

Shifts in Korea's Intellectual Community and Academia in the Early Years of Nation-Building: A Study of Hakpung, an Interdisciplinary Journal by Eulyoo Publishing

JEONG Jong Hyun

Abstract

Following independence from Japan, Korean intellectuals were faced with the task of establishing a postcolonial intellectual community and discarding the legacy of the imperial academic system. An interesting artifact of the shifts in Korea's intellectual community during this period is the interdisciplinary journal Hakpung (Academic Currents), published by Eulyoo Publishing. Hakpung captures the numerous changes that occurred within the academic community during these years, such as the contention between the Jindan Society's positivism and Marxist scholars' study of social economy, and the rise of the former to hegemonic dominance; the emergence of Americanism and alienation of socialism following the division of Korea and the Cold War; and the generational change in scholarship. Mainstream scholars shaped the academic discourse during the early years of nation building by reconstructing the knowledge they obtained through the imperial academic system as the tool and basis for establishing agency for the Korean nation, and by aligning themselves with the new dominant paradigm of American (Western) knowledge.

Keywords: postcolonial academia, *Hakpung* (Academic Currents), Joseon Studies Movement, Jindan Society, history of social economy, depoliticization of academics

JEONG Jong Hyun is currently a researcher at the Academy of Cultural Studies at Dongguk University. He obtained his Ph.D. in Korean Literature from Dongguk University in 2006. E-mail: jeongjonghyun@gmail.com.

www.kci.go.kr

The Imperial Academic System and the Desire for Decolonization

Kim Seong-han's "Kim Ga-seong ron 金可成論" (A Discourse on Kim Ga-seong), a fictional piece published in *Hakpung* 學風 (Academic Currents) in March 1950, satirizes the intellectual community of post-independence Korea. Its protagonist Kim Ga-seong is a 27-year-old rising scholar implied to be a graduate of Kyoto Imperial University and professor at Seoul National University. "It's rotten—what was that book written in Japanese? Anyway, it's some kind of chemistry research. It's still the same, there's no point in buying it," comments a middle school student on a chemistry textbook written by Kim Ga-seong, pointing out its lack of creativity and originality. Journalists who are colleagues of Kim Ga-seong say, "Ha, he is the prime beneficiary of independence. He is like a wolf playing tiger in a valley of no tigers (*muhodongjung ijakho* 無虎洞中狸作虎),"¹ and denounce him as "a scholar that skipped in front of the line" (H. Kim 1950, 3, 83). The middle school student's sarcastic remark points to Kim Ga-seong's plagiarism, i.e. the publishing of new and translated works that imitated and adopted educational content from the colonial years, a common occurrence at the time. In a postcolonial society lacking the means for indigenous knowledge production, the sheer act of coating the imperial power's rhetoric with the Korean language was politically significant in and of itself, even if it constituted imitating or plagiarizing. Premised on the absence of Japanese professors, the notion of "a wolf playing tiger in a valley of no tigers" also captures the ontological position of the intellectual society in the postcolonial era. This expression encompasses ambivalence toward the imperial academic system, which represents a past to be discontinued but remain the source of prestige for academics. For instance, Kim Ga-seong's abilities and achievements as a scholar are upheld by his affiliation with "K Imperial University" and the social position of "S University."²

1. Though not an exact match, the phrase "無虎洞中狸作虎" in the original work is similar to the idiom, "While the cat's away, the mice will play."

2. The advertisement of the fictional book *Hwahak-ui cheoljeojeok yeongu* (A Thor-

Such ambivalence toward the imperial academic system, as reflected by the subconscious expression of the Japanese scholar as a tiger,³ can be traced to the colonial era. As is widely known, Koreans were denied opportunities for professorship at Keijo Imperial University, the only university during the colonial period. Academic works written in Korean were also banned, and those who resisted the views of Japanese scholars had to mobilize outside of this institution. Various groups and their respective publications emerged in this sphere, including: Yeonhui College's commercial research society and *Gyeong-je yeongu* (Economic Research); Boseong College and Boseong *hakhoe nonjip* (Boseong Academic Journal); Jindan Society and *Jindan hakbo* (Review of Jindan Society); graduates of Keijo Imperial University who published the academic journal *Sinheung* (Burgeon-ing); the Philosophical Research Society (founded in 1932) and *Cheolhak* (Philosophy);⁴ and the Joseon Economic Research Society (found-

ough Study of Chemistry) by Kim Ga-seong shows that the imperial university remained a symbol of prestige at the time. Seoul National University was founded after independence by absorbing the site, building, and even students of Keijo Imperial University. Additionally, a great number of graduates of imperial universities became faculty members of Seoul National University. The official history of the university, compiled by Seoul National University's Compilation Committee, *Seoul daehakgyo 50 nyeonsa* (50-Year History of Seoul National University) (Seoul: Seoul National University Press, 1996) records the founding year as 1946. However, other studies such as *Seoul daehakgyo uigwa daehaksa* (The History of College of Medicine at Seoul University) (Seoul: Seoul National University Press, 1978), also compiled by Seoul National University's Compilation Committee, and *Seoul beop-dae baengnyeonsa jaryojip—gwangbok hu 50 nyeon* (100-Year History of Seoul University College of Law—50 Years Before Independence) (Seoul: Beopmunsa, 1987), compiled by Seoul National University College of Law Alumni Association, consider Keijo Imperial University as the origin of Seoul National University.

3. It was not unnatural for graduates of the Keijo Imperial University to be nostalgic for the prestige endowed upon them by the uniqueness and exclusiveness of the university. Jo Yun-je's favorable and idealized depiction of his teacher Ogura Shinpei 小倉進平 can be understood as a nostalgia for the law and literature discipline of the imperial university (Jo 1997, 142-144). The same can be detected in Choe Ho-jin's critique of the Gukdaean Crisis: "That issue was flawed from all sides. How would it have been possible to merge universities and professional colleges one to one?" (H. Choe 1991, 261).
4. For more information on the characteristics of *Hakpung* and the self-awareness of

ed in 1933). Simultaneously, there were notable activities such as the Joseon Studies Movement⁵ as well as lectures given by prominent Korean scholars at professional colleges, organized by newspaper publishers. Such groups, journals, and activities can be said to have comprised a “colonial academism” outside of the university system.⁶ Nevertheless, even as these groups of scholars were driven by a strong sense of competition against the Japanese scholarship of Keijo Imperial University, their sense of self was defined to a large extent by their own educational careers at the university. Most of these scholars, including those who held Marxist views, had developed their identities as academics within the imperial academic system.

The same continued to be true of the intellectual community in the years directly following Korea’s independence. For instance, the 42-member committee of the Joseon Academy, which was founded on August 16, 1946 with the goal of bringing together the energy of Korean academia to collaborate with nation-building efforts, was comprised of graduates of Tokyo Imperial University, Kyoto Imperial University, Keijo Imperial University, Tohoku Imperial University, Kyushu Imperial University, Tokyo College of Commerce, Waseda University, and various American universities.⁷ The Joseon Academy has been noted by Pang Kiechung as a united front of two academic branches

intellectuals affiliated with Keijo Imperial University, see Park (1999). For more about the Philosophical Research Society and *Cheolhak*, see J. Kim (2007, 208-211).

5. According to J. Lee (2002, 134), attitudes toward Joseon studies during the 1930s can be largely categorized into the following positions: (1) The uncompromising nationalist left-wing camp that argued for the Joseon Studies Movement, comprised of Jeong In-Bo, An Jae-hong, and others; (2) the Marxist internationalists who rendered Joseon studies a fascist ideal that emphasizes national supremacy; (3) the Jindan Society, led by Yi Byeong-do, which argued that the Joseon Studies Movement should be depoliticized and transformed into a pure discipline of Joseon cultural studies; (4) the Marxist scholars, including Baek Nam-un, who criticized the ideological methodology of the Joseon Studies Movement and argued for a critical Joseon studies.
6. For more information about the notion of “colonial academism,” see J. Jeong (2010).
7. These statistics have been reorganized by the writer from the information published in “Haksurwon wiwonnok” (Members of the Academy), in vol. 1 of *Haksul: haebang ginyeom nonmunjip* (Academics: A Collection of Theses in Commemoration of Independence) (Seoul: Seoul Shinmunsa, 1946), p. 230.

headed by Baek Nam-un and Yi Byeong-do (Pang 1993, 230),⁸ prominent scholars of socioeconomic and positivist history, respectively. While the two shared different methodologies, they formed a mutual alliance directly after independence in order to establish a new academic camp. *Guksa daegwan* (Overview of Korean National History), the first publication by the Joseon Academy, is particularly symbolic of this effort. According to Choe Ho-jin, this history book was assigned to Yi Byeong-do by Baek Nam-un, and became wildly popular among college students as well as a general audience (H. Choe 1991, 263).⁹ Similar collaborative efforts could be found at the standing committee elections of the Jindan Society's general assembly, also held on August 16, 1945; the elected members included various Marxist intellectuals who later defected to North Korea, such as Kim Yeong-geon, Do Yu-ho, and Yi Yeo-seong.¹⁰ It is widely known that following the controversy over the establishment of Seoul National University (commonly referred to as the Gukdaean Crisis), the two major branches of the Joseon Academy—the Jindan Society and Marxist scholars of socioeconomic history—disunited and became core faculty members at Seoul National University and Kim Il-sung University, respectively.

In the process of creating Seoul National University by merging Gyeongseong University (formerly Keijo Imperial University) and other professional colleges, the Law and Literature Department, which had been responsible for all studies on Joseon, was replaced by the College of Liberal Arts.¹¹ Additionally, the discipline of Joseon studies,

8. For more information on the structure and characteristics of the Joseon Academy, see this work and Y. Kim (2005).

9. It was published as *Joseonsa daegwan* (Overview of Joseon History) but currently found only as *Guksa daegwan* (Overview of National History), vols. 1-4 (Seoul: Dongjisa, 1948).

10. Jindan Society, "Jindan hakhoe 50 nyeon ilgi" (50 Years of the Jindan Society), *Jindan hakbo* (Review of Jindan Society) 57 (1984): p. 250.

11. The reconstruction of the law and literature discipline—a department representative of Keijo Imperial University—into an American-influenced liberal arts college was a political move that considered the postcolonial question. The situation of Korean academia during and after the period of Keijo Imperial University is well-documented by Park (2011).

a regional study of the Japanese empire, evolved into Korean Studies, an area of knowledge that constructs a homogenous identity for the new nation state. With most of the Marxist scholars having defected, it was only natural for the members of the Jindan Society to seize the university system. Although scholars of the Jindan Society had argued for the depoliticization of the Joseon Studies Movement in support for the purely academic approach of Joseon cultural studies, they could not evade the postcolonial agenda of establishing a national culture. The postcolonial context brought forth a synthesis of positivist methodology and the ideological aspect of Joseon studies, as seen in the notion of the “new nationalism” (*sin minjokjuui*) advocated for by Son Jin-tae and Yi In-yeong of the Jindan Society. Institutionally, teaching positions relevant to Korean Studies at Seoul National University’s College of Liberal Arts were filled by members of the Joseon Language Society and Jindan Society. Methodologically, a positivist approach combined with nationalist ideology became the predominant academic tendency.

Emerging in the late 1980s, studies on the Gukdaean Crisis have explained the issues in postcolonial academia as being premised on a dichotomous confrontation of the ethical left and the unethical right, the latter being a descendant of colonial views.¹² Paradoxically, however, the imperial system transcended political divisions to function as the foundation for Korean academia as a whole. After independence, all scholars faced the question of how to relate to and overcome the legacy of the imperial academic system, a remnant of the colonial years as well as the source of scholarly prestige. An in-depth analysis of the emergence and execution of the postcolonial academic agenda would be critical to enhancing our understanding of the intellectual community of this era, which has been limited to ideological

12. For instance, H. Choe (1988) and G. Lee (1999) are critical studies on the Gukdaean Crisis, but are not free from such political platforms. A useful supplement is K. Kim (2001), which transcends ideological perspectives in pointing out that the controversy over the autonomy of professors does not merely concern the question of democratic practices but also the issue of reimplementing the vested rights of the imperial university.

and ethical interpretations.

Through a textual analysis of *Hakpung* (Academic Currents), an academic journal published by Eulyoo Publishing from October 1948 to June 1950, this paper seeks to investigate the shifts in the academic community and its discourse, as well as the process by which a depoliticized outlook rose to hegemonic dominance within the academic institution. With Jeong In-Bo as its anchor, Eulyoo Publishing's main writing staff consisted of members of the Jindan Society. It played a key role in the restructuring of the postcolonial academic society in the context of nation-building. *Hakpung* was the only interdisciplinary journal of the humanities and social sciences and was published before the establishment of key academic groups such as the Historical Research Society (1952), Korean Language and Literature Society (1952), Korean Philosophical Research Society (1953), Korean Political Science Research Society (1953), and the Korean Economic Research Society (1952). Accordingly, the task of analyzing *Hakpung* is one of reconstructing the key circumstances and influences of the humanities and social sciences during the founding years of the Republic of Korea.

The Writing Staff: A Reorganization of Intellectual Communities

Hakpung was first published in October 1948 with Jo Pung-yeon as its editor, immediately following the founding of the Republic of Korea. It was intended to be a monthly journal, but was sometimes published once every two or three months due to a shortage of articles; a total of thirteen issues were published in the twenty-month period until it ended in June 1950. The study of the period between 1948 and 1950 has been strongly determined by its political context, i.e. the U.S. military government and the Korean War. The period, however, was also critical to the formation of modern Korean society in that it provided for the establishment of a wide array of ideas and institutions that would constitute Korea's cultural homogeneity. The

journal *Hakpung*, whose publishing coincided precisely with these years, is a valuable artifact of the shifts in the intellectual community that occurred as a result of the dramatic social changes that eventually resulted in the Korean War. “As an intellectual journal, *Hakpung* was very popular among scholars and within colleges. It was said that anyone who didn’t carry around this journal could not possibly be a college student” (Jung [1982] 1997, 95), testifies An Hyo-sik, who studied French literature at Seoul National University and worked as an acquisitions editor for *Hakpung*. Linguist Kim Bang-Han also recalls that when he began teaching, he relied on an essay published in *Hakpung* because there were no teaching materials on linguistics at the time (B. Kim 1996, 80). This essay, “Hyeondae eoneohak-ui baldal” (The Development of Modern Linguistics) by Yu Eung-ho (1949),¹³ introduced Saussure’s linguistic theory to Korean academia for the first time. We can thus infer that the articles published in *Hakpung* were highly specialized as well as influential.

The journal was generally composed of the following sections: preface (or a section entitled “Hakpung sipyeong”), academic theses, reviews of recent research, overviews of Western knowledge and academia, academic field reports, interpretive reviews of significant works, news on the publishing world,¹⁴ a column entitled “Nangnango,” and culture section. Additionally, there was a special series titled the “Hakja gunsang” (A Spectrum of Scholars),¹⁵ which came to an end after profiling only two scholars, Jeong In-Bo and Yun Il-seon.

13. Yu Eung-ho, who studied linguistics at Tokyo Imperial University, defected to North Korea during the Korean War and taught as a professor of language arts at Kim Il-sung University.

14. In practice, this section was utilized to advertise the publications of Eulyoo.

15. “Hakja gunsang: widang Jeong In-Bo-ssi” (A Spectrum of Scholars: Widang Jeong In-Bo), *Hakpung* 3 (January 1949); “Hakja gunsang: Yun Il-seon baksa” (A Spectrum of Scholars: Dr. Yun Il-seon), *Hakpung* 5 (April 1949). Jeong In-Bo was a major figure of national studies (*gukhak*), whose *Yangmyeonghak yeollon* (Theory of Wang Yangming) was first intended as Eulyoo’s first publication. Yun Il-seon was a medical scientist who remained a central figure of academia in spite of the fluctuations in the transition from Joseon Academy to Gyeongseong University, and then to Seoul National University. He later served as president of Seoul National University and director of the National Academy of Sciences.

Three special editions—on economics, political science, and sociology—were also published.¹⁶

The principal writers of *Hakpung* were prominent university professors, mostly at Seoul National University's College of Liberal Arts and other colleges. They also included government officials such as An Ho-sang (Minister of Culture and Education), Son Jin-tae (Vice-minister), and Yi In-yeong (Director of High School Education). The fact that the contributing writers consisted of those who were highly influential to early Korea's educational and cultural administration demonstrates the extent of *Hakpung's* academic prestige.¹⁷ It should also be highlighted here that the leading staff were professors at Seoul National University's College of Liberal Arts at the same time as being members of the Jindan Society. These writers wrote many pieces that were formative of the overall characteristics of the journal.

The relationship between the Jindan Society and Eulyoo Publishing in the post-independence years is prototypical of the ways in which intellectual dominance and publishing capital became intertwined and of the resulting development and popularization of Korean studies. *Joseonmal keun sajeon* (Grand Dictionary of the Joseon Language), *Joseon munhwa chongseo* (Series on Joseon Culture), and *Hanguksa* (Korean History) were three of Eulyoo Publishing's projects that were most directly related to the formation of Korean Studies, published from its founding in 1945 until the 1950s. *Joseonmal keun sajeon* was written by the Joseon Language Society, which became a byword for nationalist scholarship after the mass imprisonment of its

16. Such special issues also reflected the popular demand of the time. There were no independent departments of economics and political science at Keijo Imperial University—only the law and literature program, which embraced colonial ideology. Choe Ho-jin recalls that many students chose to major in economics and politics after independence, and believes that this was due to their “hunger for learning” (H. Choe 1991, 260).

17. Professors transferred frequently in the post-independence years due to the Guk-daeon Crisis, defection to North Korea, and the establishment of various private universities. For the same reasons, many also occupied positions at multiple institutions. Only the department heads are documented, and it is difficult to locate a comprehensive roster of the faculty.

members in 1942 also known as the Incident of the Joseon Language Society. The other two works were written by members of the Jindan Society. The *Joseon munhwa chongseo* was Eulyoo's first attempt toward a revival of Korean Studies, initiated by Dr. Yi (Yi Sang-baek). In addition, many of Eulyoo's early achievements, including the journal *Hakpung* and the Jindan Society's seven-book volume *Hanguksa* (Korean History), were executed under the influence of Dr. Yi and Dr. Kim Jae-won,¹⁸ notes Jung Jin-Seok, the president of Eulyoo Publishing.¹⁹ Yi Sang-baek, the leading executive of Eulyoo Publishing at the time, was a professor of sociology at Seoul National University's College of Liberal Arts. He was appointed president of the Jindan Society on August 11, 1948. Kim Jae-won was a former director of the first National Museum of Korea and also held various leadership positions for the Jindan Society.

Joseon munhwa chongseo, published on April 1, 1947, consisted of works written by scholars who are now considered the pioneers of disciplinary learning in Korea. The first volume was *Joseon minjok seolhwa-ui yeongu* (A Study of Joseon Folktales), written by Son Jin-tae, a professor of Seoul National University and former Minister of Culture and Education. All thirteen volumes²⁰ of *Joseon munhwa*

-
18. Jung Jin-Seok, "Geu ttae geu ildeul" (The Events of Those Times), *Dong-A Ilbo*, March 9, 1976.
19. The Jindan Society and Eulyoo Publishing maintained a very close relationship, to the extent that *Jindan hakbo* was published by Eulyoo for 26 years from January 1949 (issue 16) until April 1975 (issue 38).
20. Vol. 1, *Joseon minjok seolhwa-ui yeongu* (A Study of the Joseon Folktales), by Son Jin-tae; vol. 2, *Joseon munhwasa yeongu nongo* (Collected Writings on Joseon Cultural History), by Yi Sang-baek; vol. 3, *Joseon tappa-ui yeongu* (A Study of the Joseon Pagodas), by Ko Yu-seop; vol. 4, *Goryeo sidae-ui yeongu* (A Study of the Goryeo Period), by Yi Byeong-do; vol. 5, *Joseon minjok munhwa-ui yeongu* (A Study of the Joseon National Culture), by Son Jin-tae; vol. 6, *Joseon siga-ui yeongu* (A Study of Joseon Poetry), by Jo Yun-je; vol. 7, *Joseoneo eumunnon yeongu* (A Study of Phonemes in the Joseon Language), by Yi Sung-nyeong; vol. 8, *Dongbang munhwa gyoryusa nongo* (Collected Writings on the History of East Asian Cultural Exchange), by Kim Sang-gi; vol. 9, *Ijo geonguk-ui yeongu* (A Study of the Foundation of Yi Dynasty), by Yi Sang-baek; vol. 10, *Joseon eumak tongnon* (An Outline of Joseon Music), by Ham Hwa-jin; vol. 11, *Joseon minjoksa gaeron* (Introduction to the National History of Joseon), by Son Jin-tae; vol. 12, *Joseon gajok jedo-ui yeongu*

chongseo that were published before the Korean War were written by members of the Jindan Society who studied at Keijo or Waseda University, with the exception of Ham Hwa-jin, who was a hereditary musician during the Joseon dynasty. Except for Ham Hwa-jin and Ko Yu-seop, who passed away in 1944, all of the writers held faculty positions at Seoul National University's College of Liberal Arts. Seoul National University, a product of the Gukdaean Crisis, lacked the uniqueness of Keijo University due to the postcolonial expansion and reform of private professional colleges. However, it remained a prominent source of academic privilege and prestige. Interestingly enough, authors such as Yi Byeong-do, Kim Du-heon, Yi Sang-baek, Jo Yun-jae, and Yi Sung-nyeong all used the pieces they wrote for *Joseon munhwa chongseo* as their doctoral theses at Seoul National University (Jung [1982] 1997, 84-85). The fact that those who established the university system in a postcolonial society obtained their own doctorates through this very institution essentially constitutes an establishment of their own selves as the origin and foundation of academic prestige. It also indicates that scholars who previously existed outside of the system in the form of colonial academism attained complete control over Seoul National University's College of Liberal Arts, which arose as a substitute for Keijo Imperial University's Law and Literature Department. Although this paper does not deal with the content of the individual theses to a great extent, it must be pointed out that most of them were "submitted in the same form or with minor revisions as the pieces that were published in the journal before independence" (S. Hong 1950, 115). *Joseon munhwa chongseo* is a series that demonstrates the ways in which knowledge produced during the colonial era constructed a postcolonial ethnography. Furthermore, it was purchased by major universities around the world—Sorbonne University, University of Lyon, University of London, University of California, and Columbia University—and the Library of Congress (Jung [1982]

(A Study of the Family System of Joseon), by Kim Du-heon; and vol. 13, *Hanguk manju gwangyesa-ui yeongu* (A Study of Korean-Manchurian Relations), by Yi In-yeong. The first twelve volumes were published before the Korean War, and Yi In-yeong's study was in print when the Korean War broke out.

1997, 60), introducing Korea's cultural identity to Western academia for the first time. After the Korean War, the series was renamed *Hanguk munhwa chongseo* (Series on Korean Culture), illustrating the reconstructive shift from Joseon studies to Korean studies.²¹ We can gather that academic groups based on affiliations with the Minister of Culture and Education, Seoul National University's College of Liberal Arts, and the Jindan Society were highly influential in the production of knowledge relevant to Korea's national identity in the early years of nation-building, and that they were leading participants in the planning and writing of *Hakpung*.

However, we must not overlook the existence of scholars who continued the tradition of socioeconomic research. A close reading of *Hakpung* shows us that positivist historians and scholars of socioeconomic history remained in competition for the attainment of intellectual hegemony even after the establishment of the Korean government. For example, the contributing writers of *Hakpung* included members of the National Cultural Research Institute—founded by Baek Nam-un—such as Seol Jeong-sik, Yu Eung-ho, Yi Jin-yeong, Jeon Seok-dam,

21. In the years immediately following independence, the terms “Joseon literature” (*joseon munhak*) and “Joseon history” (*joseonsa*) were used to replace the terms “national literature” (*gungmunhak*) and “national history” (*guksa*), which were associated with the Japanese imperial system. After the political division of the North and South, the use of the term “Joseon,” which denoted a cultural unity, was divided into “Hanguk” and “Joseon.” Although “Joseon” remained a customary term to describe the Korean civilization until the early 1950s, it was fully replaced by “Hanguk” with the progression of the Korean War. The terms “national literature” and “national history” evolved; they no longer connoted imperial knowledge, but became systemized as a form of knowledge based in the context of the Korean nation. In line with such trends, the Joseon Language Society also changed its name to Hanguk Society (Korean Language Society) in 1949, and the *Joseonmal keunsajeon* was renamed to *Keunsajeon* beginning with the third volume (1950). Additional examples include the trajectory of Jo Yun-jae's work—*Joseon siga sagang* (The Lyrics of Joseon Poetry) (1946), *Joseon siga-ui yeongu* (A Study of Joseon Poetry) (1948), *Gungmunhaksa* (History of National Literature) (1949)—and that of Yi Hui-seung, who changed the title of his work from *Joseon munhak yeongu cho* (A Study of Joseon Literature) (1946) to *Gungmunhak yeongu cho* (A Study of National Literature) after the Korean War.

Choe Yeong-cheol, Choe Mun-hwan, and Hong Hyo-min.²² Although ideological differences existed among these scholars, and although not all those who defected to North Korea can be assumed to have been Marxists, it is true that most of the members had an affinity for Baek Nam-un's study of social economy. It is also notable that various scholars who participated as contributing writers at the onset of the journal were affiliated with North Korea—e.g. Heo Dong, Jeong Yeong-sul,²³ Yu Jin-o—or later defected during or after the Korean War—e.g. Kim Yong-jun, Kim Gi-rim, Kim Byeong-gyu, Im Hak-su, Yeo Sang-hyeon.

With an understanding of the editorial staff and the contributing writers of *Hakpung*, this paper now turns to the academic discourse of the era through a detailed analysis of the published works, with a particular emphasis on the emergence of Americanism, alienation of socialism, and evolution of positivism into a hegemonic methodology.

Changes in Korean Academia as Shown by the Discourse within *Hakpung*

The Contention between Positivism and Socioeconomic History Research

“For the Prestige of Scholarship,” a preface of *Hakpung*, reprehends the social conditions in which “a group of non-experts who claim themselves to be scholars are disseminating pointless pseudo-theories at the podium and on paper” and criticizes “the majority of conscientious scholars who place themselves in profitable organizations today

22. This roster was crosschecked with the information published in *Minjok munhwa* (National Culture) (October 1946), quoted in Pang (1993, 258).

23. Heo Dong translated Karl Marx's *Das Kapital* along with Heo Dong-eun, Choe Yeong-cheol, and Jeon Seok-dam into Korean as *Jabon ron* (Capital), vol. 1 (Seoul: Seoul Publishing, 1946-1948). They all defected to North Korea and participated in its academia. Jeong Yeong-sul also defected and later co-edited *Joseon-eseo jabon-juuijeok gwangye-ui baljeon* (The Development of Capitalist Relations in Joseon) (1973) with Kim Gwang-jin.

and sell the academia to fawn over worldly matters, being threatened by the demands of subsistence.” Essentially, *Hakpung* refuses to become “a political tool for the authorities in power” and claims that it will “not become a member of any particular organization, but rather a cornerstone for the prestige of scholarship.”²⁴ Presumably written by Yi Sang-baek, this preface suggests that specialization is the most important asset of scholarship and proposes an academic philosophy that is detached from politics and materialistic understanding. Such an outlook establishes a context in which the practical philosophy of Marxism is framed as a pseudo-theory and political tool.

The contentious relationship implied in this preface is further specified in the second issue, a special issue on academic philosophy. It is observable that the first paper published in *Hakpung* is Yi Sang-baek’s “Gwahakjeok jeongsin-gwa jeokgeukjeok taedo” (The Scientific Mind and the Active Mind). In this piece, Yi Sang-baek presents the positivism of Auguste Comte (1798-1857) as the ideal approach to learning: this methodology encompasses a scientific mind that “believes in the supremacy of observation and thus respects the truth” (Yi Sang-baek 1948b, 8) and an active mind that “does not stop at assessing reality but advances to construct a new and higher order” (Yi Sang-baek 1948b, 9). He argues that the positivist mind, directly concerned with construction and formation, is indispensable to those undergoing the foundational stage of nation-building in the here and now.

It should also be noted that in the first issue of *Hakpung*, Yi Sang-baek’s proclamation of positivist academic theory is followed by “Toji gogyuje-ui gibonjeok mosun-e daehayeo” (The Fundamental Contradictions of Land Nationalization) by Jeon Seok-dam. Jeon belonged to a branch of scholars who studied socioeconomic history through a methodology of historical materialism. The significance of such an arrangement can be elucidated by studying Yi Jin-yeong’s classification of academic groups of the time, published in *Hakpung*’s special

24. “Gwondueon: hangmun-ui gwonwi-reul wihayeo” (Preface: For the Prestige of Scholarship), *Hakpung* 1 (October 1948): pp. 2-3.

volume on economics. Yi Jin-yeong reviews Jeon Seok-dam's *Joseon-sa gyojeong* (Revisions to Joseon History) (1948) and *Joseon gyeongjesa* (History of Joseon Economy) (1949) as solutions to the gaps in Baek Nam-un's research, which excludes the Joseon era. Yi Jin-yeong creates a genealogy of socioeconomic historians by describing Jeon Seok-dam as a rising successor to Baek Nam-un, and furthermore, puts them at conflict with the old scholars who "lack scientific standards under the pretense of positivism" (J. Yi 1949, 54)²⁵ and "historians who are preoccupied with notions and literary ideas" (J. Yi 1949, 59).²⁶

The second issue of *Hakpung* deals more explicitly with the conflict over academic philosophy. In "Hangmun-gwa jeongchi" (Academics and Politics), Yi Sang-baek discusses Aristotle's idea of learning for the sake of learning; the natural sciences of the Renaissance, which is relevant to the essential nature of citizen class; and the social sciences, which applies the scientific method to study social phenomena. The discussion results in the assertion that the Weberian view of "academics as a vocation" (Yi Sang-baek 1948a, 9),²⁷ founded upon a value-free approach (*wertfreiheit*), is the ideal philosophy. By citing "Academics as a Vocation," a 1918 lecture by Max Weber that differentiates between value judgment and factual judgment, Yi Sang-baek advocates for theoretical learning, such as learning that eliminates political value judgment, ultimately arguing for the depoliticization of academics. This argument is a continuation of the Jindan Society's methodology from the colonial era; its members had argued for the exclusion of the political aspect from the Joseon Studies Movement in support for pure academics. As in the first issue, Yi Sang-baek's piece is followed by Jeon Seok-dam's "Hangmun-gwa jayu" (Academics and

25. Here "old scholars" most likely refer to Yi Byeong-do, based on the critique of *dochamseol*, a fortune-telling practice.

26. The overall context of the paper reveals a critique of the methodology of Yi Sang-baek and Son Jin-tae.

27. Yi Sang-baek continues his argument for depoliticized academics and critique of Marxism in another piece of the following issue: "Jeongchi-ui heoguseong-e dahayeo" (Against the Unrealistic Nature of Politics), *Hakpung* 2 (January 1949).

Freedom). According to Jeon Seok-dam, all great academic and ideological systems were developed through struggles against the authority of the sacred as well as the profane. Given that knowledge is a social product, academics within a class society is inherently hierarchical, and academic liberty can be obtained along with the achievement of social freedom. Jeon Seok-dam argues that since the struggle for the academic freedom exists not on its own but as a part of social struggle at large, the question of academic freedom must be shifted to one of struggle (Jeon 1948a, 13). The conflict between Yi Sang-baek's argument for depoliticized academics and Jeon Seok-dam's emphasis on academics as a political struggle is reflective of a philosophical difference that has evolved in many ways within Korean academia since the colonial era.

Following this debate on the relationship between academics and politics, the next two pieces by Yi Jae-hun and Kim Byeong-gyu demonstrate a philosophical conflict regarding specialization. In "Hangmun-gwa gyosu" (Academics and Professors), Yi Jae-hun also cites Weber's "Academics as a Vocation" in arguing that a professor must be free of subjective or partisan opinion. In particular, he posits that "one can recognize the world of truth and objective reality only if personal interests and feelings are overcome, that is, only when one transcends oneself," and sets forth an understanding of academics as "ethical purification" (J. Yi 1949, 14). In "Hangmun-gwa hakdo" (Academics and Scholars), Kim Byeong-gyu stands in opposition to Yi Jae-hun's portrayal of the academic professor as a priest of truth. He argues that modern academics is closely tied to democratization and labels this pattern the generalization, i.e. popularization, of academics. He refers to those who monopolize academics as part of a school or institute as a privileged class of "scholars," in opposition to those whom he calls "scholars of the people." He predicts that those who "blindly follow the obsolete ways of the bourgeois scholars will degenerate into pseudo-scholars that deck the outskirts of unproductive learning" (B. Kim 1949, 21). It is evident that Kim Byeong-gyu understands the positivist notion of specialization as an ideology that merely covers up the interests of the bourgeois ruling class.

Initially, the works of Marxist-influenced historians of social economy coexisted in contention with the mainstream academic philosophy of *Hakpung* as examined above. However, they disappeared with the publishing of the special issue on economics, published in May 1949. As documented by *Hakpung*'s editorials, political pressure increasingly restricted the freedom of artists and intellectuals,²⁸ leading to the marginalization of Marxist-influenced scholarship and the establishment of a mainstream approach based on the methodologies of the Jindan Society and American social sciences.

Positivist Research of Korean Culture and the Idea of National Culture

While *Hakpung*'s special issues were comprised of social science research (e.g. political science, economics, sociology), its general publications consisted of positivist studies on Korean culture. The methodology of such research was founded upon the knowledge base obtained during the colonial era. For instance in "Joseon bulsang-ui gwangbae-e daehan sogo" (Views on the Halo of the Buddha Statues of Joseon), Bak Gyeong-won utilizes the work of the Japanese scholar Ishida Mosaku 石田茂作 as a basic framework, correcting errors in the terminology found in Ishida's text, "Types and Variations of the Halo" (佛像光背の種類と變遷) and giving names to certain forms that are not mentioned in the text because they only exist in Korea (Bak 1948, 45). Bak's incorporation of Ishida's discussion is significant not because it points to the colonial origins of his knowledge, but because it illustrates an attempt to reconstruct this knowledge to produce and "naturalize" a self-identifying form of national culture. Another article written by him, "Ijo muninhwa ron" (On the Literati Paintings of Joseon Dynasty), demonstrates similar efforts. This work focuses on explaining how the literati paintings (*muninhwa*), an art form that was first influenced by the Song dynasty of China, developed in distinctive ways within the specific context of Korean history. He per-

28. "*Hakpung sipyeong: munhwain-ui saenghwal ongho*" (*Hakpung* Commentary: In Defense of the Intellectual Life), *Hakpung* 7 (July 1949): p. 4.

forms a research of literary texts to show that Confucianism led a nationalist revolution in the Buddhist periods of Silla and Goryeo; that this rise of reason gave way to a unique form of Korean literati paintings; and further, that this form of literati paintings was later brought to Japan by a monk named Shubun 周文 from the Shokokuji temple in Kyoto, who visited early Joseon (Bak 1949, 43-62). By tracing the spread of the literati paintings, the article challenges the geographic determinism of the colonial era, which stipulates that Joseon naturally stagnated under the influence of two great powers, China and Japan. Instead, he aims to establish agency for the national culture of Korea by arguing that the art form of the literati paintings was developed in different but equal ways in China and Joseon before spreading to Japan.

Yi Sung-nyeong's “‘·’-eum yeongu-ui bangbeop-gwa silje” (Methods and Practice in the Research of the Phonetic “·”) (Yi Sung-nyeong 1948a) is a response to Choe Hyeon-bae's *Hangeulgal* (A Study of Korean Language), a critique of Choe's research on phonemes. Yi Sung-nyeong responds to specific parts of this text, which he deems unprofessional and personal. In a previous work entitled “Na-ui seojae saenghwal” (My Life in the Library), Yi Sung-nyeong portrays himself as a scholar who follows in Immanuel Kant's love for learning, eliminates unnecessary things like the go board and radio, and dreams of a library with no guests (Yi Sung-nyeong 1948b, 31-32). The image of such a scholar conducting an in-depth study of the phonemes of Hunminjeongeum (Correct Sounds to Instruct the People), an early form of Korean script, is reminiscent of the academic philosophy set forth in Weber's “Academics as a Vocation”: “Whoever lacks the capacity to put on blinders, so to speak, and to come up to the idea that the fate of his soul depends upon whether or not he makes the correct conjecture at this passage of his manuscript may as well stay away from the sciences” (Weber 2006, 33, 406). This academic philosophy, closely linked to the idea of specialization, is further strengthened in Yang Ju-dong's “Goga jeondap ui 古歌箋割疑” (Supplementary Notes to the Studies of Old Korean Songs) (Yang 1949, 3-4). In this paper, the author responds to specific controversies over his previous works—

Joseon goga yeongu (A Study of the Songs of Joseon) (1945), *Yeoyo jeonju* (An Annotated Examination of the Songs of Goryeo) (1947), and others—by presenting an extensive knowledge of the literature in question. This positivist methodology of extracting “truth” from the literature itself, an objective reference material, was further reinforced by studies such as “Joseon-ui gugakbo” (The Musical Score of the Joseon Era) by Yi Hye-gu (H. Yi 1948) and “Samguk yusa-ui sahoesajeok gochal” (A Social Scientific Study of *Samguk yusa*) by Son Jin-tae (Son 1949). Positivist ideology proposed a universally valid truth and pursued academic hegemony. However, positivist research tended to focus on tradition and culture, rather than on the contemporary reality. Such investigations attempted to locate a national identity and were characterized by the deep potential to become the foundation of Korean nationalism. In this aspect, positivist academics of Korea at the time dealt with both truth, a universal question, and national identity, a localized pursuit.

Yi In-yeong's works show yet another approach to the relationship between the universal and the local. Yi In-yeong's ideology of new nationalism (*sin minjokjuui*) understands Korean history through the theories of stagnation and heteronomy, which epitomize the colonial view of history. Lee Ki-Baek had noted early on that such a contradiction arose from the “discord between the practical knowledge obtained under the Japanese colonial era and the new theories that attracted interest upon independence” (K. Lee 1978, 113). For instance, Yi In-yeong's “Uri minjoksa-ui seonggyeok” (Characteristics of Our National History) (I. Yi 1948), published in the first issue of *Hakpung*, finds that the history of Joseon is characterized by the internal cause of agricultural passivity and the external cause of geographic determinism resulting from existing “in the middle of” international powers—variants of the theories of stagnation and heteronomy, respectively. The influence of the knowledge he obtained as a student at Keijo Imperial University is also apparent in “Guksa-wa segyesa” (National History and World History) (I. Yi 1950, 44), which argues that the strong pressure from a unified Chinese nation compelled the maintenance of a centralized, unified Korea, as well as the fall of feu-

dalism. However, the most significant aspect of his work is the view of history that embraces both universal historical necessity and national will. Pursuing an understanding of national history as a part of world history, he divides Korean history into the following chronological periods: embryonic, growth, recession, and awakening. In particular, he interprets the open-door policy of the awakening period, or modern era, as Korea's participation in world history, a step past regional history. Strictly speaking, he comprehends the shift to capitalist modern society to be Korea's entryway into the universal and general patterns that characterize world history. Within such an analysis, the national history of Korea is depicted as a series of struggles for freedom, a "history that strives for the establishment of a democratic national culture" while "rejecting the invasion of other cultures" (I. Yi 1950, 49).

In contrast to Yi In-yeong's focus on the general phenomena of "the outside," Kim Seong-chil's review paper, "Yeonam-ui yeolha ilgi" (The *Jehol Diary* of Yeonam) seeks to identify and reconstruct generality within "the inside." Kim Seong-chil describes the late Joseon era as "an extremely paralyzed field of production in which even the slightest hint of civil society could not sprout" and defines Yeonam as "the one scholar who groped in the dark for the idea of civil society in such a stifling feudal chaos," whose "representative work was *Yeolha ilgi* (The *Jehol Diary*)" (S. Kim 1949, 78). Yeonam's *Silhak* (Practical Learning), which criticizes class hierarchy and neo-Confucianism through texts such as "Yangbanjeon" and "Hojil," is labeled civil society ideology. Such attempts to locate general notions (e.g. modern civil society) within Korean history (e.g. *Silhak*) later gave way to the theory of internal development (*naejaejeok baljeonron*) of the 1960s, which finds the origins of Korean capitalism within its own "feudal chaos."

Despite their different approaches, Yi In-yeong and Kim Seong-chil share the objective of reconstructing national history by relating to general world history. The next section further examines *Hakpung's* discourse on American, or Western, history, which emerges in the journal as the reference point for "world" history.

The Reorganization of Imagined Geographies under American Hegemony and the Marginalization of Socialism

The discursive theme of *Hakpung* consisted of an investigation of Korea, the self, along with an objective toward Americanism (the West), the general. Studies of the latter tended to focus on classic European literature and American intellectual works. Whereas interest in contemporary European culture appears to have been limited to an exploration of existentialism and *résistance* in the twelfth issue, special issue on contemporary French literature,²⁹ articles and theses of American journalism were translated almost immediately after publication in the United States.³⁰ Various prominent Korean scholars, who had studied in or visited the United States, also published first-hand accounts of the American intellectual community. Examples include Yun Il-seon's "Miguk-ui hakja-wa haksae" (Scholars and Students of the United States) (Yun 1948), which refers to encounters with scientists such as Einstein and Oppenheimer and describes the American field of science; Kim Jae-won's "Amerika tongsin" (From America), a series of reports on his year-long training in the United States while serving as the director of the National Museum, published from issue 2 (November 1948) to 5 (April 1949) of *Hakpung*; "Miguk gihaeng" (Travelogue of America) (Im 1949b) and "Miguk akdan geunhwang" (News on American Bands) (Im 1949a) by Im Won-sik, a former con-

29. Special Issue on Postwar French Literature, *Hakpung* 2 (May 1950). This special issue is comprised of the following pieces: Yang Byeong-sik, "Jeonhu-ui bullanseo munhak-gwa sasang" (The Literature and Ideology of Postwar France); An Eung-ryeol, "Hanggeo munhak-e daehayeo" (On Résistance Literature); T. K, "Burangwa yeonmin" (Anxiety and Compassion); the poetry of Jacques Prévert and Louis Aragon, translated by Yang Byeong-sik; Jeon Chang-sik, "Julien Benda-ui jiseong" (The Intellect of Julien Benda); Jean Cocteau, "Lettres aux Américains" (translated by T. K); and Vercors, "Le Pôle Nord" (translated by Yi Hwa-yeong).

30. Articles from American periodicals are featured consistently from the first issue. Examples include the following: Bak Sul-eum's translation of "Concerns in American Culture," *Nation*, March 6, 1948; Yi Sang-gyun's translation of George Gallu, "Electoral Campaigns and Voting," *Saturday Evening Post*; and Kim Gyeong-jin's translation of "The Western Attack on Inflation," *Harvard Journal of Industry* (September 1948).

ductor for the symphony orchestra of Harbin who was studying at Juilliard School of Music at the time; and Yi Chun-nyeong's article "Miguk-ui daehak saenghwal" (Life in American Universities).³¹ In "Miju-ui hakjadeul" (Scholars of the United States) and "Gurapa-ui dongyang hakjadeul" (Asian Scholars of Europe), Kim Jae-won chronicles the decline of prominent Asian scholars of France and Germany, concluding that "since the United States is the cultural, economic, and military center of the world aside from the Soviet Union and its subordinates, it will produce many prominent scholars of East Asian studies as in all other areas of academics" (J. Kim 1949, 108).

Such global shifts become more apparent in the special issue on "Retrospections and Prospects on 20th Century Civilization,"³² published to mark the year 1950. Jang Cheol-su's "Gukje jeongse ban segi gwan" (A Half Century of International Affairs) describes the shift in dominance from Great Britain to the United States and diagnoses that the Soviet Union must rethink its stance in order to avoid another world war. Ko Seung-je's "Jeonbangi-ui gyeongje dong-hyang" (Economic Trends in the First Half Century) represents the total production ratio of American (including European markets) and Soviet

31. Yi Chun-nyeong was the son of Yi Byeong-do, and served as a dean of Seoul National University's College of Agriculture and life member of the National Academy of Sciences. The fact that he, a graduate of Kyushu University, realigned his own academic identity by studying abroad in the United States is another artifact of the academic paradigm of the times.

32. Although it was interrupted by the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950, this issue was intended to contain the works of the following specialties: overall commentary (*sajo* 思潮) (Yi In-su), international (Jang Cheol-su), economics (Ko Seung-je), atomic science (Kim Yong-ho), war (Bak Gi-jun), society (Yi Sang-baek), architecture (Kim Jung-eop), art (Kim Hwan-gi), film (Kim Jeong-hyeok), music (No Gwang-uk), theatre (Seo Hang-seok), ideology (Yi Jong-u), education (Jang Ri-uk), and religion (author TBD). The articles published in the April and May special issue are Yi In-su's "Geumsegi jeonban-ui sajo" (Trends in the First Half of the Current Century), Jang Cheol-su's "Gukje jeongse bansegi gwan" (A Half Century of International Affairs), Ko Seung-je's "Jeonbangi-ui gyeongje donghyang" (Economic Trends in the First Half Century), Kim Jeong-hyeok's "Yeonghwa 50 nyeon" (50 Years of Film), Kim Yong Ho's "Wonjahak-ui jeonmang" (Prospects for Atomic Science), and Kim Jung-eop's "Geonchuk 50 nyeon" (50 Years of Architecture).

economies to be 100:20. Such pieces seem to suggest that international affairs are characterized not by the Cold War, but solely by American dominance. In “Yeonghwa 50 nyeon” (50 Years of Film), Kim Jeong-hyeok explains worldwide trends in the film industry as the globalization of large-cap American films. In the case of Korea, which has been reorganized into an imagined world geography centered on the United States, he observes that “the hairstyle of Hollywood’s Greer Garson is wildly popular on the streets of Seoul, and Charles Boyer’s tie pin hangs on the show windows of Chungmu-ro” (J. Kim 1950, 29).

The shift of political power led to a parallel shift in academia. *Hakpung*’s special issues on politics and economics provide key examples. The special issue on economics,³³ led by Ko Seung-je’s work, displays a keen interest in Keynesian economics. Although Keynes’ *The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money*, which laid the foundations for modern macroeconomics, was published in 1936,³⁴ the sphere of mainstream economic studies during the colonial era had largely been limited to classical and Marxist economics. The papers published in this special issue of *Hakpung* clearly indicate that prominent economists of the era began to focus on Keynes and American economics: “Hyeondae gyeongjehak-ui je munje” (Questions in Modern Economics), a critical examination of Keynes’ work by Ko Seung-je; Yi Myeon-seok’s “Keynes-ui saengsan mullyang gyeoljeong ron” (Keynesian Theory on Production Quantity); and Shin Tae-hwan’s “Keynes hwapye iron-ui seonggyeok” (Keynesian Monetary Theory). Among these writers, Shin Tae-hwan’s career is particularly emblematic of the changes in the field of eco-

33. Special Issue on Economics, *Hakpung* 6 (May 1949).

34. Keynes’ theory was introduced through “Hagi jisang daehak: gyeongjehak-ui choesin hakseol Keynes gyeongje-ui iron” (A Summer Series of Lectures: Keynesianism, A New Theory in Theoretical Economics), *Dong-A Ilbo*, August 3-7, 1938, a five-article series by Marxist economist Yun Haeng-jung. Yun, a graduate of Kyoto Imperial University, later wrote another book on Keynesianism: *Hyeondae gyeongjehak-ui gwaje* (The Tasks of Modern Economics) (Seoul: Bakmoon Publishing, 1943).

nomics prior to and after independence. Shin Tae-hwan graduated from Tokyo College of Commerce along with Marxist scholars Baek Nam-un and Kim Gwang-jin. Trained at the most prestigious economics program of the Japanese empire, he served as professor, director, and president of Seoul National University after independence. In 1953, he was invited to train as an exchange professor at the University of Chicago, also famous for its economics department. He was also the first president of the Korean Economic Association, founded around this time. Such a trajectory exemplifies a common pattern in which the generation of scholars educated at Japanese imperial universities realigned their identities in the post-independence years by training in the United States, and became the new core of Korean academia.³⁵

Such a transfiguration is also apparent in the special issue on political science,³⁶ comprised mainly of discussions on democracy. In the postcolonial era, democracy referred to all systems that rejected the totalitarianism of the Axis powers. As indicated by the use of both phrases, “American democracy” and “Soviet democracy,” democracy was an idea that was utilized competitively by all parties to represent their notion of ideal values.³⁷ However, within the discourse of

35. Kim Jun-seop wrote “Gwahakjeok gyeongheom ron” (The Theory of Scientific Experience), published in issue 10 (February 1950) of *Hakpung*, while pursuing graduate studies at Columbia University. His paper presents an emerging philosophical theory of American academia, one which combines pragmatism and logical positivism. Kim Jun-seop became a professor at Seoul National University in 1954, immediately after the Korean War. After a career of teaching American philosophy, which departed from Kim Du-heon and Bak Jong-hong’s German branch of philosophy, he served as the president of the Korean Philosophical Society. Yi Man-gap, a writer for *Hakpung*’s special issue on sociology, was a graduate of Tokyo Imperial University who also trained in the United States while teaching at Seoul National University. When he returned to Korea, he began teaching bio-sociology and methods in social research. The careers of these two scholars are a clear demonstration of the hegemonizing of American knowledge within Korea’s academic system.

36. Special Issue on Political Science, *Hakpung* 9 (January 1950).

37. Kim Dong-seong presents historical anecdotes on the wisdom of Joseon-era prime ministers and calls them “democratic ministers” in his paper, “Minjujuui daesin-

Hakpung, democracy was defined exclusively as the American, or Western, political system. Various papers compared the British and American democratic systems to that of Korea: “Tanhaek jedo ron” (A Study of the Impeachment System) by Seo Im-su, “Beopchi gukga ron” (Theory of the Law-Governed State) by Jang Hu-yeong, “Seonge jedo gaeseol” (Outline of the Electoral System) by Yun Se-chang, “Yeongguk heonjeong-ui teukjing” (Characteristics of the British Constitutional Government) by Kim Tae-dong, “Dasugyeol wonchik-ui ironjeok geungeo” (The Theoretical Evidence for Majority Rule) by Yi Sang-baek, and “Uihoe jeongchi-ui yeoksajeok hoego” (Historical Perspectives on Parliamentary Politics) by Yi Sang-gyun. This special issue reflects the idealization of Western democracy by Korean scholars of political science.

How, then, was the “other camp” of Marxism expressed within the discourse of *Hakpung*? There is a dearth of information published in *Hakpung* about the socialist states around Korea, such as China and the Soviet Union. The journal’s stance can be summarized by the fact that the only article published with socialism in its title, Kim Eun-u’s “Sahoejuui-ui noyesang-gwa jayusang” (Notions of Slavery and Freedom in Socialism) (E. Kim 1949) was a presentation of Nicholas Berdyaev’s *Slavery and Freedom*, a critique of socialism. This paper argues that democracy is based on individual humanity and that socialism, which urges everyone to be the same, is a totalitarian and slavish political system. This position can also be seen as the starting point for the political philosophy that became prevalent after the Korean War.

The elimination and marginalization of socialism did not consist solely of such direct attacks. Certain papers published in *Hakpung* held reformist socialist perspectives, partly in opposition to the *realpolitik* of the time. A group of scholars assumed reform or moderate socialist positions that differed from Soviet socialism, and this group also played a critical role in the founding of the Republic of

gwa Kim Pung-deok” (The Democratic Minister and Kim Pung-deok), *Hakpung* 2 (November 1948), providing an example of the usage of “democracy” as a value.

Korea.³⁸ Various political studies published in *Hakpung* incorporate the works of Sombart and Laski in an attempt to state such moderate views. For instance, in “Migugin-gwa sahoejuui” (The American People and Socialism), Han Chun-seop (1949) validates Sombart’s observation that socialism does not exist in the United States because of the supremacy of its fertile land and production rates, and the bipartisan political structure in which the democratic platform embraces the doctrines of the labor party. He expands this discussion in “Musan jeongdang-ui jinchul” (The Advance of the Proletarian Party) (Han 1950), published a few issues later. He organizes the proletarian movement into the labor movement of the West and the socialist movement of the Soviet or Soviet-influenced countries, with a greater emphasis on the former. His political views become evident in his focus on the proletarian labor movement within advanced Western society rather than on Soviet-centered real socialism. Additional works attempt to combine democratic politics and socialist economics in order to find points of compromise between North and South Korea, such as “Raseuki-ui gukga dawon ron” (Laski’s Theory of Pluralism) by Min Byeong-tae (1950) and “Haengjeong gwalli ron” (Theory of Administrative Management) by Seo Im-su (1950, 39), both of which incorporate Laski’s political theory.

In addition to separating real socialism from the Western labor movement and reform socialism, *Hakpung* marginalizes Marxism also by rendering it an antiquated theory that is no longer useful. Yi In-su’s “Geumsegi jeonban-ui sajo” (Trends in the First Half of the Current Century) contains an implicit understanding of English-language literature as world literature. In describing Marxist scholars as part of a discussion on the social traditions of English-language literature, he claims that “their Marxism was merely an artful instrument to provide new images and predicates” and that “their Marxism is

38. Examples include Jo Bong-am, a former member of the Joseon Communist Party, who served as Minister of Agriculture and Forestry, and Yi Sun-tak, who participated in South Korea’s land reform plans as Minister of Strategy and Finance. For more information on Yi Sun-tak’s centrist ideology, see S. Hong (1996).

now a rusty trophy only worthy of display” (I. Yi 1950, 27). Within the generalized understanding of English-language literature as world literature, Marxism becomes an artifact of the past. Similarly, Ko Seung-je’s “Hyeondae gyeongjehak-ui je munje” (Questions in Modern Economics) (Ko 1949, 10) interprets Lenin’s theory of imperialism to be useful only for understanding the first half of the twentieth century, and Hong Hyo-min’s “Reosia munhak-gwa pusikin” (Russian Literature and Pushkin) (H. Hong 1949) diminishes the importance of the Russian Revolution by introducing Pushkin only as part of Russia’s national literature while presenting Byron and Shakespeare as key figures in world literature. Consequently, knowledge of the real socialist power of North Korea, along with that of the Soviet Union and China, became marginalized within the discourse of *Hakpung*.

Conclusion

Through the analysis of *Hakpung*, the previous sections have examined the process by which positivist academics were combined with nationalism and democracy and rose to hegemonic dominance in Korea. During the years of 1948 and 1950, Korean academia was founded upon traditions of the Japanese imperial system. However, with the establishment of a new identity as a democratic nation, it later oriented itself with U.S.-centered Western capitalism and deemed its values universal. It is important to note that their works reflect both a continuity and discontinuity of colonial academics. While scholars of post-independence Korea repeated the practical knowledge they obtained through the imperial system, they also reconstructed it into a new postcolonial knowledge that that corresponded with modernization and nation-building. This trend is succinctly captured by Kim Du-heon’s ambitious study, “Minjok-gwa gukga” (The People and the Nation) (D. Kim 1950). Kim Du-heon applies Tönnies’ distinction between *Gemeinschaft* (community) and *Gesellschaft* (society), which had been used within the Japanese dis-

course of modern transcendence, to the understanding of Korean society. His arguments for the creation and sustenance of advanced communities sharing aspects of both *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* and for the establishment of a nation-state ideology that embraces the people as *Gemeinschaft* and the nation as *Gesellschaft* (D. Kim 1950, 22) are reminiscent of Miki Kiyoshi's corporatism of the wartime years. He eliminates socialism from the political socialism by framing individualism as an important basis for nationalism and strengthening the democratic element, and then by presenting the critique that "the people are an element of *Gemeinschaft* but that class society is a production of *Gesellschaft*" (D. Kim 1950, 28). He concludes that there is a need for a new ideology, one which "sublates both the democratic nation as liberalist *Gesellschaft* and the totalitarian nation as a statist *Gemeinschaft*" (D. Kim 1950, 33), and refers to this ideology as a "national moral state, national democracy" (D. Kim 1950, 38). The process by which the Japanese empire's "philosophy of overcoming modernity" becomes reconstructed as the national democracy of a postcolonial society is similar to the way in which Yi In-yeong advocates for a national history that corresponds with world history within the sphere of colonial knowledge. Such a question was not specific to these two historians, but rather a dilemma for all descendants of the Japanese academic system and also their responses to the challenge of the postcolonial question.

Positivism, which has been established as the mainstream methodology of Korean academia since independence, is now considered an instrument of right-wing nationalist scholars. However, it is also clear that positivism must not be equated with right-wing nationalism. For example, Choe Hyeon-bae, a major right-wing nationalist, denounced positivism, while Lee Ki-Baek adopted a positivist methodology and rejected colonial and nationalist history.³⁹ The dichotomous classification of positivism as right-wing nationalism and anti-positivism as left-wing, which remains influential to date, was the product

39. For more information about Lee Ki-Baek's positivist approach to history, see G. Kim (2009).

of various historical and academic processes: a combination of the ideology of nationalism and methodology of positivism in the post-independence years, along with the marginalization of Marxism through the depoliticized discourse that emerged with the founding of the Republic of Korea. In a sense, positivism, a methodology, rose to the level of ideology while Marxism, an ideology, was reduced to that of methodology. Thus, it is necessary to examine the Korean intellectual community of this time through a historical perspective. Such an examination would reveal that although positivism was claimed to be apolitical, it was engaged in its own kind of political activity under the pretext of postcolonial academics. And, in this regard, positivism was not quite positivist enough, although it is equally difficult to say that Marxism was Marxist enough. It is the author's hope that the questions presented in this paper, a historicization of the academic philosophy of the Korean intellectual community at the onset of the Cold War, will be extended to a reexamination of academic philosophy within the current historical context.

REFERENCES

- Bak, Gyeong-won. 1948. "Joseon bulsang-ui gwangbae-e daehan sogo" (Views on the Halo of the Buddha Statues of Joseon). *Hakpung* 2 (November).
- _____. 1949. "Ijo muninhwa ron" (On the Literati Paintings of Joseon Dynasty). *Hakpung* 7 (July).
- Choe, Ho-jin. 1991. "Ilje mal jeonsiha-eseoui hangmun pyeollyeok-gwa haebang hu gyeongjehakgwa changseol" (The Itinerancy of Academics at the End of the Japanese Colonial Era and the Establishment of the Department of Economics after Independence). *Yeoksa bipyeong* (Critical Review of History) 15 (May).
- Choe, Hye-wol. 1988. "Migunjeonggi gukdaean bandae undong-ui seonggyeok" (The Anti-Gukdaean Movement during the U.S. Military Government). *Yeoksa bipyeong* (Critical Review of History) 3 (June).
- Do, Myoun-hoi, and Yun Hae Dong, eds. 2009. *Yeoksahak-ui segi* (A Century of Historical Studies). Seoul: Humanist.
- Han, Chun-seop. 1949. "Migugin-gwa sahoejuui" (The American People and

- Socialism). *Hakpung* 7 (July).
- _____. 1950. "Musan jeongdang-ui jinchul" (The Advance of the Proletarian Party). *Hakpung* 9 (January).
- Hong, Hyo-min. 1949. "Reosia munhak-gwa pusikin" (Russian Literature and Pushkin). *Hakpung* 7 (July).
- Hong, Seong-chan. 1996. "Hanguk geunhyeondae Yi Sun-tak-ui jeongchi gyeongje sasang yeongu" (A Study on Yi Sun-tak's Political Economic Ideology of Modern Korea). *Yeoksa munje yeongu* (Korean Historical Studies) 1.
- Hong, Sun-hyeok. 1950. "Haebang hu guksahakgye-ui donghyang" (Trends in National Historical Studies after Independence). *Sincheonji* (New World) (June).
- Im, Won-sik. 1949a. "Miguk akdan geunhwang" (News on American Bands). *Hakpung* 8 (October).
- _____. 1949b. "Miguk gihaeng" (Travelogue of America). *Hakpung* 3 (January).
- Jeon, Seok-dam. 1948a. "Hangmun-gwa jayu" (Academics and Freedom). *Hakpung* 2 (November).
- _____. 1948b. "Toji gogyuje-ui gibonjeok mosun-e daehahyeo" (The Fundamental Hypocrisy of Land Nationalization). *Hakpung* 1 (October).
- Jeong, Jong Hyun. 2010. "Shin Nam-cheol-gwa daehak jedo-ui an-gwa bak: singminji hakji-ui yeonsok-gwa biyeonsok" (Shin Nam-cheol and the Inside and Outside of the University System: The Continuity and Discontinuity of Colonial Learning). *Hanguk eomun-hak yeongu* (Journal of Korean Literature) 54.
- Jung, Jin-Seok. [1982] 1997. *Euryu munhwasa 50 nyeonsa* (50-Year History of Eulyoo Publishing). Seoul: Eulyoo Publishing.
- Jo, Yun-je. 1997. "Daehak gyoyuk-ui jaseong" (Reflections on University Education). In vol. 5 of *Donam Jo Yun-je jeonjip* (The Complete Works of Donam Jo Yun-je). Seoul: Taehaksa.
- Joseon Academy. 1946. *Haksul: haebang ginyeom nonmunjip* (Academics: A Collection of Theses in Commemoration of Independence). Vol. 1. Seoul: Seoul Shinmunsa.
- Kim, Bang-Han. 1996. *Han eoneo hakja-ui chosang* (The Memoirs of a Linguist). Seoul: Minumsa.
- Kim, Byeong-gyu. 1948. "Hangmun-gwa hakdo" (Academics and Scholars). *Hakpung* 2 (November).
- Kim, Du-heon. 1950. "Minjok-gwa gukga" (The People and the Nation). *Hakpung* 10 (February).

- Kim, Eun-u. 1949. "Sahoejuui-ui noyesang-gwa jayusang" (Notions of Slavery and Freedom in Socialism). *Hakpung* 7 (July).
- Kim, Gi-bong. 2009. "Minjok-gwa jilli-neun hana-il su inneunga?" (Can the Nation be One with Truth?). In *Yeoksahak-ui segi* (A Century of Historical Studies), edited by Do Myoun-hoi and Yun Hae Dong. Seoul: Humanist.
- Kim, Ki-Seok. 2001. *Illanseong ssangsaenga-ui tansaeng 1946: gungnip seoul dahakgyo-wa gimilseong jonghap daehak-ui changseol* (The Birth of Identical Twins, 1946: The Founding of Seoul National University and Kim Il-sung University). Seoul: Kyoyook Kwahaksa.
- Kim, Jaehyun. 2007. "Hanguk-eseo geundaejeok hangmun-euroseo cheolhak-ui hyeongseong-gwa geu teukjing" (The Formation and Characteristics of Philosophy as a Modern Discipline in Korea). *Sidae-wa cheolhak* (The Epoch and the Philosophy) 18.3 (fall).
- Kim, Jae-won. 1949. "Miju-ui hakjadeul" (Scholars of the United States). *Hakpung* 7 (July).
- Kim, Jeong-hyeok. 1950. "Yeonghwa 50 nyeon" (50 Years of Film). *Hakpung* 12 (May).
- Kim, Seong-chil. 1949. "Yeonam-ui yeolha ilgi" (The *Jehol Diary* of Yeonam). *Hakpung* 4 (March).
- Kim, Seong-han. 1950. "Kim Ga-seong ron" (A Discourse on Kim Ga-seong). *Hakpung* 11 (March).
- Kim, Yong-Sup. 2005. *Nambuk haksurwon-gwa gwahagwon-ui baldal* (The Development of the Academies and Science Institutes of the South and North). Seoul: Jisik Sanupsa.
- Ko, Seung-je. 1949. "Hyeondae gyeongjehak-ui je munje" (Questions in Modern Economics). *Hakpung* 6 (May).
- Lee, Gil Sang. 1999. *Migunjeongha-eseoui jinbojeok minjujuui gyoyuk undong* (The Educational Movement of Progressive Democracy under the U.S. Military Government). Seoul: Kyoyook Kwahaksa.
- Lee, Ji-won. 2002. "1930 nyeondae joseonhak nonjaeng" (The Controversy over Joseon Studies in the 1930s). In *Nonjaeng-euro bon hanguk sahoe 100 nyeon* (100 Years of Korean Society through its Disputes), edited by the *Yeoksa bipyeong* Compilation Committee. Seoul: Yeoksa Bipyeongsa.
- Lee, Ki-Baek. 1978. *Hanguk sahak-ui banghyang* (Directions in Korean Historical Studies). Seoul: Ilchokak.
- Min, Byeong-tae. 1950. "Raseuki-ui gukga dawon ron" (Laski's Theory of Pluralism). *Hakpung* 9 (January).
- O, Yeong-sik, ed. 2009. *Haebanggi ganhaeng doseo chong mongnok* (Bibliography of All Publications during the Post-liberation Period). Seoul:

- Somyong Publishing.
- Pang, Kiechung. 1993. *Hanguk geunhyeondaesasangsa yeongu* (History of Thought in Modern Korea). Seoul: Yeoksa Bipyeongsa.
- Park, Kwang-hyoun. 1999. "Gyeongseong jedae-wa sinheung" (Keijo Imperial University and *Sinheung*). *Hanguk munhak yeongu* (Journal of Korean Literature) 21 (December).
- _____. 2011. "Tal singmin-ui yongmang-gwa sangsangnyeok-ui gyeoryeo—haebanggi gyeongseong daehak-eul jungsim-euro" (The Desire for Decolonization and the Absence of Imagination: A Study of Keijo Imperial University at the Time of Independence). *Hanguk munhak yeongu* (Journal of Korean Literature) 40 (June).
- Seo, Im-su. 1950. "Haengjeong gwalli ron" (Theory of Administrative Management). *Hakpung* 10 (February).
- Seoul National University Compilation Committee. *Seoul dahakgyo 50 nyeonsa* (50-year History of Seoul National University). Seoul: Seoul University Press.
- Son, Jin-tae. 1949. "Samguk yusa-ui sahoesajeok gochal" (A Social Scientific Study of *Samguk yusa*), 1 and 2. *Hakpung* 3-4.
- Weber, Max. 2006. "Jigeop-euroseoui hangmun" (Academics as a Vocation). Translated by Jeon Seong-u. Seoul: Nanam Publishing House.
- Yang, Ju-dong. 1949. "Goga jeondap ui 古歌箋割疑" (Supplementary Notes to the Studies of Old Korean Songs), 1 and 2. *Hakpung* 4-5.
- Yi, Hye Gu. 1948. "Joseon-ui gugakbo" (The Musical Score of the Joseon Era). *Hakpung* 2 (November).
- Yi, In-su. 1950. "Geumsegi jeonban-ui sajo" (Trends in the First Half of the Current Century). *Hakpung* 11 (March).
- Yi, In-yeong. 1948. "Uri minjoksa-ui seonggyeok" (Characteristics of Our National History). *Hakpung* 1 (October).
- _____. 1950. "Guksa-wa segyesa" (National History and World History). *Hakpung* 11 (March).
- Yi, Jae-hun. 1948. "Hangmun-gwa gyosu" (Academics and Professors). *Hakpung* 2 (November).
- Yi, Jin-yeong. 1949. "Joseon sahoe gyeongjesa yeongu-ui saeroun jinjeon" (New Developments in the History of Joseon's Social Economy). *Hakpung* 6 (May).
- Yi, Sang-baek. 1948a. "Hangmun-gwa jeongchi: iron-gwa silcheon-ui munje" (Academics and Politics: The Question of Theory and Practice). *Hakpung* 2 (November).
- _____. 1948b. "Gwahakjeok jeongsin-gwa jeokgeukjeok taedo" (The Sci-

- entific Mind and the Active Mind). *Hakpung* 1 (October).
- Yi, Sung-nyeong. 1948a. “‘·’-eum yeongu-ui bangbeop-gwa silje” (Methods and Practice in the Research of the Phonetic “·”). *Hakpung* 2 (November).
- _____. 1948b. “Na-ui seojae saenghwal” (My Life in the Library). *Hakpung* 1 (October).
- Yu, Eung-ho. 1949. “Hyeondae eoneohak-ui baldal” (The Development of Modern Linguistics). *Hakpung* 5 (April).
- Yun, Il-seon. 1948. “Miguk-ui hakja-wa haksaeeng” (Scholars and Students of the United States). *Hakpung* 1 (October).