

Articles



Volume 16 Number 2

December 2013

The Review of Korean Studies

www.kci.go.kr

Articles

The Model Village of Daejangchon: The Image of Imperial Japan in the Eyes of Rural Korea

Chung Seung-Jin

Introduction

The history of the Korean Peninsula in the first half of the twentieth century is largely characterized by two dominant narratives: the modern history of colonial Korea and the imperial history of modern Japan. As in many Asian regions of the period, the history of the colony (i.e., Korea) often has been written in the language of imperialism (i.e., Japanese). On the other hand, just as the history of imperialism cannot stand on its own without experiences of the colonies, the characteristics of Japanese imperialism derive much from the colonial history of Korea. Appropriate here is François Mitterrand's remark that "there is no history of French imperialism without the history of Africa," made in his *Presence Française et Abandon* in 1957 (Said 1993, 178).

In order to control and dominate its colonies, imperial Japan engaged in what may be referred to as 'Japanese Orientalism,' a concept distinguishable from Western Orientalism (Tanaka 1993). 'Japanese Orientalism,' rooted at the time in what were considered Japanese psychic attributes such as inferiority complex toward the West, anxiety of latecomer, sense of security crisis, and ambition to build a Japan-led East Asian community, was implicated in the Japanese assimilation policies, forming a unique feature of Japanese colonialism. Japan carried out a much more intensified assimilation policy in colonial Korea than any other empires did to their colonies, for example, Algeria under France or Ireland under Great Britain (Gang 2004; Bak 2000). Colonial Korea was considered as an 'extension of inner land' (*naichi* 内地) within the Japanese empire because of its geographical proximity and racial and cultural affinity between the two countries (Dong 1973; Uchida 2011).

The assimilation of Korea remained a keynote policy of metropole Japan, whose colony was not significantly changed even under the so-called 'cultural rule' policy of the 1920s, and the policy had some of the harsher aspects of the previous decade much modified (Robinson 1988; Kim 2006; Caprio 2009). Compared to other colonies in Asia, Korea's colonial experience was rather short, lasting merely 35 years. Nonetheless, these years were significant as they involved a transformation in Korean life and the attempted assimilation of Koreans into Japanese subjects (Shin and Robinson 1999).

The Japanese immigration from (or literally, colonization [植民] by) the metropole to the colony is a representative aspect of imperial penetration, especially in its early stage (Elkins and Pederson 2005; Veracini, 2010). Even

though the initial Japanese policy of the mass settlement of Japanese farmers within Korean villages had proven a failure, colonial Korea witnessed a highly developed Japanese immigrant society, perhaps only rivaled by that in French Algeria (Choi 1993; Uchida 2008). Colonial Korea served a dual function for metropole Japan, both as a cheap source of food supply and as an outlet for an overflowing Japanese population. The transformation of colonial Korea gained further momentum after the Rice Riots in Japan in 1918, during which soaring rice prices incited Japanese consumers to take to the streets. Following the Japanese victory in the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905), Korea was officially annexed as a colony in 1910, and the first wave of Japanese immigrants was witnessed in this period (Asada 1968; Kimura 1989). Among the immigrants, the Hosokawa 細川 family was particularly distinguished for their high social status and prominence, based on their family background as prestigious feudal lords (Senda 1987).

This paper intends to explore the Japanese immigrant community of Daejangchon 大場村 (Jp. Ōbamura) in a colonial Korean village setting, examining the colonialist experiences in relation to both the homeland and the new colony. This paper analyzes the way the image or impression of imperial Japan was constructed and remembered by Korean rural villagers, focusing on a model Japanese village that was transplanted into their neighborhood. The Daejangchon village, constructed by the Hosokawa family, was hailed as a successful example of Japanese penetration of Korea and celebrated as a 'model village' in the Japanese style until the liberation of Korea in 1945 (Chung and Matsumoto 2005; Matsumoto and Chung 2009).

The Advance of the Hosokawa Family to Colonial Korea

The East Asian World Order in the Late Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries

The 1894 Donghak Peasant Uprisings in Korea triggered the Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895), of which the Japanese victory put an end to the traditional East Asian international order that was presided over by China and placed Japan in a superior position vis-à-vis China and Korea. After integrating Ezo

(Hokkaidō) and Ryūkyū (Okinawa) as internal colonies (Caprio 2009), Japan became an increasingly aggressive imperialistic state. It colonized Taiwan after the Sino-Japanese War, defeated Russia in 1905, and subsequently made Korea its protectorate—and then a colony in 1910 (Duus 1995). Within Japan itself, the Local Improvement Movement (1900-1918) laid the rural foundations for fascist control under the imperial system (Miyachi 1973; Pyle 1973).

Following the Meiji Restoration in 1868, feudal lords (*daimyō* 大名) were required to surrender their domain to the emperor (*hanseki hōkan* 版籍奉還), and these domains (*han* 藩) were then converted to a prefectural system governed by officials dispatched from central government in Tokyo. In 1869, the old feudal lords were given new titles of nobility (*kazoku* 華族), and in 1884 they were granted stipends in the form of state bonds. Japanese *kazoku* were encouraged to invest their commutation bonds in various national and industrial projects such as national banks, railway companies, marine transportation, factories, and insurance business. Others purchased land, both private and public, including the vast tract of cheap governmental land in Hokkaidō, for the purpose of farming or reclamation (Hatade 1963). In contrast to many former feudal lords who lost their political and economic positions after the restoration, the Hosokawa family of Kumamoto managed to take advantage of the changes and reforms of the time. They succeeded in transforming themselves into great landlords as well as *kazoku* capitalists, both in their old prefecture and in the new colony.

The Kumamoto Prefecture in Imperial Japan

The Hosokawa family had been feudal lords who ruled the domain of *Higo* Kumamoto (today's Kumamoto Prefecture) since 1633. When the domain's registers were handed over to the government in 1869, the last *daimyō*, Hosokawa Yoshikuni 細川韶邦, was appointed as the governor of the prefecture, and the following year his younger brother, Hosokawa Morihisa 細川護久, inherited the governorship according to the Japanese practice of primogeniture. Among the Japanese nobility, the Hosokawas ranked third in wealth, and also ranked fourth in the value of state bonds they were granted, both of which indicate the size and economic power of Kumamoto region within the empire. Morihisa was given the title of marquis, and his status was succeeded by Morishige 護成 and Moritatsu 護立 (Senda 1987). The name of Hosokawa

Moritatsu found in the land registers of colonial Korea is telling evidence of Japanese penetration to Korea (Chung and Matsumoto 2006).

Kumamoto Prefecture, located on Kyushu Island in southwest Japan, was one of the five largest domains (*han* 藩) in western Japan (*Kansai*) and was financially sound. In terms of the region's political attitudes towards Korea, there were a number of elite politicians and intellectuals who had an aggressive and chauvinist attitude toward Korea and championed the "punishment" of Korea in the 1873 Conquer-Korea Debate. This aggressive tendency had been implicated in the plot to murder Queen Min in 1895. Kumamoto was also known for the large Sixth Division military outpost there and for the Fifth Imperial High School. According to the 1911 *Bulletin of Imperial Japan's Agricultural Committee* (*Teikoku Nōkaihō* 帝國農會報), the prefectural government played a leading role in Japan's immigration project, encouraging large-scale migration to Korea comparable to the 'gold rush' in the U.S. This effort was a conspicuous source of Japanese fervor for Korean migration since the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese War. The Hosokawa family, who had enjoyed the prestige and privilege as feudal lords in the past and governors at present, invested significantly in both the land and agricultural development in Korea, successfully establishing themselves as large colonial landlords (Chung and Matsumoto 2005). Moreover, the family benefited from both geographical proximity to and agricultural affinity with the farm in the colony, and thus could establish a hierarchical relationship between the farm in homeland Kumamoto and its Korean branch.

Land Accumulation by the Marquis Hosokawa Family

The assets possessed by the Hosokawa family in the 1880s included state bonds, land, stock, candle manufacturing, and so on (Senda 1987). The Hosokawa family was a large shareholder in the national banks such as the Ninth Bank in Kumamoto and the *kazoku*-established Fifteenth Bank, as well as the Japan Railway Company. The interest earnings accruing from their state bonds amounted to twice their tenancy rent revenue, and the dividend income from stocks also far exceeded this. These revenues were used to purchase large amounts of land in both Japan and Korea.

The Hosokawa family had also been active in land investment since the 1890s, and had purchased in 1894 the permanent tenancy right to considerable amount of reclaimed land on the Kumamoto seacoast that could increase

their rent revenue. The family purchased further tracts of arable land, thereby acquiring by 1919 a total of 1,240 hectares (*chō* 町) of arable land, including the reclaimed coastal land. Beginning in 1891, the family prioritized the forest project, having acquired 2,000 hectares of forest area in Kumamoto before World War I. In Hokkaidō the family had purchased 1,300 hectares of forest prior to 1919. In Korea, the Hosokawa family also began to buy additional land in North Jeolla Province after 1904 and in South Jeolla Province after 1911. By 1919 the family had accumulated 1,400 hectares in North Jeolla and 600 hectares in South Jeolla Provinces (Chung and Matsumoto 2005). The real estate business run by the Hosokawa family in the 1920s, including a Tokyo branch, and their forest management in Kumamoto and Hokkaidō ran at a deficit, whereas the agricultural farms in Kumamoto and Jeolla Provinces were two great sources of profit.

The ‘Development’ of Daejangchon as an Agricultural “Semi-Town”

The Daejangchon village was one of earliest Japanese immigrant communities in Korea. The Japanese name of Daejangchon, ‘Ōbamura,’ seems to have been designated with the inauguration of the Hosokawa Farm in 1905. The village was an incongruous mixture of modern Japanese-style urbanity and the conventional rural landscape of Korea, transplanting an urban infrastructure into the rural village setting. As such, Daejangchon as an agricultural ‘semi-town’ was a starkly foreign contrast to the surrounding traditional Korean villages.

From Traditional Port Village to Modern Railway Town

The Honam Plain (North Jeolla Province), in which the Daejangchon village is located, extends along the Mangyeong-gang river valley. It has encompassed a vast belt of paddy field since the Joseon period (1392-1910) and thus aptly dubbed the breadbasket of Korea. According to Namgung Bong (1990), the village neighborhood had a relatively short history, and was originally a settlement of poor farmer-peddlers who generally had no kinship or other ties with each other. With the passage of time, however, its landscape changed rapidly. Located near the rice-exporting treaty port of Gunsan, which opened

in 1899, the region became renowned center for rice exports to Japan since the end of the Russo-Japanese War in 1905, characterized by ever-intensifying monoculture of rice and high concentration of Japanese landlords. The region was much comparable to Kumamoto in terms of geographical environment and the strong landlordism. Both regions had suitable environment for rice-farming, benefitted from monsoon rainfalls and well-developed irrigation facilities (Matsumoto 2003; Chung 2008).

The Hosokawa Farm opened immediately after the Russo-Japanese War in 1905, and development of a Japanese immigrant community soon followed. The railway construction of Honam Line and Jeonbuk Light Line drastically changed the landscape and the infrastructure of the region in the early 1910s, effectively transforming an idyllic port village known locally as “Bomgae” into a relatively modern railway town named “Öbamura,” or “Daejangchon.” The Mangyeong-gang embankment project that began in the mid-1920s closed down the villager’s access to the river or sea. The waterway became incorporated within the local train network instead, connected to the newly rising city of Iri, and as such began to develop as a town. As its connection to new cities such as Iri and Gunsan intensified, its traditional relationship with old commercial and administrative towns like Jeonju and Samnye became more tenuous. The physical change of landscape caused by the opening of the railway track, coupled with administrative reorganization, also entailed a change in the cognitive map of Korean villagers, who gradually developed closer psychological ties to the modern urban areas, as well as a wider notion of local community.

Effectively, Daejangchon was quickly transformed to a farm village with modern urban amenities. The mixture of town infrastructure and agricultural farming was reminiscent of the homeland Hosokawa Farm in Kumamoto, and the village stood aloof and foreign amid traditional Korean villages. The urban part of Daejangchon was centered by the railway station with a small multi-ethnic society, which was dominated by Japanese immigrants and a small number of Koreans that a Japanese who visited the area would feel “as if he were walking around an ‘inner land’ (*naichi* 内地) village” (Matsumoto and Chung 2009, 126). As such, Daejangchon clearly represented an aspect of imperial penetration into Korea. Yet, unlike other Japanese farms in Korea that were controlled by the Oriental Development Company and where the Japanese diasporas remained more or less isolated (Choi 1993), Daejangchon constituted a relatively more integrative ethnic society comprising a mixed residence (*naisen*

zakkyo 内鮮雜居) of forty Japanese and ninety Korean households.

Construction of Social Infrastructure and a 'Gray Zone'

In Daejangchon, modern facilities and institutions such as the railway, roads, communication lines, security infrastructure, irrigation network, schools, hospitals, architectural firms and religious institutions mushroomed during the period of 1905-1915 (Chung and Matsumoto 2005). Among these developmental projects, school and police station were first built in Iksan County. The success of these projects owed much to the negotiation skills and capital of the Hosokawa family, whose distinctive management methods enabled establishment of modern facilities based on large-scale investments or donation. These undertakings had broad influence that was felt beyond the individual agricultural farm. For example, the establishment of the Jeonik Irrigation Association under the leadership of the family extended water supplies to a much larger area, thereby bringing economic stability to the farmland worked by Korean tenants (Chung 2008). By 1915, Daejangchon was celebrated as a successful immigrant 'model village' by the Government-General of Korea (hereafter GGK). Considering that the official 'model village project' of the GGK began in earnest in the late 1920s, the success of the Daejangchon project seems to represent an early transplantation of the local improvement movement from the family's homeland (i.e., Japan) that had been well underway, rather than a product of colonial rural policy in Korea. Therefore it can be argued that Daejangchon represents how quickly what Edward Said called the "secondary or lesser culture" of the metropole adapted itself to the structure of colonial discipline (Said 1993, 112). The 'secondary or low culture' of metropole Japan was displayed before the colonized Koreans as a microcosm of the empire, as a model to be emulated by them.

From a broader regional view, Daejangchon, along with Hwangdeung, Osan-ri, and Mokcheonpo, was one of the satellite semi-towns that surrounded the nearby large town of Iri to which they were connected by railway. This group of satellite semi-towns was a product of imitation of the planned-city development of Iri and thus exhibited a large developmental gap compared to the neighboring traditional villages. Iri was a newly developed center of Japanese immigrants and had been the administrative seat of Iksan County since 1911. Among the satellite towns of Iri, Daejangchon was made prominent as it

became the administrative seat of the Chunpo sub-county (*myeon*) in 1921 (replacing Insu-ri), and it was also connected to the port city of Gunsan via Iri by rail line. Daejangchon had a commercial link to the Osaka rice market via Gunsan, as well as a technological link in terms of agricultural management to the Hosokawa Farm Headquarters in Kumamoto.

The development of Daejangchon based on the construction of large-scale social infrastructure eventually created a sort of 'gray zone' between Japanese-style modern cities such as Iri and traditional Korean villages such as Insu-ri, thus representing a 'colonial modernity' that belonged neither to modern Japan nor to traditional Korea (Yun 2003). The colonial development projects of local society sometimes provided opportunity for collaborationist Koreans with the requisite education and economic means to improve their lot. Kim Seongcheol 金聖哲 (1913-2004), the only Korean employee at the Hosokawa Farm, witnessed firsthand the 'gray zone,' in which some opportunistic Koreans, who were rarely found among the Korean peasantry, sought economic profits through cooperation with the Japanese (Chung and Matsumoto 2005, 269). In the neighboring Korean villages, therefore, the considerable effect of the 'developmental boom' of Daejangchon might have mitigated the sense of a dichotomy between collaboration with and resistance against the Japanese colonialists.

However, the vast majority of Korean villagers lacked the economic and cultural means to utilize the modern facilities that the colonial development projects provided. This phenomenon was a backwater reality of colonial Korean villages that existed behind the façade of rapid colonial growth. Another witness, Cheon Sang-un 千相雲 (1927-), who had spent his adolescence in Daejangchon and frequented the train station with his Japanese classmates recalls that though there did exist some Korean-run stores in front of the train station, the customers were mostly Japanese, with only few Korean farmers (interview, August 13, 2010). His recollection reveals that under apparent interethnic congregation of Koreans and Japanese, there existed real gaps in income (i.e., purchasing power) and culture between the two groups. Many anthropologists of rural society point out that the reluctance of local peasants to accept modern facilities derives from rural underdevelopment compared to rapid advancement elsewhere, as well as from conventional mores (Wolf 1966; Scott 1985; Sorensen 1999). An overwhelming majority of Korean peasants remained alienated from the Japanese-led modernization and urbanization, not

only because of their limited economic resources but because of the traditional ethos of rural community.

Management of the 'Model Farm' and Rice Exportation

Besides the Hosokawa Farm, Daejangchon included other renowned Japanese-run farms such as the Imamura Farm and the Tasaka Farm, all of which were also run with a tenancy system and specialized in rice production. The head of the Imamura Farm, had been a school teacher in the Kumamoto Prefecture and served as the vice president of the Agricultural Committee of Iksan County. For his work as the head of a 'model farm,' he received a silver medal from the GGK in 1915. The head of the Tasaka Farm, who was probably from the Hosokawa family, served as the president of the Jeonik Irrigation Association in the early 1910s, which was founded by the Hosokawa Farm. These farms were connected through a common irrigation network, which brought economic stability to their farm management. Also included in Daejangchon was the model Daejang Sericulture Association. The Jeonik Irrigation Association substantially sponsored by the Hosokawa Farm was financially sound, and thus it served as a 'model association' as well.

The tenants of these farms were predominantly poor Koreans, while the Japanese immigrants were mostly half-tenants or smallholders. As will be discussed below, the Hosokawa Farm employed double standards in its management of these two groups, delineating a clear 'class division' between them. Most importantly, Korean peasants received a smaller income than their Japanese counterparts in spite of little difference in their productivity. Korean tenants under Japanese management experienced simultaneously high productivity and relative deprivation. The economic position of the Korean tenants was also reflected in their household sites, which on the surface appeared to be relatively smaller (averaging 80 *pyeong*) than those of the Japanese.

Taking advantage of the tenancy system, the rice storage, the railway from Daejangchon via Iri to Gunsan, and the sea route to Ōsaka, the Hosokawa Farm was able to collect and export a large quantity of rice to Japan. The rising demand for rice in the metropole dictated and intensified the monoculture of rice, the tenancy mode, and technological dependence. The Imamura Farm, a model farm in Daejangchon, thriving on the favorable rice market in Japan, took the lead in transferring the advanced technological and managerial skills of

the owners' homeland (i.e., Japan) to the colonial Iksan County. The head of the farm, as the vice president of the Iksan Agricultural Committee, played a leading role in promoting fertilizer production, modifying species, and so on. Notably, the introduction and distribution of botanical fertilizers such as *Jaunyeong* in the late 1900s was the first of its kind in Korea. Considering that the colonial agricultural policy of the GGK began in earnest in 1920, designated as the "Plan for Increasing Rice Production," this earlier movement by the Japanese farms placed Daejangchon on par with its contemporaries in Kumamoto Prefecture, yet created a conspicuous gap with the surrounding Korean villages.

According to the *Bulletin of the Agricultural Committee of Kumamoto* (*Kumamoto Nokaiho* 熊本農會報) in the 1900s, the advanced rice cultivation system, which involved so-called "large inputs of labor and fertilizer" based on extended irrigation network and increased fertilizer application, had already been common practice in Kumamoto Prefecture as a part of the Local Improvement Movement (1900-1918). This technology was quickly imported to the colony after the Russo-Japanese War with the arrival of the Japanese landlords and the basic strategy for Korean farm management. Given that there was no such designation as a "model farm" in the homeland Hosokawa Farm in Kumamoto, the earlier establishment of a model farm in the colony is a historical irony that reflects the agricultural gap between Japan and Korea, and at the same time highlights the rapid adaptability of Japanese techniques transplanted in Korean agriculture. In short, what would have been a common farm in the metropole was exhibited as a model farm and model village, and as such formed a striking symbol of the advanced Japanese empire in rural Korea.

A Colonial Model Village and the Realities of Assimilation

The urban part of Daejangchon was an attempt to imitate the cityscapes of the new town of Iri and the port city of Gunsan, albeit on a much smaller scale. Yet Daejangchon was more or less an adaptation of the homeland Hosokawa Farm in Kumamoto to the colonial setting, rather than being representative of general rural development under colonial policy. Because of its rapid change and advancement (and its heterogeneity), Koreans in Daejangchon experienced difficulty and alienation in adapting to the modern changes that they experienced.

The Local Improvement Movement and the 'Self-Ruling' Village

As the Korean branch of the homeland Hosokawa Farm, the development of Daejangchon progressed in line with that of the Kumamoto headquarters. The development was nothing less than an application of the Local Improvement Movement as conducted in imperial Japan, which was officially launched by the Interior Affairs Ministry (Naimushō 内務省) in the aftermath of the Russo-Japanese War so as to mobilize rural resources. Initially, it focused on propagating model cases rather than on specific projects, but soon extended to include autonomous efforts for rural development and reforms to daily customs (Miyachi 1973; Ōkama 1994). The Meiji government incorporated Shintō shrines that had been hitherto scattered among villages into a nationwide system in which there was one Shintō shrine at each administrative village level, thus fostering a sense of spiritual unity among villagers, based on a sense of loyalty to the emperor (Ariizumi 1976). In 1908, compulsory education was extended to six years, and moral education was reinforced to promote national integration as well as local patriotism. In agricultural reforms, new techniques related to seeds, fertilizer and pesticide were distributed, sometimes forcefully by the military police (the so-called *Sabel* サーバル Policy), and a new solar calendar was introduced to 'modernize' the everyday life-rhythm of ordinary peasants (Ōkado 1995).

In 1905, the foundation of the Hosokawa Farm in the colony transplanted the homeland model so as to build what was perceived to be an ideal immigrant community, based on the family's experiences with the Local Improvement Movement in Japan. The Jeonik Irrigation Association, the Imamura Farm, and the Iri Agricultural School were key examples of this enterprise. Nevertheless, the expansion of modern facilities masked the highly closed nature of the immigrant community in Daejangchon. There, the traditional ethos endemic in Japanese villages remained in operation. Predominant in this was the principle of closed community, which involves the concept of a 'self-ruling' village (*jichisonraku* 自治村落) in which minimal living conditions are ensured through exclusion of non-members of the community, along with a strategy of consolidating community identity by fostering a sense of closed membership (Saito 1989). What was unique to Daejangchon was the coexistence of incorporation and otherness within a common space shared by Koreans and Japanese residents. The following two examples illustrate the dual nature of the immigrant society

created by the contradiction between these two forces.

Two elementary schools were founded in 1909 and 1923, respectively, in the Chunpo sub-county to which the Daejangchon village belonged. The Hosokawa Farm donated to both schools; the former, the Ordinary Primary School, was the first of its kind in Iksan County and was open only to Japanese children; the latter, the Public Common School, was to be established for Koreans much later, as the eighth elementary school in the county. Thus, the Hosokawa Farm evidently placed a much higher priority on educating immigrant children than their Korean peers, as seen through varying quality of donation and the foundation periods of two schools. In addition, the Hosokawa Farm contributed a substantial sum to the building of a Shintō shrine in the village in 1907 so as to promote indigenous Japanese religion and customs. It is evident that the Hosokawa Farm had a strong interest in fostering spiritual integration among the Japanese immigrants through native religious practices in the shrine. Furthermore, it evinced ethnic favoritism in introducing a modern hospital, an architectural firm, and other facilities for the benefit of the immigrant society.

Daejangchon was an important example of a 'self-ruling' village established in the colony. Though it was a rare example to be found in the colony, it reflected the Local Improvement Movement in metropole Japan. The village was constructed mostly under the auspices of the Hosokawa Farm, comparable to the 'rule by the renowned' in Japan. The Japanese immigrants might well have evoked a kind of nostalgia for the Hosokawa family, whose members had been 'paternalistic' feudal lords in the old Kumamoto domain (*han*). The Hosokawa Farm acquired the legitimacy of local rule by its enormous investment in local infrastructure, and its leadership was hegemonic over the village members. Yet the 'paternalistic' hegemony of the Hosokawa Farm had a different effect on the Korean villagers, who had different sources for their solidarity. According to Hahm Han-hee's study (2005), the rice monoculture reinforced the corporatist tendency of the Korean peasant community due to their shared experiences with rice co-production and co-consumption in the busy farming season. Moreover, the enhanced integration and unity within the Japanese immigrant community in Daejangchon brought home the ethnic otherness and schism to Korean villagers, thus further deepening their sense of ethnic division.

Separation, Alienation, and the Local Community

The Hosokawa Farm in Japan (about 1,400 hectares) was scattered across three administrative units in Kumamoto Prefecture: Kumamoto City, Uto County and Yatsushiro County. According to the *Historical Collection of the Local Improvement Movement in Japan* (*Chihō kairyō undōshi shiryō shūsei* 地方改良運動史資料集成), within these areas, there did not exist model villages or model farms, as Daejangchon or Imamura Farm had been designated. Even in Yatsushiro County, where the headquarters of the Hosokawa Farm supposedly was based (Senda 1987), neither a “model village” (including *jichisonraku*) nor a “model farm” was found or developed. Given this, Daejangchon being referred to as a “model branch” of the homeland farm was exceptionally notable because what would have been a commonplace farm in the metropole, when introduced to the colony, established itself as a model farm. This is clearly indicative of the gap in agricultural technology and modernization that existed between metropole Japan and colonial Korea during the tempestuous time of the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905) and the annexation of Korea (1910). Needless to say, the early settlement of an advanced Japanese farm in the underdeveloped colonial environment much relieved the socioeconomic gap between the two regions. It can be argued that the focus was on this gap, rather than intentional discrimination.

The modern facilities in Daejangchon produced an economic and cultural gap between the two ethnic groups in terms of economic power, markets, education and medical care. The Daejangchon village, by and large, was composed mainly of Korean tenants and Japanese smallholders. Class and ethnic divisions were evident between the Korean villagers and Japanese immigrants, visible in differences in everyday lifestyles and behavioral patterns. The Koreans found themselves limited in their access to the modern facilities for economic activities, commerce, education, and medical care. For example, the gap in income and purchasing power resulted in a sort of ‘division of market’ wherein the Japanese bought their goods in the permanent market at Iri or in downtown Daejangchon, while the poor Koreans did so in the traditional five-day markets in the towns of Samnye or Iri. Considering that the marketplace serves as a venue for communications and social contact, the two groups obviously and inevitably ended up in separate communicative spheres. According to Cheon Sang-un, there were only few Korean-run stores among the twenty or so shops

in front of the Daejangchon Station in the late 1930s, but Korean tenants were not the main customers of these establishments; rather, they used the five-day market some distance away (interview, February 24, 2011).

Different regulations were also applied to Korean tenants and Japanese immigrants within the Hosokawa Farm. The Japanese smallholders were to follow the rules and norms of the Japanese ‘self-ruling’ village, whereas the Korean peasants were subject to a separate set of tenant regulations. The Hosokawa Farm nominally propagated *naisenryūwa* 内鮮融和, that is, ‘equality and harmony between Japanese and Koreans,’ yet this was not supported as the Japanese immigrants declined to implement any sign of equality between the two groups. Instead, they displayed an ambiguous attitude toward assimilation policy by calling for Koreans to become “imperial subjects”—but at the same time denying them equal rights (Uchida 2008). Even though there were some efforts to improve the Korean standard of living, such as that which occurred in the Imamura Farm in Daejangchon, this fell short of resolving ‘the class division’ problem that was based on the unequal possession of properties by the Koreans and Japanese, respectively. Most probably, this socioeconomic gap engendered a sense of frustration and alienation among Koreans.

The separate schools established for Korean and Japanese children in Daejangchon were an example of institutional gap and outright segregation on the basis of ethnic group. The medical facilities may have shown a similar situation to those in education and the consumer markets (Matsumoto 2005). Religious practices such as visits to the Shintō shrine and the usage of different languages further articulated the disintegration between Koreans and Japanese. The Japanese immigrants held a monthly traditional meeting of Japanese villagers called *yoriai* 寄り合い, as was practiced in the ‘self-ruling’ villages of their homeland, to foster communal unity among them, thereby excluding their Korean neighbors. Confronted with this barrier of Japanese-style closed community, even the Koreans in the ‘gray zone’ must have felt some sense of alienation. In the last years of colonial rule, the GKK intensified its assimilation policies to dissolve ethnic and linguistic gaps between the two peoples by eliminating sources of Korean identity through the means of abolishing Korean language and surnames. Yet this attempt to assimilate Koreans as Japanese subjects, the *kōminka* 皇民化 policy, had little success, not only because of Korean resistance but also significantly because of refusal from the Japanese immigrant community (Miyata 1985; Uchida 2008). In addition to the

discrimination, the economic, cultural and institutional gaps were a barrier on the path to integration and equality between the two peoples. The psyche of the Japanese colonists was comparable to that of the British against the Irish, or the French against their Algerian subjects, in their imperial eras (Bak 2000).

Changes after the Liberation

Following the liberation of Korea from Japanese rule in 1945, the Japanese in Korea were called upon to return to their homeland, thus dissolving their immigrant community. The deserted Daejangchon village reverted to the pre-existing settlement, *Bomgae* village. With the Japanese gone, the interregional link between the colony and the metropole that had been mediated by rice exportation was also dissolved. Since this connection had been the driving force in regional development, its loss meant a cessation of the former economic growth and the lapse of the village into obscurity in both economic and cultural terms. Daejangchon's experiences shows that the developmental projects in the colonial period were far from a 'self-ruling' development well-rooted in a local society. Rather, the model village exemplified 'isolated' development, which became increasingly alienated from its surroundings along the progress. The village's history in the aftermath of liberation was also different from its Japanese counterpart after World War II.

The Hosokawa Farm was dismantled by post-liberation reforms, such as the disposal work of enemy (i.e., Japanese) property under the U.S. military government, and the Land Reform launched with the outbreak of the Korean War in 1950. The Korean tenants of the farm at last became small owner-farmers with less than three hectares under the Land Reform (Chung and Matsumoto 2006). In short, the owner-cultivator system created by the Land Reform replaced the established landlord system at a stroke. However, the vulnerability of Daejangchon without the Hosokawa Farm was soon evident. Cheon Sang-un witnessed that the twenty or so stores in front of the Daejangchon Station kept their business even after the liberation, between 1945 to 1950, before going out of business in the aftermath of the Korean War 1950 (interview, February 24, 2011). However, the merchants began to migrate to neighboring cities such as Iri or Gunsan due to a business slowdown. Colonial cities like Iri or Gunsan managed to maintain their growth potential even after the colonialists left, but the semi-towns such as Daejangchon, under

the sweeping forces of Land Reform and economic recession, lost their urban functions and reverted to pure rural village status.

Under post-liberation government, the modern facilities of Daejangchon reached different endings. The Ordinary Primary School reserved for Japanese students was relegated as a branch of the Public Common School for Korean students. The Jeonik Irrigation Association had been incorporated into the Jeonbuk Irrigation Association in 1941, and then was placed under Korean management after liberation. The Japanese Shintō shrine, modern hospital and architectural firm were abolished. The famous Agricultural School at Iri was converted to a college with two-year undergraduate courses. Despite some changes in the milieu of the post-liberation, public facilities like the sub-county administrative office, the railway station, the police station, and the post office continued their services, despite the change of governance under Korean management. The legacy of Daejangchon does not point to a clean break from its colonial past. Reminiscences of Daejangchon may hold a tinge of nostalgia for its affluence and prosperity.

Daejangchon and the Hosokawa Farm, as a case study, highlights the controversial issue of continuity versus discontinuity in the colonial legacy, and at the same time problematizes interpretation of colonial modernity as well as manifesting the inherent contradictions of assimilation policies (Shin and Robinson 1999; Caprio 2009; Uchida 2011). This raises the question of the proper balance between making normative judgments and acknowledging factual achievements when it comes to evaluation of colonial development and assimilation. However, it is clear that behind the image of affluent model village lies a gloomy memory of inequality and alienation for the Daejangchon peasants. Probably, this history represents a kind of distorted and ambiguous memory.

Conclusion

The imperialist mission of civilizing Korea was propaganda for colonial rule, and at the same time, the ideological motive for assimilating the colonized (Said 1993). Following the Japanese immigration to Korea, the establishment of a model village in the early colonial period demonstrated the characteristics of Japanese colonialism as well as Japanese Orientalism (i.e., assimilation through

development, assimilation and separation). Japanese immigration was expected to enhance the modernization and assimilation of rural Korea, which in turn could stimulate the growth of markets in the colony and further integrate such growth into those of the metropole. In the long term, however, the immigration policy of Japan barely succeeded in achieving its goals, as was clearly shown in the failure of the immigration project of the Oriental Development Company. In the latter period of colonial rule, the GGK shifted from the former immigration policy to one of ‘transform Koreans into imperial subjects’ (*kōminka*). This assimilation policy under the slogan of *naisen ittai* 內鮮一體 (“Japan and Korea are one body”) was not only confronted by Korean resistance but also disinclination on the part of Japanese immigrants.

The assimilation policy engendered contradictory responses within the Japanese immigrant community in Daejangchon: deep down, the Japanese did not want substantial equality and integration with their Korean neighbors. At the same time, marginalized Koreans had difficulty in catching up with or adjusting themselves to the advancements of Japanese immigrant society. The sentiments of alienation and frustration entailed by rapid development often transformed into a kind of reluctance towards modernization. Ethnic and cultural divisions were evident in Daejangchon, coupled with further economic inequality between Korean tenants and Japanese smallholders, which in turn widened the institutional gap to an almost unbridgeable extent. Though various economic growth took place in rural Korea, a radical difference still remained in economic power and political position between the two peoples. Moreover, there existed an off-the-record ‘everyday politics’ of smallholding peasants, who balked at the assimilation policy in covert ways (Scott 1985).

Once apparently a model village of an advanced empire in the eyes of Korean peasants during the colonial period, Daejangchon represented an artificial transplantation of the Japanese Local Improvement Movement under the guidance of the Hosokawa Farm. Advanced techniques were quickly transferred to the village without much consideration of the local context. The Japanese immigrants in the village maintained separatist attitude toward their Korean neighbors, retaining the closed community of a Japanese-style ‘self-ruling village.’ Substantive assimilation with the Korean people was impossible due to the closed nature of the Japanese immigrant community. Hence, while the development of Daejangchon was exceptionally hailed as a model case of local improvement in rural Korea, it was in fact a failure in terms of interethnic and

local integration and stability.

In addition, there remained a wide gap between Korean and Japanese villages in their level of modernization, as was evident in the development in agriculture and social infrastructure in Daejangchon and its surrounding villages. Daejangchon was a sort of ‘island’ isolated amidst the sea of Korean villages. The dilemma of Daejangchon was that the more development and intimate economic ties with the metropole it pursued, the more tenuous its tie to the surrounding Korean villages became, as there would be fewer chances that the Korean peasants could catch up with their Japanese neighbors. We may suppose there was a resentful attitude among Korean peasants toward the Japanese in Daejangchon, arising from the absence of a horizontal reciprocal relation between villagers. This fact became evident by the quick disappearance of the Japanese-type ambience in the village after the Korean liberation in 1945.

The Daejangchon case has left a contradictory image of Japanese assimilation in modern Korean history. On the one hand, it has been considered as a successful case of a model village initiated by Japanese colonialism. On the other hand, however, it did not inspire any models of rural development in Korea after the liberation. Rather, the image of a model village is remembered as a confusing, alien district by the Korean villagers. This paper forms preliminary research into the adoption pattern of local peasants faced with the rapid modernization of the colonialists, an exemplification of a model village transplanted from the metropole. The topics of the local peasantry’s ‘structures of attitude and reference’ (Said 1993) in their experiences of colonial modernization await future research.

References

- Ariizumi, Sadao 有泉貞夫. 1976. “Meiji kokuka to minshū tōgō” 明治国家と民衆統合. In vol.17, bk. 4 of *Iwanami kōza Nihon rekishi* 岩波講座日本歴史, 236-37. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Asada, Kyōji 淺田喬二. 1968. *Nippon teikokushugi to kyū-shokuminchi jinuissei* 日本帝國主義と舊植民地地主制. Tokyo: Ryukei Shosha.
- Bak, Jihang. 2000. *Jeguk juui: Sinhwa wa hyeonsil* [Imperialism: Myth and reality]. Seoul: Seoul Daehakgyo Chulpanbu.
- Caprio, Mark. 2009. *Japanese Assimilation Policies in Colonial Korea, 1910-*

1945. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.
- Choe, Won-gyu. 1993. "Ilje ui chogi Hanguk singminchaek gwa Ilbonin nonggeop imin" [Early Japanese colonial policy toward Korea and Japanese agricultural immigrants]. *Dombang Hakji* 77, 78, 79:691-743.
- Chung, Seung-jin (Jeong, Seungjin). 2008. "Ilje sidae Jeonik suri johap ui jeongae gwajeonggwa geu ui yeoksajeok uiui" [Formation and historical implications of Jeonik Irrigation Association in colonial Korea]. *Nongchon Gyeongje* 31 (6): 79-102.
- Chung, Seung-jin and Takenori Matsumoto. 2005. "Yeongju eseo singminji daejiju ro: Ilbon Hosokawa ga ui Hanguk eseuoi toji jipjeok" [Transformation into the colonial landlord from the Japanese feudal lord: Case of Marquis Hosokawa family]. *Yeoksa Bipyong* 73:241-70.
- _____. 2006. "Toji daejang e natanan nongji gaehyeok ui silsang (1945-1970): Jeonbuk 'Iksan-gun toji daejang' ui bunseok" [Realities of the Land Reform in Iksan County (1945-1970): Analysis of land registers of Iksan County]. *Hanguk Gyeongje Yeongu* 22:41-77.
- Dong, Wonmo. 1973. "Assimilation and Social Mobilization in Korea: A Study of Japanese Colonial Policy and Political Integration Effects." In *Korea under Japanese Colonial Rule: Studies of the Policy and Techniques of Japanese Colonialism*, edited by Andrew C. Nahm, 146-82. Michigan: Western Michigan University Press.
- Duus, Peter. 1995. *The Abacus and the Sword: The Japanese Penetration of Korea, 1895-1910*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Elkins, Caroline and Susan Pederson. 2005. *Settler Colonialism in the Twentieth Century: Projects, Practices, Legacies*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Gang, Man-gil. 2004. *Ilbon gwa seogu ui singmin tongchi bigyo* [Comparison of colonial rule between Japan and the West]. Seoul: Seonin.
- Hahm, Han-hee. 2005. "Rice and Koreans: Three Identities and Meanings." *Korea Journal* 45 (2): 89-106.
- Hatade, Isao 旗手勳. 1963. *Nippon ni okeru dainojo no seisei to tenkai* 日本における大農場の生成と展開. Tokyo: Ochanomizu Shobo.
- Kim, Dongno. 2006. *Ilje singminji sigi ui tongchicheje hyeongseong* [The formation of the ruling system in Japanese colonial period]. Seoul: Hyeon Publishing.
- Kimura, Kenji 木村健二. 1989. *Zaicho Nipponjin no shakaishi* 在朝日本人の社會史. Tokyo: Mirai-sha.

- Matsumoto, Takenori 松本武祝. 2003, “Shokuminchi Chosen ni okeru nōgyō yosui kaihatsu to suiri chitsujiyo no kaihen” 植民地朝鮮における農業用水開発と水利秩序の改編. *Chosenshi Kenkyukai Ronbunshu* 朝鮮史研究會論文集 41:145-71.
- _____. 2005. *Chosen nōson no ‘shokuminchi kindai’ keiken* 朝鮮農村の‘植民地近代’経験. Tokyo: Shakai Heironsha.
- Matsumoto, Takenori and Chung, Seung-jin. 2009. “On the Hosokawa Farm and the History of Daejangchon, a Japanese-style Village in Colonial Korea: Dilemmas in Rural Development.” *Korea Journal* 49 (3): 121-50.
- Miyachi, Masato 宮地正人. 1973. *Nichiro sengo seishi no kenkyū* 日露戦後政治史の研究. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppansha.
- Miyata, Setsuko 宮田節子. 1985. *Chosen minshu to ‘kōminka’ seisaku* 朝鮮民衆と‘皇民化’政策. Tokyo: Miraisha.
- Namgung, Bong. 1990. “Hacheon yuyeok ildae ganseokjisang ui gancheok chwirak yuhyeong e gwanhan yeongu: Mangyeonggang, Dongjingang yuyeok ul sarye jiyek euro” [Study on patterns of reclamation settlement on the tidal flats along the riverside: Case study of Mangyeong and Dongjin River basins]. PhD Diss., Seoul National University.
- Ōkama, Kunio 大鎌邦雄. 1994. *Gyoseison no shiko taisei to shuraku* 行政村の執行体制と集落. Tokyo: Nihon Keizai Hyoronsha.
- Ōkado, Masakatsu 大門正克. 1995. “Nōmin no seikatsu no henka” 農民の生活の変化. In vol. 4 of *Kōza Sekaishi* 講座世界史, 77-80. Tokyo: Tōkyō Daigaku Shuppansha.
- Pyle, Kenneth. 1973. “The Technology of Japanese Nationalism: The Local Improvement Movement, 1900-1918.” *Journal of Asian Studies* 33 (1): 51-65.
- Robinson, Michael. 1988. *Cultural Nationalism in Colonial Korea, 1920-1925*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Said, Edward. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage Books.
- Saito, Hitoshi 齋藤仁. 1989. *Nōgyō mondai no tenkai to jichisonraku* 農業問題の展開と自治村落. Tokyo: Nihon Keizai Hyoronsha.
- Scott, James. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Senda, Minoru 千田稔. 1987. “Kazoku shihon toshite no Koshaku-Hosokawaka no seiritu, tenkai” 華族資本としての侯爵細川家の成立・展開. *Tochi Seidoshi Gaku* 土地制度史學 116:40-59.

- Shin, Gi-wook and Michael Robinson, eds. 1999. *Colonial Modernity in Korea*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sorensen, Clark W. 1999. "National Identity and the Creation of the Category "Peasant" in Colonial Korea." In *Colonial Modernity in Korea*, edited by Gi-wook Shin and Michael Robinson, 288-307. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Tanaka, Stefan. 1993. *Japan's Orient: Rendering Pasts into History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Uchida, Jun. 2008. "Chongnyeokjeon sigi jae-Joseon Ilbonin ui 'Nae-Seon ilche' jeongchaek e daehan hyeomnyeok" [Collaboration of Japanese settlers with "naisen ittai" (Japan and Korea as one body) policy in colonial Korea under total war]. *Asea Yeongu* 51 (1): 14-52.
- _____. 2011. "A Sentimental Journey: Mapping the Interior Frontier of Japanese Settlers in Colonial Korea." *The Journal of Asian Studies* 70 (3): 706-29.
- Veracini, Lorenzo. 2010. *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*. London and New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wolf, Eric. 1966. *Peasants*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Yun, Haedong. 2003. *Singminji ui hoesaek jidae* [The gray zone of the colony]. Seoul: Yeokbi.

Chung Seung-jin (seungjinch@hotmail.com) is an Adjunct Professor at the Department of Economics and the Academy of East Asian Studies, Sungkyunkwan University, Korea, where he teaches economic history and Korean culture. He received his Ph.D. in economics from Sungkyunkwan University in 2002. He is the author of *A Local Economic History in Modern Korea* (2003), and the co-author of *Social Change of Naju County in Colonial Korea* (2008).

Abstract

In contrast to many feudal lords who lost their political and economic positions in the aftermath of the Meiji Restoration (1868), the Hosokawa family from Kumamoto Japan succeeded in transforming themselves to be significant landlords, both in their old prefecture and in the new Korean colony. The Hosokawa family came to Korea immediately after the Russo-Japanese War (1904-5), where they acquired a large tract of land upon which they built a tenant farm and model village. The family put forth a large amount of investment and donation to the immigrant village of *Daejangchon*, so as to develop social infrastructure as well as to carry out land improvement for rice production. *Daejangchon* was in North Jeolla Province, a famous bread-basket in Korea, and was a Korean branch of the Hosokawa Farm Headquarters in the Kumamoto Prefecture. As a model village, *Daejangchon* experienced rapid development among immigrant society. However, this highly developed community caused confusion and alienation among the native Korean villagers, and presented itself as a contradiction to the assimilation policy of the colonial authorities. This was because *Daejangchon* represented a kind of transplantation of the Japanese local improvement movement to the colony, rather than an outgrowth of autonomous rural development in the context of Korean local society.

Keywords: immigration, development, model village, assimilation, alienation