol ~~Song~~ can be described as a clash between ~~the definition of~~ private and public duties, but only within the frame of politics. ~~However,~~ ~~V~~viewed from ~~the a~~ wider perspective of ~~Confucius Confucian~~ ideology, it is a dispute ~~of between~~ “*gonggong* as a universal of morality” and “*gonggong* as a political of domain.” The ~~problem question becomes is then, W~~hich *gonggong* has precedence if ~~both~~ duties to both “*gonggong* of morality” and “*gonggong* of domain” cannot be ~~simultaneously~~ ~~simultaneously~~ satisfied? ~~?~~ ~~?~~ —NeoNeo-ConfuciusConfucian ideology explains that duty to one’s parents is equal to duties to ~~the one’s King, hence a ‘natural order of things’,~~ and that the two are equal under. ~~In~~ other words, it is explained as ‘Heaven’s law’ or *cheolli* (天理). In the sense that these two ~~are duties reflect~~ the “~~H~~heavenly Principle” of nature. (네모를 파악부분으로) ~~The answer to which~~ one ~~hata~~ takes precedence. Therefore, it begs the question again, when the two ~~duties~~ ‘conflict with each other in reality, which ‘law’ (理) has precedence? ~~The answer to this question is~~ the point on which where ~~Seo~~ Pil-won ~~Seo~~ and ~~Song~~ Si-yeol ~~Song~~ opinions dividedisagree.

If precedence is given to “‘public duties;” then the order based on moral principles is destroyed. If precedence is given to ‘private duties,’ then it ~~it~~ weakens the order of national rule. ~~Song~~ Siyeol ~~Song~~, who was a major figure in the Noron (Old Doctrine) faction which dominated politics and governance, asserted the importance of ‘private duty’ to one’s family and blood relations over duties to one’s sovereign. ~~Song’s~~ assertion illustrates the unique characteristics of the concept of *gonggong* and *sa* in the Joseon pPeriod and corresponds to modern political thought, which recognizes and aggressively protects the ‘private sphere.’ However, the precedence of ‘private duties’ over ‘public duties’ ~~burgeons~~ ~~spreads~~ a dark cloud over ~~the~~ Korean society, as ~~the precedence degenerates into~~ family ~~centrism~~ (가족 이기주의?) and group ~~centered~~ egoism during the modernization period.

#### 4. ~~The Minimazation~~The Suppression of “Sa” ~~and~~ ~~and~~ the ~~Maximization~~ the Emphasis of “GongGong”

In the Joseon Period, *gonggong* signified political domains such as a nation, a sovereign, national law, and government agencies, or moral principles such as justice and impartiality. ~~Contrastingly~~In contrast, *sa* ~~ordinarily possessed a meaning of~~signified unlawfulness, ~~an act something was acts committed~~ without approval from the state or law, ~~something and a meaning of~~ selfishness and unjust ~~which which goes that went~~ against ethical and moral standards. ~~For example, i~~In the vocabulary of the Joseon Period, *sado* (私屠) ~~was meant defined as~~ the secret killing of animals without a permit from the appropriate government agency (앞에 같은 내용이 있지만 그냥 두세요 습니다. 삭제?) and *sasi* ~~was defined as~~meant conducting of business without an appropriate license. ~~Furthermore, sa~~ constituted words that described actions that were morally unfair or unjust. ~~For example, sageo, which means~~ unfair recommendations based on personal feelings, and *satong*, ~~which means~~ adultery or infidelity. The character Sa (私) also ~~constituted appeared in~~ words that described actions for personal or individual gain, ~~unlike as opposed to the character gonggong, which constituted appeared in~~ words that described actions benefited benefiting the group. For example, *sauu* ~~which means, to~~ to privately discuss and plot, and *sabun*, ~~which describes~~ relationships based on favoritism, became part of the everyday lexicon.

There ~~were are~~ many instances ~~of the use~~ of contrasting meanings of *gonggong* and *sa* in the Joseon Period. ~~With the exception of neutral expressions such as "like 'private ownership'" or "'individual,'" sa is was commonly for sa to possessed~~ negative connotations. ~~In other words, if. While gonggong signified justice in the context of the authority to rule, then sa signified criminal acts or other actions that crossed the boundaries of the authority to rule. And In the context of moral principles, sa signified impartial and unjust actions that violated moral principles. Furthermore, while gonggong signified the masses' cooperative volition represented by 'togetherness' and collectivity, everyone, sa signified 'selfish' and 'individualist' desires that deviated from the cooperative consciousness.~~

The ~~logistics of the~~ emphasis of *gonggong* and ~~the~~ suppression of *sa* had both negative and positive impacts on the modernization process of Korea. ~~From the positive aspect~~Positively speaking, the gonggong as universal of ethics and morality,

together along with the *gonggong* as of 'the collective will of the masses, both' militated against military dictatorship and facilitated the establishment of a democracy. The assertion that it is not the case that cannot be assumed that the opinions of the leading-intelligentsia, who argued the necessity of ethics and morality in government, were influenced solely by western democracy is simply untrue. Although democracy's concept of "authority" calls for the control of conflicting interests and the political goal of actualizing the will of the masses is inherent in it, western democracy does not consider ethics or morals in authority as the primary value, while whereas unlike Neo-Confucianism does. Thus, it might be concluded that the intelligentsia's emphasis on ethics and morality in authority by the leading-intelligentsia during the fight against dictatorship was a result of significantly influenced from by the Neo-Confucian traditional Neo-Confucian concept of *gonggong*.

The emphasis of *gonggong* and the extreme-suppression of *sa* also had a negative affect on the process of Korea's transitioning into capitalistic modernity. Although negative attitudes toward 'personal desires' began to show signs of change into a positive one at the end of the Ming dynasty empire in China, unfortunately, the Learning of Yang-ming never took root in Joseon because it was driven out as considered as heresy. Consequently, a favorable view of *sa* (private) and *yok* (desire) in Joseon did not arise until modernity. Under the influence of a Confucian morality that stressed internal purity and impartiality, it was impossible for a favorable view of personal desires to emerge. Instead, the constant cultivation of one's moral character and temperance was emphasized as a noble virtue. The Confucian culture, particularly, in the customs of a Confucian culture, which viewed the relationship between *gonggong* and *sa* to be one of relativity and continuity. The individual was understood to be an ethical figure, who, in the context of universal moral principles, transcended *sa* and had to constantly pursue the *gonggong* of self-deprecation, all while, though the individual still being considered to be under the sphere of *sa* in the context of the political domain. Consequently, the objectively favorable view of *sa* found in modern societies of the West could not materialize. Instead, during Korea's modernization process, a hypocritical attitude appeared as a state of hypocrisy took root as individuals pretended not to pursue *sa*, when in truth

they did all they could to fulfill personal desires ~~privately~~. As the ~~cultural~~ inertia that originated from the rejection of *sa* converged with ~~a the~~ capitalistic modernity that openly accepted *sa* as a positive quality, *sa* took on a marginalized, dual meaning which lead to ~~the~~ distorted ~~the~~ self-portraits of contemporary Koreans.

### Modern Transformations of ~~the~~ Traditional *GongGong* and *Sa*

From the analysis of ~~the concept of gonggong~~ and *sa* ~~utilized~~ in the Joseon Period, we can conclude that *gonggong* had three different meanings: ~~one,~~ ruling authority and ~~political ruling~~ domain, ~~two, the~~ moral qualities of justice and impartiality, and ~~the collective will of the masses~~ ~~three, gong (gong) that represents the will of the masses~~. These three ~~aspects connotations connoted~~ in the traditional concept of *gonggong* ~~prepared the way~~ ~~was were formed after a long accumulating fountain~~ of knowledge ~~regarding the~~ ~~for new~~ possible directions ~~of in~~ the development of ~~our Korean~~ society ~~would take~~ as it entered modernity. ~~In other words,~~ ~~the~~ three concepts of traditional *gonggong* signified three different paths ~~respectively~~: ~~first,~~ the path leading to ~~severe extreme~~ ~~strong n~~ Nationalism ~~강한 민족주의?~~, ~~second,~~ the path to a just and impartial society, ~~and third, nd~~ the path to a society that respects the opinions and the interests of the masses. Among these possible paths ~~for the traditional concept of gong to take,~~ ~~our Korea had no choice but to follow in the first path, leading to modernity had no other choice, but to choose the path to~~ nationalism. ~~Although~~ ~~there are many reasons for this choice,~~ ~~but of these the fact that Korea's modernity was we cannot overlook in particular the fact that our modernity was both~~ ~~'upwardly? (위로부터?)' and 'externally'~~ ~~propelled in a top-down manner is most prominent compelling~~. The exploitation suffered during Japanese colonial rule, the Korean War, the Cold War and the emergence of military rule all made it inevitable for ~~our modernity modernity to walk the path toward~~ ~~follow the path of~~ nationalism. Subsequently, *gonggong* became a substitution for, and even used synonymously with, ~~"the nation"~~ and ~~"government"~~ ~~the people"~~. Hence, it was nearly impossible for the other connotations of *gonggong*, such as ~~the an~~ ideal just and impartial society, ~~or of justice and impartiality emphasizing and~~ the will of the masses, ~~to be realized in~~

our modernity. Korean society destined from 'above' and from 'outside' to walk the path of modernization excluded the connotations of 'impartiality' and 'the will of the masses' and applied the influence of gonggong only to national power. Consequently, ~~the people's~~ voices that were meant to check corruption of power ~~in check~~ disappeared, and the function of guarding against collusion in the nation and in the market was forfeited.

As long as gonggong is accepted only as national power, it will be difficult to expect ~~people's~~ "decent" personal interests and moral character ~~of gong~~. ~~In a state where~~ Where all policies and decisions are ~~mainly~~ determined mainly by the national or a government officials, even the assertion of "decent" personal interests ~~will be~~ regarded as something ~~that destroys~~ detrimental to ~~public~~ the public one interest. ~~So and~~ subsequently, all pursuit of personal interests ~~will be relegated to basements and~~ degenerates into illegal or irrational actions ~~done in secret~~. Moreover, under the influence of ~~neo~~ Neo-Confucianism, which viewed *sa* as an immoral opposition to gonggong, national power, which monopolized gonggong, became the oppressor that ~~forced~~ weakened the ~~justified~~ voices demanding the pursuit of "decent" personal interest to fade.

Due to rapid modernization, ~~we Korea~~ were ~~was~~ unable to ~~prepare a system~~ to prevent ~~the~~ injustice and partiality that could arise in the pursuit of interests. Furthermore, ~~in a situation where~~ since social ~~trust~~ confidence ~~was not~~ had not been systematically established, and in the maelstrom of ~~pursuits of~~ self-interested ~~pursuits~~, ~~everyone~~ many forgot the wisdom of living 'together' and ~~didn't hesitate in~~ carrying out immoral actions solely for their own benefit of one's own family. The relational characteristics of relativity and continuity in the traditional concept of gonggong and *sa* degenerated into tools ~~for applied to that the~~ amplification ~~the~~ strengthening both ~~selfish~~ family interests ~~and~~ group interests. Family, schools, regions, and other group entities maybe seen as gonggong from within, but in relation relative to larger groups outside their circle, they ~~will always be nothing more than~~ are merely *sa*. The goal of ~~neo~~ Neo-Confucian scholars was to make ~~known the~~ aforementioned phenomenon of the ~~sure~~ it known that the "smaller gonggong" ~~know~~ they are ~~was also part of~~ being no more than *sa* in the larger context, context of a larger scope and ~~to~~ enable people to be a part of the "larger gonggong" by practicing and

~~even a step farther and practice the virtue of 'selfless impartiality originated from selflessness and deference (무아지공?)'. In a time of military dictatorship, the 'selfless and devoted' acts of many conscientious intelligentsia/intellectuals, who dedicated and sacrificed themselves for democracy and for the benefit of the "larger gonggong," can be deemed as a legacy of the traditional concept of gonggong. On the other hand, in the midst of tremendous chaos, ~~masses~~ some people were concerned only for ~~on their o's own~~ welfare, and pursued the "smaller gonggong" ~~as the only going and didn't even without~~ attempting to pursue the "larger gonggong".~~

As the inconsistencies of *chinchin* and *jonjon* festered as the seed of conflict in traditional times, it continues to expand in ~~its a~~ marginalized manner.— The government monopolized gonggong and incessantly demanded 'public duty (*jonjon*).— However, the people adhered to *jonjon* in form only. —In truth, they were only concerned with *chi chin*, ~~or (personal~~ personal duty). ~~To reiterate, P~~ people only pretended to show deference to ~~the the~~ absolute authority of the government, ~~or to gonggong authority~~, when in reality they were concerned with the chasing interests of their immediate group. Family-~~centrism~~ egoism and group-centered egoism, and favoritism based on regions, schools, and family ~~one is associated with~~, all reflect the extreme state of disorder in which all efforts of *chinchin* were concentrated. This explains why the many opportunities inherent in the traditional concept of gonggong were not able to evolve positively after encountering modernity, in which personal interest that was possessed a favorably favorable viewed, of 'personal interest' and instead ~~d,~~ deteriorated into ~~'the lower class vulgar~~ capitalism' and distorted form of liberalism, along with the taint of 'the a low degree of lower class freedom (천민 자유주의?)' ~~tainted by~~ favoritism and nepotism.

### Modification of GongGong Via Rational Discourse and Democratic Procedures

Traditional Korea's concept of gonggong referred to political ruling authority and political domain, but more importantly, it implied a standard of justice and impartiality. Moreover, it implied that it held the interest and opinion of the masses in high regard. From this perspective, ~~'public interests'~~ can be defined ~~as justice of as~~

'the legitimate opinions and interests of ~~the the unidentified faceless masses~~ (불특정 다수의 이익?)' achieved through morality. This is illustrated in the ideal of grand harmony (*datong*) philosophy found in the *Liyun* volume of *Ye-Gi* chapter of *Liji* (The Book of Rites). A *datong* society of grand harmony refers to describes a state in which wealth is equally distributed among the people, where social welfare is available to the weak and the poor, and everyone is morally righteous, thus creating peace and harmony in society. The current political and economic orders in Korea crippled by new freedoms, leaves one to just with just a dream of (오원하게 만듦?) the ideal *datong* society (Greater Community). The current system that considers Current myth of the "principles of the omnipotency of the free-market system" - "시장 만능 범칙?" and the blind worship of the "enhanced utilitarian principle of efficiency" - "as supreme virtues" are again weeding out the weak and bringing wealth and power to the strong, who won the battle for survival. Hence, the traditional ideal constitution of *gonggong*, which is centered on universal moral principle moral justice and the common interests of the masses, must be modified, in the form of *datong* democracy.

The *gong* discourse over about *gonggong* in contemporary society is a complex one to consider. *GongGong* is used as an ideological slogan for the justification of government policies or for the grasping of seizing political power. Conversely, *gonggong* is also used to criticize any self-righteous government policies or to establish a code of conduct for official positions. Those representing self-interests raise their voices proclaiming justice, while those after the same interests gather and constitute lawful various interest associations organizations. It is. Therefore, in the liberal society, where people can freely choose and pursue their own self-interests, it is increasingly more difficult to distinguish between what is properly public (*gonggong*) from and what is not in a society where self-interests are favorably viewed upon favorable and freedom is protected. Without a transcendental and universal basis for determining what 'public interests' are, the distinction must be made through a democratic dialogue and rational discussion. At last Finally, what is most important in this vein to consider is that whether a More importantly, a *gonggong* which that that ignores universal moral principles justice and the common the opinions of the masses cannot can be a true *gonggong* called true *gong*. In this

서식 있음

서식 있음

context, the traditional conception of ~~gonggong~~ of the ~~traditional~~ ~~cratraditional~~, which was aimed at ~~considered the guaranteeing protection of the~~ ~~expression of the~~ ~~legitimate~~ ~~opinions~~ of the masses ~~that isto be morally just, is still as~~ an ideal ~~is~~ applicable even today.

(여기부터 해야함.)

Footnotes

- 1) Reference from Yuuzo Mizoguchi (溝口雄三 ~~빠진 한자가 아니라 임 구(口)자입니다 알려주시기 바랍니다~~), *Chugoku no kKoo-oe to Si-si* (Tokyo: Kenbun Shuppan, 1995), pp. ~~ages~~ 91-132.
- 2) *Iching* (Book of Changes), the Da-yu hexagram (大有 掛), line third nine (-九三). “A feudal lord presenting his offerings to the Son of Heaven. A small man would be unequal.” (公用享于天子, 小人克.)—
- 3) Lou Yu-lie, 王弼集校釋 (臺北: 華正書局有限公司, 民國 81), p. 291. “威權之盛, 莫此過焉.”
- 4) *Ibid.*, p. ~~age~~ 293.
- 5) *Shijing* (The Book of Songs), Bookgwon H2, Guofeng (Lessons from the sStates(國風), c-Chapter 10, Zhaonan (-The Odes of Shao and the South(召南), Xiaoxing (-sSmall Stars(小召星). “肅肅宵征, 夙夜在公.”
- 6) Xu Shen, *Shuowen jiezhuzhu 說文解字注(Annotation to Shuowen jiezi)*, annotated by Duan Yu-cai (臺北: 漢京文化事業有限公司, 民國 1969 (1980), p. 50.,
- 7) Xun Zi, “一曰: 人主不公, 人臣不忠也.”
- 8) Xun Zi, book 4, Rongru (Of Honor and Disgrace(榮辱). “...聽斷公...”
- 9) *Lushi chunqui* (The ~~Anal~~Annals of Lu Buwei(呂氏春秋), Bookgwon I, Cchapter 4, Guigong (Honoring Impartiality)(一貴公). “一昔先王之治天下也, 必先公. 公則天下平矣, 平得於公 ... 天下非一人之天下也, 天下之天下也.”
- 10) “天道, 能通萬物, 享毒蒼生, 施化無私, 故謂之公.”
- 11) Yi Lee Yi-Seung-hwan (1998b). (제 성을 yi 가 아니라 lee로 통일하여 주세요)
- 12) *ZhuXi yulie* (Classified Conversation of Zhu Xi(朱子語類), Volumegwon 卷13, article 30項. “一凡一事便有兩端; 是底即天理之公, 非底乃人欲之私.”
- 13) Yi Hwang, *Seonghak sipdo* (Ten Diagrams of Sage Learning), Inseol (Dissertation on

서식 있음

Benevolence(仁說).

14) Quoted from *Hwaseo a-eon* (華西雅言-Collection of 번역Elegant Sayings by Hwaseo Yi Hang-no), gwon-vol. 40, articles, 10-11. recited from Yi Sang-ik (1997), p. 211.

서식 있음

15) *Domokjeongsa*: A system of the Goryeo, ~~Kyoro~~-Joseon Period that reviewed a qualified candidate's selection, transference, appointment and dismissal, or promotion by examining the record of achievement of that candidate (a government official) in Ijo (Ministry of Personnel) and Byeongjo (Ministry of Military Affairs).

16) “公猶共也. 禪位授聖, 不家之.”

17) “老聃曰… 名, 公器也, 不可多取.”

18) “名, 鳴也. 公, 平也. 器, 用也.”

19) Mizoguchi, Yuuzo (1993), p. 224.

20) Daebaek chamchanso (A Memorial to the King in the place of Sir Baek), *Yulgok jeonseo* (Collected Works of -Yulgok Yi I), -vol.gwon gwon-7,-A Memorial to the King in the place of Sir Baek(代白參贊疏).

서식 있음

21) Sadaesagan geom jinsecheokdongseoso (辭大司諫兼陳洗滌東西疏) (A Letter of Resignation), *Collected Works of Yulgok Yi I*, Volumegwon gwon-7,-A Letter of Resignation(辭大司諫兼陳洗滌東西疏)-.

22) Yi Gi, Cheongyuk iso (eulsa), -Haehak yuseo (Collected Works of Haehak Yi Gi) 해학은 아기의 호pen name입니다)유서 뜻풀이), gwonVolume gwon 4,-請六移疏 (乙未)-.

서식 있음

23) Fei Xiao-long, 『鄉土中國』-Xiangtu Zhongguo (Basic Structure of R-Lural China) (Peking 출판자: San-lien Shu-dien, 1947)-

서식 있음

24) Law of Uniform Land Tax is a post-Seonjo tax payment system of the Joseon Period, in which changed tributes to the government form materials goods to rice. rice was declared the proper tribute (tax). (총서-역사-참조?)

25) Yi Hwang, Seomyeong (Commentary on Chang Tsai's Western Inscription), *Ten Diagrams of Sage Learning-*, Seomyeong- Chapterch. 2.- Commentary on Chang Tsai's Western Inscription.?

26) On Confucianus theory of vengeance, refer to LeeYiYi Seung-hwan (1998a), chapter 1: Yuga-ui jeongui-gwan (Confucianus Justice).

27) Refer to Jeong Man-jo (1991), pp. 65-89 and Yi Won-taek (2001).

## Selected Bibliography

[OrientalAsia](#) Studies Research Institute,

Dankuk University. 1992. [Hanguk hanjaeo sajeon](#) (Korea Dictionary of Chinese Characters). Seoul: Dan [Kook University Press](#).

[kuk University Press](#)

~~Lou Yu-lie. 1992. [Wangbijixiaoshi Revised Manuscript of Wang Bi' Work](#) (Revised Manuscript of Wang Bi's Work, [Wangbijixiaoshi](#)) (영문풀이). Taipei: [Huazhengshuju youxiangongsi](#) 臺北: 華正書局有限公司.~~

서식 있음

Bak, Jeong-sun. 2000. "Sari-wa gongik-ui jayujuui-jeok gwallyeon bangsik" (Free Relational Methodism of Self-Interest and Public Good). *Emeoji saecheonmyeon* (Emerge New Millennium) (June). Seoul: [Jungangilbosa](#) [JoongAng Ilbosa](#).

~~Duan Yucai. 1980. [Shuowen jiezi zhu](#) (Annotation to the *Shuowen jiezi*). Taipei: [Hanjing Wenhuaishiye Youxian Gongsi](#).~~

~~詩經, 書經, 周易, 春秋左氏傳, 荀子, 老子, 莊子, 呂氏春秋, 說文解字注, 二程集, 朱子語類, 朱子大全, 退溪全書, 栗谷全書, 華西雅言, 海鶴遺書.~~

~~Fei, [ShiXiao-t-Tong-g](#) (費孝通). 1995. [Xiangtu Zhongguo](#) (Basic Structure of Rural China) [Basic Social Structure of Rural China](#) (鄉土中國). Translated by [Yi Gyeong-gyu](#) [Yi](#). Seoul: Ilchokak Publishing Co.~~

Hwang, Ho-sik. 2001. "Chunchu sidae-ui gongsa gwannyeom" (The Concept of *Gong* and *Sa* of the Spring and Autumn Period). Ph.D. diss., Korea University.

서식 있음

서식 있음

Jeong, Man-jo. 1991. " [Joseon hyeonjongjo saui gongui nonjaeng](#)" (A Discussion on [Sausai Gongui](#) -in [Joseon Hyeonjong's Reign](#)). Vol. 14 of *Hangukhak nonchong* (Korean Studies Thesis Collection). [Seoul](#): [Kookmin University Research Institute](#)1).

서식 있음

Kim, Gyo-bin. 2000. "Dae-ui myeongbun-e nullin sajeok gonggan" (Private Space Suppressed by *Daeuimyeongbun*). *Emeoji saecheonmyeon* (June).

Lou Yulie. 1992. *Wangbi jixiaoshi* (Revised Manuscript of Wang Bi's Works). Taipei: Huazheng Shuju Youxian Gongsi.

Mizoguchi, Yuuzo (溝口雄三). 1993. “*Gong and Sa* of Japan and China.” (한국에서 발표한 한글로 번역된 논문입니다.영어논문?) *Daedong Cultural Research* 28. Daedong Cultural Research Center, Sunggyunkwan University.

----- 1995. *Chugoku no Koo to Si*. Tokyo: Kenbun Shuppan.

Song, Bok. 2000. “ Hanguk sahoe-ui gong-gwa sa” (*Gong and Sa* of Korean Society). *Emeoji saecheonmyeon* (June).

Yi, Jong-eun. 1999. “ Seogu-wa yugwo munhwa-eseoui gaein” (The Individual in the Western and Confucian Culture). Collaborative Colloquium Papers. Seoul National University Research Association of Contemporary Thought and Japan Future Generation Collective Research Institute.

Seung-Hwan Lee

Yi, Sang-ik. 1997. “ Hanguk geundae sasang-e iteotseo minjokjeok jucheseong-gwa segyejeok bopyeonseong-ui munje (1)” (The Problem of National Individuality and Universal Ubiquity in Korean Modern Thought (1). *Jeongshin munhwa yeongu* (Journal of Korean Studies) 20. 3.

Yi, Seung-Hwan Lee Yi, Seung-hwan (Lee, Seung-hwan Yi Lee, Seung-Hwan). 1998a. *Yuga sasang-ui sahoe cheollhakjeok jaejomyeong* (The Social-Philosophical Reconsideration—Re-illumination of Confucian-ismThought). Seoul: Korea University Press.

----- 1998b. “ Juja hyeongisanghak-e natanan gongjikja yulligwan yeongu” (A Study on the Ethics of a Public Official as in Zhu Xi Physical Philosophy). *Dongyang cheollhak* (OrientalAsian Philosophy) 10.

----- 2000. “ Hangugin-ui jahwasang” (Self-Portrait of a Korean). *Sahoe bipyong* (Social Commentary) (Spring).

Yi, Won-taek. 2001. “ Hyeonjongjo boksu uiri nonjaeng-gwa gongsa gwannyeom” (A Discussion on Hyeonjongjo-Principles of Vengeance and the Concept of *Gong* and *Sa* in Joseon Hyeonjong's Reign). Paper Presented for the Annual Conference of Korean ation Paper of Summer 발표회 of the Association of Political Thought.

서식 있음

이원택. 2001. “현종조 복수의리 논쟁과 공사 관념”. 정치사상학회 하계발표회 자료집.

References

—詩經—, —書經—, —周易—, —春秋左氏傳—, —荀子—, —老子—, —莊子—, —呂氏春秋—, —殷文解字注—, —三經集—, —朱子語類—, —朱子大全—, —通溪全書—, —東谷全書—, —華西雜書—, —海輪遺書—

미조구미 유우조(溝口雄三). 1995. —中國の公と私—. 東京: 研文出版.

박정순. 2000년 6월. “사리의 공익의 자유주의적 관련방식”. Emerge-새천년. 서울: 중앙일보사.

정만준. 1991. “조선 현종조 私義·公義 논쟁”. 한국학 논총 제 14집(국민대 한국학 연구소 1).

황훈식. 2001. —춘추시대의 공·사 관념—. 고려대학교 대학원 철학과 석사논문.

웨이샤오 퉁(費孝通). 1995. —중국사회의 기본구조 (원서명: 差序格局). 이경규 역. 서울: 일조각.