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Abstract
The purpose of this article is to examine the impact of Japanese nationalistic thought on the administrative systems and structures of colonial and modern higher education in Korea, as well as to analyze Japanese higher educational policy in Korea during the colonial period (1910-1945). It begins with an examination of Shinto, a syncretistic Japanese state religion and the ideological basis of national education. The author investigates Japanese educational policy and administration during the colonial period, including the establishment of a colonial imperial university in Korea. He also reviews the administrative systems and organizational structures in imperial and colonial universities. Both beneficial and negative impacts of the Japanese colonial education
system on current Korean higher education conclude the analysis.

**Shinto**

Shinto was a spiritual foundation of the educational system of imperial Japan, as well as the national religion—or some would say cult. Throughout the history of Northeastern Asia, ancient Japan had close political, economic, and cultural relations with old Korea. Both Japanese *Nihongi* (Chronicles of Japan from the Earliest Times to AD 697) and *Kojiki* (Records of Ancient Matters) indicate numerous and multi-layered relationships between Korea and Japan. The earliest relations of Japan with the continent were mainly with Korea, particularly the Paekche Kingdom (18 BC-AD 660)\(^1\), which was a cultural mediator between China and Japan (Hong, 1988; Longford, 1911; Maki, 1945). According to the records of Japanese *Nihongi* and *Kojiki*, Korea's two greatest early contributions to Japan were the transmission of Chinese writing and literature, and more importantly, Buddhism\(^2\). The introduction of Buddhism had a significant effect on the development of Japanese culture and religion. A form of the northern branch of Buddhism (*Mahayana*) was transmitted to Japan via Tibet, China, and Korea (Aston, 1905, p. 359; Reader et al., 1993, p. 93). Indeed, Buddhism had a great impact on the development of Japanese culture as well as *Shinto*.

In the historical development of the Japanese religion and national thought, the origins of Shinto are highly controversial. Many eastern and western scholars (Aston, 1905; Holtom, 1938; Hong, 1988; Picken, 1994; Reischauer and Craig, 1973; Tsunoda et al., 1964) point out that Shinto cannot be separated from Buddhism, Confucianism, and other continental influences\(^3\).

In its earliest stage, Shinto was a primitive natural religion with elements of animism, natural worship, shamanism, ancestral reverence, agricultural rites, and purifications. Shinto later merged with Buddhism and Confucianism as *Ryobu* (Dual) Shinto\(^4\), which contained religious and ethical components of a high order. Finally, the separation of Shinto from Buddhism was achieved, that is, *Kokka* (State) Shinto or *Jinja* (Shrine) Shinto as the state cult or religion (Aston, 1905; Bocking, 1996; Herbert, 1967; Holtom, 1938; Picken, 1994). Japanese ancestral worship is a combination of Shinto and Confucianism, what we call Shinto-Confucianism.

Twelve centuries later, *Shinto* was established under national and patriotic auspices and was subsequently adopted as Japan's national religion and ideology.\(^5\) In 1870, Japanese Emperor Meiji issued a rescript defining the relation of Shinto to the state and the intention of the government concerning this matter. The Rescript states:

> We solemnly announce: The Heavenly Deities and the Great Ancestresses...established the throne and made the succession sure. The line of Emperors...entered into possession thereof and transmitted the same. Religious ceremonies and government were of a single mind....Government and education must be made plain that the Great Way of faith in the kami [gods] may be propagated....(Holtom, trans., 1938, p. 55)
After the declaration of the Rescript, the Japanese government formulated the Three Principles of Instruction for the establishment of royal rule through a Shinto-centered indoctrination and decreed the Education Code for the foundation of modern educational systems. On April 28, 1872, the Education Code was proclaimed: (1) compliance with the spirit of reverence for Kami (Gods) and love of country; (2) clarification of ‘the principle of Heaven and the Way of man’; and (3) exalting the Emperor and obeying the Imperial Court (Tsunetsugu, 1964, p. 206). The 1872 Education Code of Japan emulated the uniform and centralized system of France initiated by Napoleon III in 1854 (Anderson, 1975, p. 21).

Furthermore, the Japanese government attempted to set up national morals within the schools based on the Shinto-Confucian Imperial Rescript on Education that was promulgated on October 30, 1890 (Anderson, 1959, p. 13; Beauchang & Vardaman, 1994, pp. 4-5; Holtom, 1938, p. 71; Horio, 1988). The Rescript stressed the Shinto ideology of royal worship mixed with Confucian ethical concepts and practices such as loyalty, filial piety, benevolence, ancestor worship, learning, and harmonious human relationships. Shinto appealed to Japanese cultural nationalists because it combined ethical codes of virtue and honor with an even more exalted ethic of duty to the state, and to the divinely inspired head-of-State in particular.

Therefore, Shinto ideology and Confucian concepts were two main pillars of Japanese imperial education. The Meiji Rescript, as a Holy Writ or a national moral prop of the Japanese people, was reinterpreted several times in maintaining the rising militaristic and ultranationalistic ideology. Its philosophy extended to the educational systems of Japan. State-Shinto or National-Shinto dictated an administrative structure in government as well as in higher education that enforced a strict stratification system, centralized governance, and intellectual conformity. Certainly these features were reinforced further, even ossified with the Japanese occupation and colonialization of Korea from 1910 to 1945. Japanese imperialists set up the ruling policy that aimed to let Koreans assume the personalities of loyal citizens of her imperialism. To fulfill their political scheme, the Japanese nationalists imposed Shinto-Confucianism on Korea and attempted to design a new educational system and an administrative structure suitable for the execution of their colonial policy. Therefore, higher education was an essential tool in accomplishing the Shinto-Confucian ideologies during Japanese colonization.

**Japanese Educational Policy and Administration in Colonial Higher Education**

After the 1895 Shimonoseki Treaty, Japan introduced western-style institutions and reforms Kora including the elimination of such social practices as class discrimination. However, these reforms were met with hostility from a broad cross-section of Koreans who felt their traditional Confucian and shamanistic beliefs threatened by the social-leveling tendencies of western-style democracy. Having won the Russo-Japanese War in 1905, Japan moved immediately to establish a protectorate over Korea, called the 1905 Protectorate Treaty (Kibaek Lee, 1984, p. 309). After the treaty was signed, the Choson government nearly lost its national right to govern. During the ‘Protectorate’ period (1905-1910), the Japanese educational policy was chiefly the preparatory operation for colonization through the promulgation and practice of various educational ordinances and regulations. For instance, the Private School Ordinance (Sarip-hak-kyo-ryeong), which was promulgated in 1908, was a means of placing under
Japanese control and suppression all the private schools administered by Christian missionaries and patriotic Korean leaders (KNCU, 1960, p. 15).

In 1911, the Japanese colonial government proclaimed the Educational Ordinance\(^7\) in accordance with the Imperial Rescript (Cheong, 1985, p. 283; Keenlyesids and Thomas, 1937, p. 100; Sung-hwa Lee, 1958, pp. 83-84; Nam, 1962, p. 38; The Government-General of Choson, 1935, p. 167; Yu, 1992, p. 126). The Educational Ordinance appeared as follows:

> Be filial to your parents, affectionate to your brothers and sisters; as husbands and wives be harmonious, as friends true; bear yourselves in modesty and moderation; extend your benevolence to all; pursue learning and cultivate the arts, and thus develop your intellectual faculties and perfect your morality. Furthermore, be solicitous of the commonwealth and of the public interest; should emergency arise, offer yourselves courageously to serve the State. (Keenlyeside and Thomas, 1937, p. 100).

Based on the above Ordinance, the Japanese colonial administration urged elementary, secondary, and vocational education, including medical, foreign language, and teacher education. The Educational Ordinance of 1911 allowed higher educational institutions, such as Christian missionary colleges, to lose their college statuses and be downgraded to non-degree granting schools. It was not until the promulgation of a new Educational Ordinance on February 4, 1922 that previous higher educational institutions were accredited once again.

The ordinance was a strategy by the Japanese to force the Korean people to become compliant to Japanese imperialism, to undermine the nationalism of Koreans, and ultimately to transform the people into loyal Japanese citizens. After issuing a new Educational Ordinance on February 4, 1922, several Christian missionary schools and one Korean private collegiate school that had lost their college statuses were upgraded as college institutions. The major difference between the old (1911) and the new ordinances (1922) was that the latter abolished a dual discriminative system and applied the Japanese educational system throughout Korea.

At the same time, patriotic Korean leaders promoted an educational movement to implement their own private colleges or universities (Lee, 1965, p. 241). To offset this trend, the Japanese administration opened Keijo Imperial University (now evolved into Seoul National University) in 1924, under the Ordinance of University, and based on the Meiji Rescript (The Government-General of Choson, 1935, p. 486). This was to be the first modern university in Korea, which included the departments of law and literature, and medicine. Although the Japanese established a new national-level university in Seoul, most Koreans, nationalists and conservative Confucians, did not enroll their sons and daughters in the new imperial university. Instead, many patriotic intellectuals who were eager to encourage nationalism opened several private schools. These open, night, and labor schools were designed for Koreans to enhance national spirit.

The Japanese colonial government claimed that Keijo Imperial University in Seoul was almost the same as Imperial universities in Japan in terms of quality (The Government-General of Choson, 1935, p. 486), but the university was not a scientific research institute like the Japanese imperial universities. In truth, Tokyo Imperial University, as a scientific research university, was organized into four departments: law,
science, literature, and medicine. Despite the fact that Keijo University was a prototype of a Japanese imperial university, it became a model for successive modern Korean universities.

Regarding educational structure and systems, an Educational Bureau under the Internal Affairs Department in the Government-General of Choson became a top organ of educational administration after Japanese annexation. The Educational Bureau was composed of an educational section, an editorial section, a religious section, and a school inspectorate. In the provinces, educational sections formed part of the Department of Internal Affairs and had a staff of school-inspectors (The Government-General of Choson, 1921, p. 75). The chief of the Educational Bureau was controlled and supervised by the Director of Internal Affairs, who was in charge of the entire educational system of Korea (Cynn, 1920, p. 100). Educational administration under Japanese rule was highly centralized in the Internal Affairs Department and in the Educational Bureau, and was directed and supervised by these offices due to their coercive power within the organizational hierarchy. The Educational Bureau under the Internal Affairs Department had responsibility for most aspects of the whole school system, including missions and aims, scholastic terms, curricula, qualifications of teaching staff, management of personnel, fiscal review, allotment of funds, and inspection of educational facilities.

Administrative control of educational affairs such as policy-making, establishment of schools, compilation and censorship of textbooks, granting of teacher certificates, hiring and assigning of teaching staff, formation of the educational budgets and approvals, and scholarship administration were exercised on the authority of the Government-General of Choson (The Government-General of Choson, 1921, 1935).

Top policy of the Japanese Emperor was issued in Imperial Ordinances prepared by the governor of the Government-General of Choson. Policy change was usually initiated in the form of directives and instructions by the department and bureaus under the Government-General (Anderson, 1959, p. 75). The administrators of these offices stressed authoritative hierarchical orders that were followed without questions by the subordinates of the organizational systems.

During the Japanese occupation, the highly centralized system of educational administration based on Imperial Ordinances was used to reinforce centralized governance and intellectual conformity, as well as to eliminate Korean nationalism, independence, and cultural identity. The Japanese educational system and structure was a means to edify the Korean people in accordance with the Meiji Rescript on Education. Thus, the colonial educational system and structure were tools to achieve Japanese political schemes, denationalization and assimilation.

**Administrative System and Organizational Structure in Imperial and Colonial Universities**

Under the imperial Japanese rule, there were nine imperial universities. Seven of these were in Japan: Tokyo (1886), Kyoto (1897), Kyushu in Fukuoka (1903), Hokkaido in Sapporo (1903), Tohoku in Sendai (1909), Osaka (1931), and Nagoya (1931). Two were located in the colonies: Keijo in Korea and Taihoku in Taiwan (Anderson, 1959, p. 126). The governing system and the organizational structure of Keijo Imperial University were
copied directly from Japanese Imperial Universities, which were patterned after several Western countries' academic models and institutions, particularly Germany (Altbach, 1989; Anderson, 1959; Cummings, 1990). Many ideas and models of higher education were taken from Western countries, including French administrative organizations and bureaucratic coordination systems, Pestalozzi's developmental educational system, Herbartian moral centered-pedagogy, German university models and structures for academia, Anglo-American ideas of utilitarian education, American liberal arts philosophy and American pragmatism, especially John Dewey's educational philosophy (Altbach, 1989; Cummings, 1990, p. 73; Cummings, Amano, & Kitamura, 1979; Nakayama, 1989, pp. 31-48).

Chinese educational ideas based on Confucianism and Chinese classics also had a great impact on Japanese education. Indeed, after adopting many Western ideas of higher education, the Japanese incorporated them into the Shinto-Confucian tradition. Shigeru Nakayama (1989), a Japanese historian, asserts that "the first example of the window-shopping mode occurred in the late nineteenth century, whereas the involvement mode is best illustrated in the post-World War II Occupation period, in which reforms based on the American system were carried out" (pp. 31-32).

Japanese Imperial higher education adopted the centralized system of France, as well as a system of rank structure modeled on the German approach (Anderson, 1975, p. 21; Cummings, 1990, p. 113). Keijo Imperial University as a colonial institute was also shaped by a highly centralized organizational structure. The entire academic structure was set up in accordance with the Japanese prototype. Accordingly, the curriculum of Keijo Imperial University was almost identical to the Japanese imperial universities and the majority of the academic staff and students were Japanese (The Government-General of Choson, 1935). Furthermore, educational administrators and faculty members used the Japanese language for higher education, including teaching and learning, textbooks, and communicating with faculty members. Not only did the Japanese colonial administrators manage academic affairs and finance, but they also supervised closely all faculty members from the president to the administrative and teaching staff (The Government-General of Choson, 1935, p. 486). The Japanese administrators appointed all faculty regarding their working positions and functions, and controlled students' activities and academic freedom (Ibid).

In terms of educational administration, the administrative system and structure of Keijo University was almost the same as that of the Japanese university. Like the metropolitan imperial universities, Keijo University was hierarchical in organization and had an authoritative system of rank structure. The university administrators and the colonial authorities imposed strict rules, and hierarchical authority through royal rescripts, ordinances, policies, and directives. As Cummings (1990) points out, the system comprised a linear rank structure in which the head of the chair exerted absolute authority. Further, the academic ranks of professor, assistant professor, instructor, assistant, and vice-assistant taught and assisted in each field. In the selection of new faculty members, the most important criterion was age. The age rank structure based on Confucian ethical and social values solidified authoritarian leadership of top and middle line senior administrators. Accordingly, the open-rank system, which depended on cooperation and more objective evaluations, was not practiced.

In this manner, the organizational structure of Keijo Imperial University was maintained in a highly centralized formal system based on Shinto-Confucian values and norms. In
addition, the Meiji Rescript was a blueprint of the Shinto-Confucian educational plan and a seed of institutional culture in colonial higher education.

Under Japanese colonial rule, Koreans were discriminated against either in institutional programs or training. The Japanese imperial administration offered higher educational opportunities to the Japanese people. Few Koreans could access elite (Lee, 1984, pp. 367-68). Actually, Japanese administrators under restrictive administration and curriculum policies provided Koreans with few chances to enter higher educational institutes and did not educate them in advanced engineering and scientific courses. In 1925, at the college level, the proportion of Korean enrollment was no more than one-twenty-sixth of Japanese and at the university level over one-one hundredth (Lee, 1984, p. 367). Japanese used two educational systems to discriminate between Japanese and Koreans: one was an educational system for persons using Japanese, and the other for persons using Korean. As Jin-Eun Kim (1988) points out, the Japanese were allowed to operate within a separate privileged system, while the Koreans were subject to limitations in secondary and higher education.

At that time, university admission of Korean people was strictly limited, and only very few Koreans, who were by and large the offspring of pro-Japanese persons or rich people, attended Keijo University. Many scions of pro-Japanese and rich people enrolled at Japanese vocational or teachers' schools. Sungho Lee (1989) points that “the total enrollment of the Keijo Imperial University in 1934 in ten years since its establishment was 930, of which the Korean fraction was only 32 percent” (p. 95).

Specifically, in 1939, there were only 0.27 Korean students in colleges and teachers' training seminaries for every 1,000 Koreans of the general population, and 7.20 Japanese students for every 1,000 Japanese in Korea. There were 0.0093 Korean students enrolled in university for every 1,000 Koreans, while 1.06 Japanese university students per 1,000 of Japanese population in Korea (Grajdanzev, 1944, p. 264; Sungho Lee, 1989, p. 94; UNESCO, 1954, p. 24). The higher educational schools under Japanese colonial rule were viewed by the nationalistic Koreans as training institutes that cultivated pro-Japanese agents serving the Japanese imperialists. In fact, as Byung Hun Nam (1962) mentions, the primary motives of the establishment of this university were to offer higher education for the Japanese in Korea, to forestall growing Korean nationalism, and to indoctrinate the Korean elite as pro-Japanese. Indeed, some of the Koreans who studied at Keijo University faithfully served Japanese imperialists as puppets or collaborators during the Japanese colonial period (Chang, 1992; Seo, 1989). For instance, among 804 Korean graduates, 228 persons served at Japanese governmental and public offices (Chang, 1992, p. 392).

In particular, during World War II (1937-1945), the Japanese regime announced three educational principles of its administration. These included profound understanding of the national mission, strengthening Japanese and Korean unity, and dedication to labor for the realization of national goals. Japanese militarism reached its peak following the establishment of the puppet government of Manchukuk. The Japanese colonial administration demanded that the Korean people, including Western missionary teachers and students, should pay homage to Shinto shrines (Palmer, 1977, pp. 139-40). They forcibly demanded that the Koreans should use the Japanese language, instruct all classes in Japanese, and change their traditional family names to reflect Japanese styles (Meade, 1951, p. 213).
From this, it can be concluded that the purposes of the Japanese colonial education were denationalization, vocationalization, discrimination, and assimilation, according to Han-Young Rim’s (1952) analysis. Especially at the higher level, the ultimate goal of university education in Korea was to foster the pro-Japanese elite as faithful Japanese puppets. Furthermore, after the liberation in 1945, these Japanese agents ironically became the privileged class leading to a new Korean society (Chang, 1992; Cheong, 1985; Choi, 1990; Im, 1991; Lee, 1985; Lee, 1997; Seo, 1989). For example, during the 12 years Syngman Lee’s administration (1948-1960), 83 percent of 115 Cabinet ministers were Japanese agents or collaborators under Japanese colonial rule (Seo, 1989, p. 452).

On the contrary, many patriotic or nationalistic Korean people participated in the army for national independence, and attended the native private schools, or Christian missionary institutes instead of Japanese institutes. More than half of the Korean students attended private Korean colleges or collegiate schools, and many of them journeyed abroad to access higher education (Lee, 1984, p. 368). In fact, many Confucian learned men were actually reluctant to accept Western education, resulting in their adherence to the Confucian educational tradition at village schools.

The Impact of the Japanese Colonial Education System on Current Korean Higher Education

During the Japanese colonial period (1910-1945), Japanese imperialists designed the educational system and administrative structure to reflect a Shinto-centered philosophy. This was used as a tool to aid the assimilation of Koreans to a more Japanese point of view and subverted the Korean national spirit. Shinto ideology was integrated into colonial higher education through emphasis on the worship of Shinto shrines as well as Shinto-Confucian concepts in the college curriculum. With the enforcement of the cultural assimilation policy and practice, Japanese colonizers used Shinto ideology as a means of strict disciplinary action against Koreans, eliminating freedom of speech, clamping down on colleges or universities, and eradicating Korean nationalism. The resulting tensions among Korean nationalism, independence, and democracy were at the heart of Korean educational development in the twentieth century.

In addition, the Japanese authorities offered higher education opportunities to some pro-Japanese Koreans to train as an elite group who could support the pro-Japanese militarism. Despite such an undesirable policy, the heritage of Japanese colonialism shaped the nature of the modern Korean universities and left both positive and negative outcomes within Korean higher education.

The positive effects were that the Japanese colonial government established several collegiate institutions including a university, endorsed public education for many Koreans regardless of social status and gender, introduced Western technical and professional training through common higher or collegiate level institutes, and transferred preferred administrative systems and practices. The administrative system and structure became models for modern Korean higher education. Many Korean intellectuals who had studied at the colonial or Japanese imperial universities played an important role in the foundation of contemporary Korean higher education (Banminjokmoonjeyeonkuso, 1993; Chang, 1992; Cheong, 1985; Choi, 1990; Im,
Several negative results can also be noted. Firstly, Japanese colonial authorities regarded higher education as a tool to foster pro-Japanese elite agents who were able to practice Japanese colonial policy and Japanese imperialism based on Shinto-Confucianism. Secondly, the Japanese abolished the Confucian National Academy which had preserved the Korean academic tradition. Thirdly, Korean tertiary institutes under the Japanese colonial period lost opportunities to introduce Western models which may have been well suited for Koreans' needs. Finally, some Korean alumni of the Keijo Imperial University became pro-Japanese collaborators, resulting in unfair or discriminatory practices for Korean educators (Banminjokmoonjeonyeonkuso, 1993; Chang, 1992; Choi, 1990; Im, 1991; Lee, 1985).

In terms of educational administration, a closed organizational system--rigid and authoritative leadership, a hierarchical centralized formal structure, closed communication networks, and administrator-centered education--has formed the organizational system and culture in contemporary Korean higher education. Moreover, several Western education systems, for example, "window shopping modes," adopted by the Japanese are the typical types of administrative systems in current Korean higher education. For instance, a centralized system and a linear rank structure are the backbones of the organizational systems in the Ministry of Education and higher education institutions.

In particular, the Meiji Rescript on Education promulgated by the Japanese Emperor Meiji in 1890 was a matrix of the Chart of National Education promulgated for the recovery of national spirit and educational reform by the Park Administration in 1968. The Chart was a guiding principle in Korean education from the 1968 until the early 1980s. In addition, Keijo Imperial University established by the Japanese Colonial Administration in 1924, was a precursor of the present Seoul National University, and has produced a large number of bureaucrats and talents as leading individuals who play important roles in the present Korean society.

From all of this, it can be concluded that the story of Japan's influence in Korea and the historical connection between these two traditional rivals is far more complex and nuanced than the paper would suggest. That history is replete with rich and telling ironies. The importance of Shinto, a syncretistic Japanese state religion borrowing elements not only of Chinese Confucianism but also of Korean Buddhism and Shamanism, is a good case in point. In addition, Japan undertook to introduce Western-style institutions and reforms, including the elimination of such social practices as class discrimination. Furthermore, State-Shinto dictated an administrative structure in higher education as well as in government that enforced a strict stratification system and intellectual conformity, and even ossified the Japanese colonialization of Korea 1910-1945.

The Japanese reforms based on the ideology of State-Shinto met with general hostility from a broad cross-section of Koreans, who felt their traditional Confucian and national beliefs being threatened by the social-leveling tendencies of western-style democracy. After 1910, Japanese colonizers took a harder line against Koreans, eliminating freedom of speech, the press, and association and clamping down on the universities. This caused public resistance, but around the issue of independence, not the restoration of
western-style freedoms. The tensions between Korean nationalism, independence, and democracy are at the heart of the story of Korean educational development and yet remain largely unexplored. Clearly, the heritage of Japanese colonialism has contributed to the shaping of the administrative systems of the contemporary Korean universities and also has positively and negatively affected overall current Korean higher education.

Notes

1 In the history of Korea, Paekche Kingdom (18 BC-AD 660), as one of Three Kingdoms, was located in the southwest of the Korean peninsula. Three Kingdoms were Koguryo (37 BC-AD 668) in the north; Silla (57 BC-AD 935) in the southeast; and Paekche. Silla unified the Korean peninsula. The next epoch was Koryo Kingdom (918-1392), and the last Korean kingdom was Choson (1392-1910).

2 Like Nihongi's records (Vol. I, pp. 262-63), Kojiki also left Wangin (Wani)'s contribution in AD 285 (Aston notes that the year corresponds to AD 405). Kojiki describes that the King of Paekche presented a man named Wani-kishi, and by this man he presented the Confucian Analects in ten volumes and the Thousand Character Essay in one volume (tr. Chamberlain, p. 306). In AD 552, the Nihongi records that the King of Paekche in Korea sent an embassy to Japan with a present to the Mikado of an image of Shaka Buddha in gold and copper, banners, umbrellas, and a number of volumes of the Buddhist Sutras (tr. W. A. Aston, pp. 59-60).

3 Wontack Hong (1988), a Korean historian, claims that "The dominant religion in Korea prior to the introduction of Buddhism and Confucianism was Shamanism. This Shamanism seems to have been brought to Japan by those who migrated from Korea" (pp. 138-39). Ryusaku Tsunoda and William T. de Bary (1964) also claim that "Shinto was not an indigenous religion...Shamanistic and animistic practices similar to these of Shinto have also been found through northeast Asia, especially in Korea" (p. 21). In addition, Edwin O. Reischauer and Albert M. Craig (1973) assert that "[m]embers of the priestly class who performed the various rites...probably represented the Japanese variant of the shamans of Korea and Northeast Asia" (p. 473). Lastly, W. G. Aston (1905), a translator of Nihongi, insists that in prehistoric Shinto, there are definite traces of a Korean element in Shinto A Kara no Kami (God of Korea) was worshipped in the Imperial Palace (p. 1). Stuart D. B. Picken (1994) mentions that "Shinto has been described as the source of Japan's creative spirit on the one hand, and as an incorrigible source of militaristic nationalism on the other" (p. 4).

4 Ryobu Shinto means "Two-sided" or "Dual Shinto." A Popular Dictionary of Shinto (Bocking, 1996) notes, "An interpretation of Kami (Gods) beliefs and practices developed in the Kamakura period (1185-1333) and maintained by the Shingon School of esoteric Buddhism. A derivative theory that reversed the status of kami and Buddhas was proposed by Kanetomo Yoshida (1435-1511)" (p. 145).

5 After the Meiji Restoration of 1868, the affairs of both Shinto and Buddhism were placed under the same set of official regulations on April 21, 1872 (Holtom, 1938, p. 59). However, in February 1873, the Japanese government proclaimed officially that it would protect the freedom of Shinto and Buddhism and that it encouraged each of them to grow (Herbert, 1967, p. 51). Brian Bocking (1996) notes: "State Shinto,' ‘National
Shinto,' or 'Shrine Shinto' was a concept defined retrospectively and applied by the occupation authorities in the Shinto Directive of 1945 to the post-Meiji religious system in Japan. In the Directive, State Shinto is defined as 'that branch of Shinto (Kokka Shinto or Jinja Shinto) which by official acts of the Japanese Government has been differentiated from the religion of sect Shinto (Shuha Shinto) and has been classified a non-religious cult commonly known as State Shinto, National Shinto, or Shrine Shinto'" (pp. 100-01).

6 The Japanese Emperor Meiji's Rescript on Education notes:

Know ye, Our Subjects:

Our Imperial Ancestors have founded our Empire on a basis broad and everlasting, and have deeply and firmly implanted virtue; Our Subjects ever united in loyalty and filial piety have from generation to generation illustrated the beauty thereof...Ye, Our Subjects, be filial to your parents, affectionate to your brothers and sisters; as husbands and wives be harmonious, as friends true; bear yourselves in modesty and moderation; extend your benevolence to all; pursue learning and cultivate arts, and thereby develop intellectual faculties and perfect moral powers; always respect the Constitution and observe the laws; should emergency arise, offer yourselves courageously to the State; and thus guard and maintain the prosperity of Our Imperial Throne coeval with heaven and earth....(Sansom, trans.,1950, p. 464)

7 With the Meiji Rescript, the Educational Ordinance was a fundamental frame for governing colonial education in Korea until August 15, 1945, although the Japanese colonial administration revised and enacted several educational ordinances in 1922, 1938, and 1943 (Cheong, 1985; Jin-Eun Kim, 1988; Nam, 1962; Yu, 1992).

8 In 1931, 3,639 Korean students were enrolled in Japanese tertiary institutions, whereas as many as 493 Koreans were studying in the United States (Lee, 1984, p. 368).

9 In the history of Korea, Confucian education traditionally maintained two streams from the Three Kingdoms period to the early twentieth century. One stream was of national institutions, and the other stream was of civil or village schools. The national Confucian institute, Seongkyunkwan, was compulsorily abolished by the Japanese imperialists in the early twentieth century, but many Confucian civil or village schools actually existed in the provincial areas during the Japanese colonial period.

10 When the United States Military Government organized Korean Committee on Education in September 1945 in order to build a new Korean education, the majority of committee members were pro-Japanese collaborators who studied in Japanese imperial universities during the Japanese occupation (Banminjokmo-onjeyeonkuso, 1993; Cheong, 1985, pp. 85-88; Im, 1991). Furthermore, many graduates of the colonial and imperial universities became faculty members of the new university when Keijo University evolved into the Seoul National University in 1946 (Choi, 1990, p. 51).

11 Many Korean alumni became Japanese governmental or public officers and suffered
the Korean people (Chang, 1992; Lee, 1985). For instance, H. N. Lee, an alumnus of Korean Imperial University, was a county magistrate who drafted young Koreans for the Japanese Pacific War under the rule of Japanese imperialism, but he became a professor and president at a university in Seoul under the contemporary Korean government (Chang, 1992, p. 348). B. D. Jeon, as a public officer in Kyungki province, suppressed many patriotic Korean nationalists in the Japanese colonial period (Chang, 1992, p. 394).

12 The Chart states:

We have been born into this land, charged with the historic mission of regenerating the nation...With the sincere mind and strong body improving ourselves in learning and arts, developing the innate faculty of each...we will cultivate our creative power and pioneer spirit. We will give the foremost consideration to public good and order, set a value of efficiency and quality, and inheriting the tradition or mutual assistance rooted in love, respect and faithfulness, will promote the spirit of fair and warm cooperation... The love of the country and fellow countrymen together with the firm belief....we pledge ourselves to make new history with untiring effort and collective wisdom of the whole nation. (Ministry of Education, 1976, p. 3)
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