

Yang Ilmo

Fusion of Horizon in the Korean Enlightenment Movement: 1880-1890

Abstract

This paper aims to analyze the ideology of the early Korean enlightenment intellectuals by focusing on the fusion of horizons. The conception of horizon was derived from H. G. Gadamer's phenomenology. According to Gadamer, 'understanding is always interpretation, and meaning is always the fusion of horizons between the interpretation and the object'. I would like to argue that there were four horizons, that is, Silhak rooted in the late Chosŏn period, Chosŏn Confucianism, Chinese academism of 19th century and Japan's New learning in the process of Chosŏn intellectuals' understanding and interpreting the West in the late 19th century. In this paper, I will inquire into the complexities of horizons of Chosŏn enlightenment intellectuals by way of reviewing their two problematic questions. The first was whether Chosŏn was barbaric or not. The second question was whether Confucianism is unpractical. Finally I would like to bring forward the example of Pak Yŏnghyo' "Kŏnbaeksŏ" (1888), which was addressed to King Kochong during his period of exile in Japan. I think it will be more wholesome approach to consider his work as a fusion between Confucianism and Western learning via Japan, rather than investigating its theoretical inconclusiveness, in order to reveal Pak Yŏnghyo's complicated horizons, which incorporate all the horizons of Confucianism, Japan and the West.

Keywords: Korean Enlightenment Movement, Fusion of Horizon, Western Learning, Pak Yŏnghyo, Gadamer

Introduction: The West as the Other

The Chinese civilization has maintained a self-sufficient system of culture centred on Confucianism in a long history. Before encountering the West by the late 19th century, Chosŏn constructed its society under the strong

influence of Confucian ideology while professing itself as a civilization, so called “a little China”. Yet, the advance of Western powers into Asia from the mid-19th century made East Asian countries move to the stage of “World history”. As Western military powers began to impose Asian countries to sign unequal treaties, there appeared conflicting opinions in the process of understanding the West as the others. Chosŏn signed with Western power without exception during late 19th century. These regions began to compete with a civilization different from the traditional Sino-centric order, and the West came to be understood as an unavoidable force in the Asian world order.

Based on the logic of the Confucian Cultural sphere that draw a line between civilization and barbarism, it was inevitable to denounce the West as savage, implementing the policy of seclusion. Yet, as the West arose on the East Asian horizon, it gradually became the object of speculation to the Confucian officer-scholars. From the 1880s, a group of intellectuals began to emerge in Chosŏn who tried to embrace not only the technology, but also the political theory and institutions of the West and attempt an institutional reformation. As the West transformed into an object of speculation, various reactions, ranging from rejection to acceptance of the West, were proposed. These opinions on the West were different from each other, on the basis of individual understandings of the West. For these scholars, to contemplate the West was the process of encountering a new horizon upon their previous horizon of perception.

In the late 19th century Chosŏn politics, there were two oppositional opinions; One advocated “defending orthodoxy and rejecting heterodoxy (衛正斥邪)” which renounced the acceptance of Western civilization, the other raised a slogan of enlightenment (開化) that attempted political reformation through the reception of foreign institutions. Despite the difference in cognitive attitudes between two political groups, it can be said that both are standing on the same horizon, because they contemplate the ideology and politics of Chosŏn in the horizon of the West. If the West was to be introduced as a civilization, there follows the following two questions; one is the reason that the West is civilized, the other is the relation of two civilizations.

The reception of Western learning by early advocates of enlightenment was not merely the acceptance of culture and institution. Analogous to the oppositional camp, as scholars-officials who received Confucian education, they understood the West based on the Confucian

horizon. Tradition and the West did not exist as separate horizons. As H. G. Gadamer discerns that ‘Understanding is always interpretation and meaning is always a “fusion” of the “horizons” between the interpretation and the object. It follows that one’s historical and linguistic situation presents no barrier to understanding but is rather the horizon of perspective form which understanding first becomes possible.’ⁱ Chosŏn scholars understood and interpreted the West upon their Confucian horizon. This paper will further illuminate the ideology of the early enlightenment intellectuals from Gadamer’s phenomenological point of view, by focusing on the fusion of horizons. If Chosŏn scholar-officials accepted and understood Western learning on the basis of some kinds of horizons in the late 19th century, it is necessary to inquire into the complexities of horizons of Chosŏn enlightenment intellectuals by way of reviewing their problematic questions. There have been a lot of reseach on the ceptance of Western political thought by Chosŏn intellectuals, focuseing primarily on the question of what Chosŏn scholar-officials accepted. Howerve, this paper, using the fusion of the horizon, aims to focus on how Chosŏn’s intellectuals understood Western ideas.

The Emergence of a New Horizon

The assertion that the origin of enlightenment is not only in the horizon of Western learning but also in Silhak (實學), the school of practical learning, was propagated by Kim Yunsik, who is assessed to be a part of the moderate enlightenment faction. In Korean academic circles, there have been studies linking the relevance of Silhak and enlightenment movement.

At first, under the tutelage of Pak Gyusu, Kim Okgyun became aware of the general current of the world and deplored national affairs with his peers. In 1881, I went to Tianjin, while Kim Okgyun and his peers went to Japan, and promised to help the nation together during their expedition.ⁱⁱ

Kim Okgyun and Kim Yunsik acknowledged the necessity of reformation while asserting different political opinions. However, in the excerpt above, Kim Yunsik accentuates the fact that he and Kim Okgyun studied together under the tutelage of Pak Gyusu. As Pak Yŏnghyo recalls ‘the idea of equality was gleaned from the work of Pak Chiwŏn, Pak Gyusu’s grandfather, who criticized the aristocrats’, the ideological foundation of the enlightenment movement was the horizon of Silhak rooted from the

late Chosŏn period.ⁱⁱⁱ

Yi Hangro, as a representative conservatist, argued, ‘although Western learning has a myriad of suggestions, it is merely a claim that disregards one’s parents and monarch, and a means to export commodities’^{iv}, and concluded the refusal of exchange with the West. This kind of political argument is the result of Chosŏn’s adaptation of Sinocentrism. Therefore, he insisted that the West could not integrate into the horizon of Sinocentrism. As long as Western civilization cannot assert the ethics of family and nation that is crucial to Confucianism, the Confucianist could not accept it. Yi Hangro’s claim was founded on the Confucian horizon, but stood on a different standpoint from Silhak’s challenge to Sinocentrism. The Confucian horizon that the late 19th century Chosŏn scholar-officials used to understand Western learning was not limited to Silhak.

It can be observed in Kim Yunsik’s writing cited above that the early enlightenment faction procures a new ideological foundation through China and Japan upon the horizon of Silhak. Just as the Chosŏn scholars generally made speculations through China as an academic resource, even after the mid-19th century, they imagined the world through the information found in Chinese publications on the Western world. However, in the 1880s, a group of intellectuals appeared in Chosŏn who were attentive to the changes in Japan after the Meiji restoration. In 1881, Chosŏn sent the Korean Courtiers Observation Mission to Japan, which was a significant source of change in their horizon. Sixty-four members including high-ranking officials were dispatched to observe the new changes in Japan, while Yun Ch’iho and Yu Kilchun joined them to study abroad. For Chosŏn intellectuals, the reality of Chosŏn and the Confucianism of China constituted their intellectual horizon, but from this point on Japan also stood out as another horizon. The envoys reported the achievements in fields such as politics and economics that Japan accomplished by emulating Western modernity. The information Chosŏn needed was on Japan’s modern experiment that was modelled after the West. Thus, their interest in Japan was not in Japan itself, but the West that was absorbed by Japan. The new intellectual horizon based on the West was formed in Chosŏn by way of Japan.

Korean Courtiers Observation Mission dispatched to Japan submitted a total of 80 books on Japan’s achievements including political, economic, military, industrial, social, cultural and educational spheres made by emulating the modernization process of the Western countries.^v The knowledge they needed was not an old Japan but rather a modern experiment

made by Japan. Therefore, Chosŏn's intellectuals became interested in the West, which was digested in Japan. In other words, there established a new intellectual horizon of the West through Japan in Chosŏn. The intellectuals that emerged after the 1880s during Chosŏn's reformation process mostly contemplated amidst the complicated horizons of Confucianism, Silhak, China, Japan and the West. Thus, in order to interpret their method of thinking, it is necessary to observe how these horizons come into contact and change within their structure of thought. While dynamically organizing the multiple horizons, the scholars endeavoured to solve the practical problems that Chosŏn confronted. Thus, it is important to examine what questions arose through these horizons.

The Relocation and Fusion of Horizons

The first question that arose amid the complexities of Chosŏn in the 1880s was whether Chosŏn was barbaric. Yun Ch'ihŏ records in his diary the debate with Eo Yungchung on this subject.

Yun Ch'ihŏ said 'The distinction between barbarianism and enlightenment is due to the difference between moral and violence. Barbarianism is cruel and unwise, killing and eating each other. Now, our country is making laws, killing and murdering the people. I don't know if there is a difference between a knife and a club'.^{vi} For the Chosŏn intellectuals, the centre of civilization was the Confucian world revolving around China, and the rest of the world was either less benefited by the civilization or barbaric. Therefore, Yun Ch'ihŏ's assessment of Chosŏn as barbaric was a challenge against the commonsensical world view accepted during his era. By contrasting barbarism and enlightenment, he supports his claim with the legitimacy of law and the lack of constitutionalism in Chosŏn.

Although the enlightenment activist were interested in a political reformation, it was not easy to immediately define the Confucian view, as well as Asia itself including China, as barbaric. Scepticism on the question of whether the teachings of Confucianism were barbaric lingered on in their ideological horizon for a long time. While asking 'according to the spirit of Europe, they call the gradual change in customs enlightenment. What is there to change and transform in the East, the region of civilization?'^{vii}, Kim Yunsik criticizes the participants of the Gapsin Coup of denying Confucianism as a result of their admiration of Europe. He could not deny the values of Confucianism, and therefore did not accept any argument which was not in favour of it.

Yun Ch'ih'o's estimation of Chosŏn as barbaric was founded on a geographical understanding of civilization and barbarism suggested by Japanese scholars, which is also called the horizon of the "civilization and enlightenment". Fukuzawa Yukichi, in *The Outline of a theory of Civilization*, divides the world history into barbarism, semi-civilization and civilization, and discerns this process of development as a chronological sequence.^{viii} He defines the stage of civilization as the pursuit of happiness through academics and a thriving industry and commerce that is founded on autonomy and independence. Fukuzawa's argument is based on the progressive view of history propagated by the 18th century Enlightenment movement, as his theory of civilization was said to be influenced by F. Guizot and H. T. Buckle.^{ix}

Moreover, Fukuzawa's idea was heavily tainted by 19th century European Orientalism, imagining Europe as civilized and the non-Europe as barbaric. Therefore, as the non-European, China was now the emblem of barbarism instead of civilization. The status of Sinocentrism that considers China as civilization is subverted within the framework of Orientalism. The diagram of civilization and barbarism upon the chronological sequence of the progressive viewpoint is rearranged geographically in its understanding of China and Japan. As the East Asian region was placed upon the Western horizon of thought, there resulted not only a subversion of the location of civilization and barbarism, but also changes in a traditional spatial representation. The influence of Japan was one reason why the early advocates of enlightenment that participated in the Gapsin Coup asserted the autonomy and independence of Chosŏn in terms of world politics, but their political opinion was the presence of an ideological horizon that rearranged the notions of civilization and barbarism drawn upon the diagram of polity into a spatial map in Asia. Yun Ch'ih'o's denouncement of China that 'he is pleased to have the name of a barbarian as the title of a king',^x and the exclusion of Qing's interference with Chosŏn can be thought of as a statement presented within this kind of horizon.

As civilization and barbarism, Japan and China were contrasted, a group of thinkers began to assess Japanese academism from a different standpoint. As it was acknowledged that Japan was able to transform into a modern nation due to their study of the West, the axis of confrontation between civilization and barbarism shifted to an evaluation of Western and Chinese scholarship. Western knowledge was interpreted as science, whereas the Confucian study of classics was considered unpractical. *Hansŏng Sunbo* published multiple articles which criticized that the

Chosŏn scholars 'do not seek practical studies (Silhak) but only revere empty knowledge',^{xi} which was contrary to European's mind of science (1 March 1884). This negative evaluation of Confucianism is influenced by Fukuzawa's claim that 'true scientific ideas cannot develop unless the study of Chinese classics is eliminated, and excluding Sinology is the most urgent task today'.^{xii}

The emphasis on practical knowledge can be construed within the influence of Fukuzawa, but the discourse of practical studies by the press during the enlightenment period overlaps with the ideological horizon of Silhak scholars of the late-Chosŏn period. Considering Pak Yŏnghyo's mention again, that is to say, he understood equality through the works of Pak Chiwŏn who was a symbol of Silhak movement in the 18th century in Chosŏn, the horizons of Western ideology via Japan and Silhak are entangled within the enlightenment faction's understanding of equality. Equality in late-Chosŏn was interpreted as denying discrimination amongst the noble and humble, master and slave, legitimate and illegitimate children, and genders. The second article of the Kapsin Coup's manifesto titled, 'abolish hereditary aristocracy and provide institutional rights of equality for the people',^{xiii} should be interpreted as the fusion of Western and Silhak horizons in the reality of Chosŏn, rather than being one-dimensionally considered upon the horizon of equality in Western liberalism.

During the 1880s in Chosŏn, the notion of natural rights in the United States' Declaration of Independence was already introduced and the words "freedom" and "equality" were frequently used. Interpreting these as merely the reception of Western liberalism fails to notice the complicated ideological horizons of the Chosŏn's intellectuals. Moreover, the freedom and equality that they propagated were limited, for even though they argued for limiting the power of the monarch within monarchy, due to the political circumstances they could only support the Herrschaft of both the King and People. But that does not mean their reception of freedom and equality was a faulty understanding of Western learning. As it can be seen in *The Independent (Doklibsinmun)*'s report on a civilized nation as 'where the law and all national affairs are transparent and fair so that there are no ignorant subjects, and each and every one has civil liberty and the nation is as beautiful as the regime of Yao and Shun Emperor', the problem of freedom was understood in terms of constitutional governing, education and also a Confucian utopia.^{xiv} This can also be seen as a newly formed notion of freedom during Chosŏn's enlightenment period that integrates the European ideological horizon with the

actual circumstances of Chosŏn.

The Duet of Confucianism and Western Civilization

The petition “Kŏnbaeksŏ (建白書)” (1888) that Pak Yŏnghyo wrote and addressed to King Kochong during his period of exile in Japan suggests reformation plan in all state affairs; therefore, it is a valuable material that illuminates not only his thought but also the ideological foundation and full account of the enlightenment party. The petition for reformation projects beginning with the sentences that consist of a preliminary and 8 articles is subdivided into 114 sections. The text consists of the following table:

1. The conditions of the world.
2. Act the laws and discipline and comfort the nation and the people.
3. Revive the economy and enrich the peoples and peoples alike.
4. The medical institution aims to promote the health and reproduction of the people.
5. Guard the army and protect the people and the nation.
6. Teach the people the basics of knowledge, morality and art.
7. Govern correctly and present standards to the nation and the people.
8. Let the people earn enough freedom and cultivate vigour.

Excluding the word “freedom” used in the eight articles, ‘Let the people earn enough freedom and cultivate vigour (元氣)’, “Kŏnbaeksŏ” is mostly written in the discourse of Confucianism. Of course, as was seen in the first article, a critical assessment of international law written by Henry Wheaton and translated by William Marin, it is understood that this petition was not only written in the horizon of Confucianism. Rather, it will be more appropriate to say that the Confucian intellectuals discuss a political system of the State and social system by embracing Western knowledge in the Confucian imagination. According to an existing study, a quarter of Pak’s petition were affected by the Japanese scholar, Fukuzawa Yukichi’s famous works, *Things western*, *Encouragement of learning*, *The Outline of a theory of civilization*, especially, the influence of the first book is overwhelming.^{xv} As noted by the existing research, we cannot ignore Japan’s influence on his petition and the influence of Western modernistic political theory, which he studied in Japan. He was dispatched to Japan in 1883 and experienced Japanese change in Japan, and after returning to Korea, he hired a modern soldier who had been trained

in Japan. Therefore, it was not unusual for him to model Japan for the sake of modern reforms of the Chosŏn Dynasty.

However, it is not difficult to find out that his text consisted of Confucian terms. In his petition, Pak Yŏnghyo uses conventional words in Chinese characters such as “freedom (自由)” “equality (平等),” “right of liberty (自由之權)” and “general righteousness (通義)”; yet, they include meanings different from their previous usage and Confucian context. He asserts the theory of natural rights, the education of the people for modernization, the right to property as the basics of law and economics, social contract and the freedom of religion. Previous scholarship has observed how this discourse was influenced by the Japanese academism including Fukuzawa’s publications. However, I think it will be more wholesome approach to consider his work as a fusion of Confucianism and Western learning via Japan, rather than investigating its theoretical inconclusiveness, in order to reveal Pak Yŏnghyo’s complicated intellectual horizons, which incorporate all the horizons of Confucianism, Japan and the West.

However, I would like to say, the most notable thing in this text is that the Chinese classical canons have been quoted frequently, such as *Sunzi* (孫子), *Wuzi* (吳子), *Liutaosanlue* (六韜三略), *Shiji* (史記), etc., not to mention the Confucian classics, *Sishusanjing*. For example, Pak Yŏnghyo quotes a passage from *The Analects of Confucius*, ‘the determination of the humble man cannot be taken away’,^{xvi} in order to demonstrate the modern values and fundamental doctrines of liberalism such as the right to life, the right to freedom, the right to happiness and natural rights; he argued that the legitimacy of the government is the protection of the people. Furthermore, he discerns that the overthrowing of a government is justified when the government does not fulfil these duties. His methodology of demonstrating the legitimacy of Western modern value through Confucian texts can be criticized of lacking academic rigour. Nevertheless, I would like to focus on the dynamism of Pak Yŏnghyo’s ideological horizon that understood and practiced Western ideology upon the traditional cognitive horizon.

In the midst of the transition, compared to the West, the reality of Chosŏn Dynasty could not help to be imagined as behind the times. Pak Yŏnghyo was forced to take advantage of Confucianism altogether with the Western theory, for the sake of criticizing Chosŏn and accepting the Western thinking. Therefore, he understood civilization and barbarism not as a chronological sequence or a spatial arrangement, but in terms of

the latent and reality. Recalling the fact that Asia was a civilization, he seeks to explain Asia's retreat in civilization compared to the West not in the lack of Western modern values, but in the lack of Confucian virtues. When the Confucian theory of civilization is applied in justifying the liberal values of Western modernity, the two values can be explained in complementary, instead of contradictory, terms. The Asian intellectuals who valued the West were mostly compelled to deny Confucianism as a civilization. Yet, Pak Yŏnghyo accentuates the fact that Asia was the cradle of civilization. In his analysis, the reason why Asian ancient civilization fell back in the modern period was because the government did not guide the people through benevolence, righteousness, propriety and wisdom, and did not realize edification. It is not because the Western civilization was not realized, but because the political ideals of Confucianism were not fulfilled. This reality of Asia was not the fault of the people, but that of the administrator who did not properly rule or edify the people.^{xvii}

Furthermore, by stipulating that 'penalty should be executed through benevolence, punishment through righteousness, the enforcement of law through trust', Pak Yŏnghyo indicates that the virtues of benevolence (仁), righteousness (義) and fiduciary relationship (信) must be the foundations of the realization of a constitutional state. Even though punishing a person according to law, righteousness and justice, fiduciary relationship should be a foundation of the law. Therefore, to inflict harm on the people by imposing a cruel punishment, and to destroy justice by putting a gag on the people, and to lose fiduciary relationship by wresting the law to suit oneself make the people's mind vulnerable, harsh, doubtful, this is barbarian politics. To execute a person based on benevolence, and to punish according to justice, and to carry out a law based on fiduciary relationship make the people's mind sound and generous, peaceful, stable; this is politics of civilization and enlightenment. Therefore, we should comfort the people by benevolence, and govern the people by justice, and pacify the people by fiduciary relationship. If we know these three ways well, not to lose it, grace and dignity are accorded together, the law does not relax, at the top the nation is flourishing, in the bottom the custom is beautiful and fine.^{xviii}

Constitutionalism in the West is generally rationalized in terms of justice, but Pak advocates for a constitution in terms of the actualization of Confucian virtues and identifies these virtues as the standard for determining civilization and barbarism. Therefore, he argued, if Chosŏn's

reformation aims at civilization, it is better to recover the politics of benevolence and righteousness, or in other words the government of virtue, rather than to aspire the accomplishment of Western values.

Nonetheless, Pak's argument does not mean that he completely affirms the reality of Confucianism. He criticized the civil service examination that gave rise to negative consequences, and even ruthlessly denounced the outdated curriculum that was taught in Confucian institutions of learning. But despite these criticisms, he intended to restore the Confucian horizon through the philosophy of 'investigating things and extending knowledge' and 'governing through self-cultivation' in *The Great Learning*. He 'put practicality first and flowery rhetoric behind (先其實用, 而後其文華)^{xix} in order to emphasize the useful aspect of Confucianism. These arguments propose a direction of reformation that is deduced from the interface of Confucianism and Western learning.

Conclusion

Since the beginning of the 19th century, the meeting between East Asian and Western countries has been a process of reflection of understanding an anonymous object called the West, contrasted to the Orient. As the West was regarded as a symbol of modern civilization, and Asian scholars explored usually a general study of Western scholarship that could be understood to create modern civilization in the Western countries. Meeting between East Asia and the West was a meeting of well-known civilization and an unknown civilization as the other. On the other hand, it was a clash of civilizations. In the process of meeting of the East and the West civilization in the Korean enlightenment movement, I think, there were four horizons, that is, Silhak rooted in the late Chosŏn period, Chosŏn Confucianism, Chinese academism of 19th century and Japan's New learning in the process of Chosŏn intellectuals' understanding and interpreting the West in the late 19th century.

From the perspective of fusion of horizons, the following three conclusions can be addressed in the latter part of the 19th century. First, in the late 19th century, Korean, as a discourse was formed that regarded the West as a civilization, the relationship between the West and the Asia was represented as a simple civilization theory that was presented by a simple dualism of civilization and barbarism. Asia has been referred to as a backward step in terms of the evolution of civilization. Although East Asian Confucian culture sphere including Korea has maintained a scheme that Chinese culture is a civilization in the perspective of Sino-

centrism, Sino-centric civilization was pushed out of civilization and even to be compared to barbarism, in a discourse of western civilization theory which regards western civilization as a real civilization. In the Pak Yŏnghyo's understanding of civilization, the standards of civilization were not merely acceptable to western values, but to the realization of Confucian humanity. If we consider a realization of humanity as a goal of modernity, we will be able to rid ourselves of narrow-minded arguments, which consider Confucianism as an old idea contrary to a civilization to be cleared up.

Second, if a modernity of Asia is meant to follow the Western value, we may be confronted with the problem of loss of the subjectivity which accepts and understands the Western learning. From the perspective of Confucian intellectuals who thought and practiced on the basis of Confucian knowledge system, both a subject of accepting the other civilization and his Confucian horizon may be disappeared. However, the reason that Pak Yŏnghyo claimed the value of equality in his petition to King Kochong was not merely because it was the Western value, but because the problem of the Western concept of equality was continued with abolition of discrimination between the nobles and the means, abolition of slavery that was raised since the 18th century from the point of view of Silhak. Human equality, which has been a widening of human rights in the Confucian horizon, can be seen as the modern value transcending mentality of the East and the West, by the fusion of East and West horizons.

The third, although Freedom and democracy, human rights and rights are the precious values of the West, the Western modernity, which is realized through these values, reveals considerable problems in the past century. The Western scholars are also seeking a new value in order to overcome the so-called "The Decline of the West". The Efforts to make the fusion of horizons by Pak Yŏnghyo, not to mention the Chinese and Japanese thinkers, who attempted to interpret the Western value on the Confucian horizon adopting Western ideas, will enable to deliver invaluable intellectual assets at a critical juncture in the post-modern world's history. Towards the efforts trying to find the "fusion of horizons" between the Confucianism and the Western modernity, such evaluations like an immature acceptance of the Western modernity or an inconclusive settlement of the past should be reconsidered.

References

- Aoki, Koichi. 1969. 'Chosen Kaika Siso to Hukuzawa Yukichino' (The Influence of Fukuzawa Yukichi in Pak Yŏnghyo's Petition'), *Chosengaku* 52; 35-92.
- Documents on Japanese Foreign Policy (Nihon gaiko bunsho)*. Volume. 21, No. 106. Edited by The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. Accessed 21 August, 2016. Digital Archive of the document on Japanese Foreign Policy. <http://www.mofa.go.jp/mofaj/annai/honsho/shiryo/archives/index.html>.
- Fukuzawa, Yukichi. 1988, *The Outline of a theory of Civilization* (文明論之概略), Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
- Fukuzawa, Yukichi. 1957. *The complete collection of Fukuzawa Yukichi* (福沢諭吉全集), Volume. 20. Edited by Keio Gijuku. Tokyo: Iwanami shoten.
- Hansŏng Sunbo*.
- Huh, Donghyun. 2002. 'Korean Courtiers Observation Mission's Views on Meiji Japan and Projects of Modern State Building', *The Study of Korean History of Thought* 19: 507-537.
- Kim, Okgyun. 1979. *Collections of Kim Okgyun* (Kim Okgyun chŏnjip). Edited by Institute of Documents for Korean Studies. Asia Munhwasa.
- Kim, Yunsik. 1957. *Sogŭmch'ŏngsa*. Volume 2, no. 5. Seoul: National Institute of Korean History.
- Maruyama, Masanao. 1986. *Reading the Outline of a theory of Civilization* (文明論之概略を読む). Tokyo: Iwanami publishing Company.
- Tongnip sinmun (The Independent)*.
- Warnke, George. 1987. *Gadamer: Hermeneutics, Tradition and Reason*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Yi, Gwangsŭ. 1931. 'A story on meeting Pak Yŏnghyo' (Pak Yŏngho ssi-rŭl mannan iyagi). *Donggwang* 19 : 13-16.
- Yi, Hangro. *Complete collection of Hwasŏ* (*Hwasŏ sŏnsaeng munjib*), vol. 15. Accessed 15 June. DB of Korean Classics. <http://db.itkc.or.kr/index.jsp?bizName=MK>.
- Yun, Ch'ihŏ. 1980. *The collected letters of Yun Ch'ihŏ* (Yun Chiho sŏhanjip). Edited by National Institute of Korean History. Seoul: National Institute of Korean History.

Yun, Ch'ihō. 2001. *Yun Ch'ihō's Diary 1 (Kulyôk Yun Ch'ihō ilgi)*, translated by Song Byōnggi. Yōnse University Press.

-
- ⁱ Warnke 1987, 82.
ⁱⁱ Kim Yunsik 1957. Vol. 2, 577.
ⁱⁱⁱ Yi Kwangsu March 1931, 13-16 .
^{iv} Yi Hangro, Volume. 15. 'Miscellaneous writings (雜著)'. "Kyesangurok (溪上隨錄)"
^v Dong Hyun Huh 2002. 507-537.
^{vi} Yun Ch'ihō 2001. 75-76. 29 January 1884.
^{vii} Kim Yunsik, Volume 5, 577.
^{viii} Fukuzawa 1988, 25.
^{ix} Maruyama 1986, 229-231.
^x 'To Anonymous Person'. Yun Ch'ihō 1980, 3.
^{xi} *Hansōng Sunbo*. 'Recent event of the world'. 1 March 1884.
^{xii} 'A yell at a literary coterie (文学會員に告ぐ)'. Fukuzawa 1971, 267.
^{xiii} Kim Okgyun. 1979, 147.
^{xiv} 'The rank of a country'. *The Independent (Tongnip sinmun)*, 23 February 1899.
^{xv} Aoki 1970, 35-92.
^{xvi} The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, 309.
^{xvii} The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, 297.
^{xviii} Ibid.
^{xix} The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan, 306-307.