

- bei aller Kollegialität den Unterschied zwischen seiner gesellschaftlichen Position und derjenigen seines Briefpartners nicht verkannte.
- 2 Konkret geht es dabei um eine Entscheidung für einen ganzheitlichen Wissenschaftsstil, der, so Humboldt, in Frankreich und in England nicht (bzw. nicht mehr) gepflegt wird: „Beide Nationen fördern die Wissenschaft als täglich neu angefüllte Briefkästen ihr vereinzelte Nachrichten zuführend aus der ganzen Welt [...]“ (S. 147) – eine treffende Beschreibung des positivistischen Wissenschaftsverständnisses, das sich in der zweiten Hälfte des 19. Jahrhunderts durchsetzt, was dann auch dazu führt, dass Humboldts Kosmos mit seinem ganzheitlichen Anspruch relativ bald nach seinem Erscheinen in wissenschaftlichen Kreisen wie ein obsoletes Werk behandelt wird.
 - 3 S. 163. Vgl. auch S. 167.

Yumi Moon: Populist Collaborators. The Ilchinhoe and the Japanese Colonization of Korea, 1896–1910, Cornell University Press: Ithaca / London 2013, 678 S..

Rezensiert von
Dolf-Alexander Neuhaus, Berlin

Collaboration still is a highly contentious issue in many countries that once have been occupied by a colonizing power. Korea is no exception to this and the question of collaboration during Japanese rule yields political implications to this date. Accordingly, previous Korean scholarship on Korean reformists has often rendered their reliance on Japan problematic sometimes exhibiting nationalist inclinations. At the same time, Japanese and Western historiography largely assign only a mar-

ginal role to the pro-Japanese organization Ilchinhoe within the history of the annexation of Korea focusing instead on the narrative of diplomatic history.¹ Hence, they tend to ignore the agenda of the Ilchinhoe that frequently contradicted the objectives of Japanese imperialism on the peninsula. Yumi Moon's thorough and carefully researched new volume "Populist Collaborators. The Ilchinhoe and the Japanese Colonization of Korea, 1896–1910" offers a nuanced and sophisticated corrective to this conventional narrative.

Redefining the Ilchinhoe's position as "populist" (p. 15) Moon argues for the need to fundamentally reframe the study of Ilchinhoe collaboration with the Japanese empire. Toward this end, she delves into an extensive body of Korean language sources in order to better understand the choices and activities of collaborationist on the local level within the political and material context of a colonized society. Because it challenged established structures of local power the Ilchinhoe movement constituted a "significant chapter in the introduction, if not invention, of democracy to ordinary Koreans" (p. 281). By emphasizing popular sovereignty vis-à-vis the King and local elites over national sovereignty the organization eventually became in the contradictions between its initial objectives and its subordination to Japanese.

The seven main chapters of this detailed volume proceed chronologically. The first chapter explores the roots of the Korean reform movement and the social and economic basis of the late Chosŏn state. As fundamental crisis befell Chosŏn society in the late 19th century the Korean monarchy faced a number of challenges by

elite reformers as well as peasant rebellions prompting military intervention by the Japanese. Both elite reformers of the Independence Club and the local leaders of the Tonghak rebels tried to constrain the courts power by advocating “people’s rights” changing the popular attitude against the monarchy. The Ilchinhoe, Moon argues, later “embraced such popular turns of the Independence Club and replicated the club’s strategies with its own interpretations and agendas”.

The second chapter outlines popular sentiments toward foreigners in the Northwestern provinces between the Sino-Japanese War and the Russo-Japanese War. Toward this end, Moon delves into four case studies comprising the riots of Catholics in Hwanghae province, the miner’s protests of P’yongan province, the impact of a changing order in East Asia in the northwestern provinces and the pro-Japanese turn of the Tonghak leadership. Growing Pan-Asianism of popular movements in the Northwestern provinces around the turn of the century elucidate that they were not necessarily susceptible to the nationalist solution articulated during the Protectorate period. The following chapter illustrates the emergence of the Ilchinhoe as an anti-status quo force during the time of the Russo-Japanese War and delineates its ensuing campaigns on the national stage. Within the context of Japanese military occupation the pro-Japanese Ilchinhoe faced a social backlash against Japan that coincided with the rise of a more exclusive Korean nationalism. Nevertheless, Moon concludes, the relation between the organization and the Japanese army were more complicated than has hitherto been understood. Moon goes on to examine how the

Ilchinhoe tried to reclaim the legacy of the Independence Club by civilizing language and body practice (haircutting ceremonies that were reminiscent of the Kabo-reforms of 1894). Reviewing the organization’s major public statements and its distinctive positions regarding monarchy reform, sovereignty, and collaboration, the chapter elucidates the populist orientation of the Ilchinhoe by linking those statements with the actions of local Ilchinhoe members. As the public statements shifted along with the different stages of protectorate rule and increasing Japanese control over the Korean Peninsula, the Ilchinhoe’s endorsement of popular participation became more and more unrealistic.

Chapter five delves into the Ilchinhoe’s tax resistance movement in the northwestern provinces identifying it as “populist”. By actively engaging with popular issues and taking up a leading role in the tax resistance the Ilchinhoe was able to enhance its status among the ordinary people and mold public attitude towards the monarchy. However, the tax resistance movement undermined the power of the monarchy by reducing the revenues of the Royal Treasury. This in turn ran counter to the state’s need to strengthen the Korean army against a backdrop of imperialist encroachment. Subsequently, Moon explores how local disputes over tenant rights and other privileges led to a division of local society into Ilchinhoe followers and their adversaries by the examples of P’yongan province and Ch’ungch’ong province. When the Japanese implemented a new tax policy in 1907, fault lines within the movement became apparent. “Anti-state resistance gradually shifted to a power struggle with local elites” (p. 240) and the

organization's influence began to wane. Finally, Japanese statesmen favored the authoritarian solution that did not leave room for an anti-state popular movement like the Ilchinhoe. Thus, Moon maintains, the Japanese "chose to appease the old Korean elites rather than endorse the 'subversion' of the Ilchinhoe" (p. 285). This elucidates the incongruity of Ilchinhoe attempts to constrain the power of the state and the Japan's goal to further extend her grip on the Korean peninsula.

"Populist Collaborators" offers a welcome and refreshing perspective on an issue that in the past often has been burdened by an overdetermined view of a particularly fraught period of history. The study comprehensively demonstrates that local non-state actors in history matter as much as diplomatic concerns and reminds us of the importance of the historical agency of the colonized that is oftentimes buried beneath asymmetrical power structures. However, to strengthen the argument that the Ilchinhoe was a "transnational, redemptive society" it would have been interesting to delve deeper into the close connection between the organization's leadership and Japanese Pan-Asianist Uchida Ryōhei and the Kokuryūkai that acted as intermediary between Itō Hirobumi and the Ilchinhoe. Furthermore, keeping track of the participants in different localities can be challenging and at times it seems Moon herself becomes confused with the many names when Japanese scholar Ogawara who has published extensively on the Japanese Protectorate and the Ilchinhoe in Korea becomes Ogawa in the next column (p. 242).² These minor limitations notwithstanding, "Popular Collaborators" is a long overdue and welcome study addition

to scholarship on the Japanese colonization of Korea. This book is a recommended reading not only to scholars of Korean and Japanese History but also to a broader audience interested in the history of collaboration and colonialism.

Notes

- 1 Conroy, Hilary: *The Japanese Seizure of Korea 1868 – 1910. A Study of Realism and Idealism in International Relations*, Philadelphia 1960; Dudden, Alexis: *Japan's Colonization of Korea. Discourse and Power*, Honolulu 2005; Duus, Peter: *The Abacus and the Sword. The Japanese Penetration of Korea, 1895 – 1910*, Berkeley 1995; Moriyama, Shigenori: *Nikkan Heigō*, Tōkyō: Yoshikawa Kōbunkan 1992.
- 2 See for example: Ogawara, Hiroyuki: *Itō Hirobumi no Kankoku Heigō Kōsō to Chōsen Shakai. Ōkenron no Sōkoku*, Iwanami Shoten: Tōkyō 2010; or Ogawara, Hiroyuki: *Isshinkai no Nikkan Heigō Seigan Undō to Nikkan Heigō. „Seigappō“ Kōsō to Tennōsei Kokka Genri no Sōkoku*, in: *Chōsenshi Kenkyūkai* (Hrsg.): *Chōsenshi Kenkyūkai Bunshū. Tokushū: Chōsen ni okeru Shūkyō to Kokka*, Nr. 43 (Oktober 2005), S. 183 – 205.

Ottmar Ette: *TransArea. Eine literarische Globalisierungsgeschichte (= mimesis. Romanische Literaturen der Welt, 54)*, Berlin: De Gruyter 2012, 334 S.

Rezensiert von
Antje Dietze, Leipzig

Der Literaturwissenschaftler Ottmar Ette engagiert sich für ein Verständnis von Literatur, das vor allem deren grenzüberschreitendes und verbindendes Potential betont. In seiner Trilogie ‚ÜberLebenswissen‘ hat