

ISSN 1598-2661 (Print)  
ISSN 2586-0380 (Online)

# SUNGKYUN JOURNAL OF EAST ASIAN STUDIES

---

VOL.19 No.2

OCT. 2019



Academy of East Asian Studies  
Sungkyunkwan University

# The Configuration and Evolution of an Autonomous Space of Research in the Republic of Korea (1945–1979): The Relationship between Governments and Archaeologists\*

Luis A. BOTELLA\*\*  
*University of Malaga*

## ABSTRACT

The relationship between the government and academics has been a contentious issue in the history of Korean archaeology. The government and archaeologists mainly established their relationships around three issues: the process for granting authorization for archaeological excavations, government archaeological institutions, and the funding structure of archaeological research. These spaces had a colonial origin, and entailed power relationships between the government and archaeologists. The defeat of the imperial power, Japan, in 1945 entailed dramatic changes. This paper claims that the decolonization of those spaces ushered in new dynamics that allowed for new forms of autonomy for archaeologists, continuing in the post-Liberation period. However, since 1968, the government's greater involvement has affected the direction of research performed in the field, without completely destroying said autonomy.

**Keywords:** South Korea; colonial legacy; archaeology politics; nationalism; government

## Introduction

Relationships between government and scholars have been a contentious issue in academic studies. The field of archaeology has not escaped these considerations, due to its heavy dependence on an established government, in terms of a legal framework for excavation and research funding. The case of the Republic of Korea (Korea hereafter) is no exception. This article analyses the relationship between the government and archaeologists, considering their spaces and structures of interaction. The aim is to clarify the dynamics of those relations and the government mechanisms' influence on the academic community. The article will consider three aspects: the process of granting an excavation authorization, government archaeological institutions, and the economic structure of archaeological research. The analysis of these spaces will consider the particularity of the colonial origins at the base of some of them, which adds a layer of complexity to the analysis of the power dynamics. In addition, the analysis aims to assess the power dynamics of archaeological research, without removing archaeologists' agency. The paper defends the idea that archaeologists were able to create autonomous spaces of research vis-à-vis the government in the context of new power dynamics. It also argues that changes taking place in the government's

cultural policy beginning in 1968 introduced a new dynamic to the field, in the form of mobilizing archaeologists in government projects, without destroying the autonomous space for archaeological research.

This study will focus its attention on the Republic of Korea's first years—between 1945 and 1979—when the field of archaeology became an independent discipline. These years witnessed the configuration of an academic community around the study of archaeological materials and excavations, the establishment of research and education institutions focused on archaeology, and the creation of the first journals and handbooks on Korean archaeology (Barnes 2015, 33–34, 38–39). The political context for this trend was a series of authoritarian governments that tried to secure Korea's economic development. Syngman Rhee (Yi Sŭngman 李承晩, 1875–1965; in office 1948–1960) soon used the political turmoil of the division of Korea to take control over the government and eliminate political opposition. He remained in power until a popular uprising forced him to resign. The democratic project born from that uprising in 1960 was short-lived, due to a *coup d'état* led by Park Chung Hee (Pak Chŏnghŭi 朴正熙, 1917–1979; in office 1961–1979). On the economic side, despite early attempts by Rhee's government to develop the country economically, the greatest transformation came under Park Chung Hee's presidency and his five-year economic development plan. In particular, the third five-year economic development plan laid the foundation for the industrialized nation which Korea is today, investing in the heavy and chemical industrialization of the country.

Governments in different political circumstances have used archaeology for their own aims (Fowler 2008; Arnol 2008; Díaz-Andreu 1994), and that has even affected archaeological interpretations (Díaz-Andreu and Mora 1997; Kohl and Fawcett 1995; Härke 2002). Evassdottir (2004) presents a detailed ethnography of current archaeology in China, which considers the problems of the relationships among different administrative, political, and academic organizations involved in archaeological research, illustrating the interests of these kinds of studies. Considering this, it is relevant to consider how Korean governments and archaeologists constructed their relationship during the formative years of the field, and what kind of power or influence they exercised over the community of researchers.

Scholars have portrayed the relationships between archaeologists and governments in Korea from several perspectives. Some studies focused their interest on archaeological activities and interpretations of the archaeological record, limiting the role of governments. They present a government with minimal involvement in the field, solely limited to financing. Even when they present a correlation between discourse production and some political objectives, they fail to explain the mechanism through which the government could wield influence

\* This work was supported by the Seed Program for Korean Studies through the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and Korean Studies Promotion Service of the Academy of Korean Studies (AKS-2016-INC-2230004).

\*\* I would like to thank the thoughtful comments that Fernando Wulff and Antonio Doménech have provided throughout the different stages of this article.

(Kim Wönyong 1981; Nelson 1995; Ch'oe et al. 1992). Other studies stress the collaboration of archaeologists with the interests of the state. These explanations identify intellectuals as willing participants in the construction of a nationalistic discourse, becoming instrumental to the government (Pai 2000; 2001). However, they focus on the colonial period, limiting analysis of the post-colonial, and creating a teleological argument in the process. That analysis also disregards Korean archaeologists' agency in the configuration of their relationships with the government. A different perspective takes the system of archaeological heritage conservation (Bale 2008; Jang 2012) and the organization of rescue archaeology in Korea (Shoda 2008; Shin 2012) into consideration. These studies present the tensions among archaeologists, the cultural heritage administration, and economic development projects, particularly in relation to rescue archaeology, providing an analysis of the relationship between the government and scholars. However, they mainly focus on the 1990s and 2000s, limiting their consideration of previous years. Therefore, the analysis of the formative years of Korean archaeology has been generally overlooked.

The relationship between the Korean government and archaeologists between 1945 and 1979 presents two main characteristics. Firstly, archaeology in Korea started within the context of colonial domination of the peninsula, under the control of Japanese scholars who—as took place in other colonial configurations around the world—were interested in asserting a discourse of domination over the colonial population (Pai 2000, 23–56; Díaz-Andreu 2007). The colonial government developed a sophisticated system of archaeological research and conservation, starting with the enactment of the Regulations on the Preservation of Ancient Sites and Relics of Chōsen (Koseki oyobi ibutsu hōzon kitei 古蹟及び遺物法損規定) and the Committee on the Investigation of Korean Antiquities (Chōsen Koseki Kenkyūkai 朝鮮古蹟研究會) in 1916, antecedents of the Cultural Properties Protection Act (Munhwajae Pohopōp) and the Committee for Cultural Properties (Munhwajae Wiwōnhoe) from 1962 (Pai Hyung Il 2001). The colonial government also funded and directed archaeological research through several administrative units within the Department of Internal Affairs (Section I of the District Bureau, Government-General Museum and Educational Bureau) and the Department of Agriculture, Commerce and Industry (Forestry Section) (Sekino 1931). In addition, the colonial government almost exclusively employed researchers from Tōkyō, Kyōto, and Keijō Imperial Universities, such as Torii Ryūzō 鳥居竜藏 (1879–1953), Imanishi Ryū 今西龍 (1875–1932), Kuroita Katsumi 黑板勝美 (1874–1946), Hamada Kōsaku 濱田耕作 (1881–1938), Umehara Sueji 梅原末治 (1893–1983), and Fujita Ryōsaku 藤田亮策 (1892–1960), who were sympathetic and/or contributors to the orientalist view of Korean archaeology and history so appreciated by imperial bureaucrats (Tanaka 1995).

After the Japanese surrendered in 1945, Koreans conducted archaeological research and managed their own archaeological heritage for the first time with the excavation of a *tumulus* (*kobun* 古墳) at the city of Kyōngju 慶州, from the Three Kingdoms period (AD 1st–7th century) (Kim Chaewōn 1948, 1) in 1946. The Liberation of Korea in 1945 meant the substitution of all Japanese archaeologists at

the colonial museum by Koreans with very limited, if any, experience in the field (Steinberg 1968, 22). Some Korean scholars outside the museum had archaeological training, but the division of the peninsula and the Korean War prevented them from founding a school in the south (Kim Chŏngbae 2000, 11–18). The early pioneers in the field had to deal with the legacy of colonial archaeology when they established their relationships with the government and its archaeological heritage management system.

Secondly, these early archaeologists had to establish a relationship with authoritarian governments. Under the presidencies of Syngman Rhee (1948–1960) and Park Chung Hee (1961–1979), the administrative apparatus of the government expanded decisively as part of its nation-building efforts, including the cultural heritage management system. The government changed the administrative structure and its size several times following changes in its cultural policy (Munhwajaech'ŏng 2011; Han Sangwoo 2001). Those transformations established growing bureaucratic structures for the control and protection of cultural heritage, raising the question of the government's and archaeologists' role in their creation. The field of archaeology, as part of the academic world, worked under its own dynamic of academic research and publication, but it was also a field that depended on the government to perform archaeological excavations, while the government had to negotiate with it in order to use that academic knowledge (Bourdieu 1996; 2006, 1–166). The government and archaeologists negotiated their relationships from different positions of power, at different institutions, and under different circumstances, allowing, up to a point, a dialogue and space for mutual influence, while building the structures that regulated archaeological research in the process. Consequently, those negotiations allowed for the configuration of an autonomous academic space of research in exchange for archaeologists' collaboration with the government in its projects.

Government and archaeologists established their relationships mainly through their participation in three areas: 1) the legal structure that protected archaeological heritage and regulated its research, 2) the government institutions engaged in the protection and research of archaeological heritage, and 3) the financial structure of archaeological research.

The main legal structures that affected and regulated the protection and research of archaeological research included the Cultural Property Protection Act and the Committee for Cultural Properties. The legislation and Committee were established under different names during the colonial period, and underwent different amendments during the same period. They continued in place until 1962, when the Korean government enacted the Cultural Property Protection Act and the Committee. This article will consider, in particular, how the legislation and the committee regulated authorizations to conduct archaeological excavations. An examination of this aspect allows us to understand better the continuities and discontinuities between the colonial and post-liberation periods regarding who had access to archaeological fieldwork, and the ability of the government to influence the community of archaeologists by controlling access to the field.

The second represents an obvious space of engagement for government and

archaeologists. These institutions included the National Museum of Korea (Kungnip Chungang Pangmulgwan), established in 1945 over the structure, building, and collections of the colonial museum; the Office for Cultural Properties (Munhwajae Kwalliguk Samuso), established in 1961; and the National Research Institute for Cultural Properties (Munhwajae Yönguso), established in 1969. These institutions were the most direct instruments of the government in the world of archaeology. Two questions must be considered in order to understand this sensitive field: the impact of the colonial legacy and the distinct role of researchers and bureaucrats, including their respective balance of power.

Finally, the financial structure of the field changed over time, allowing the introduction of new institutions and researchers. The government was always a strong funder of archaeological research, as in many other countries, both during the colonial period and after. However, it was not the only one, and its relative weight changed over time. Those changes allowed for alternatives to how archaeologists approached the government and its funding. This article considers how this structure changed from the colonial period to the post-Liberation period, how the government invested resources in archaeological research after 1945, and the role of alternative funding agencies in archaeological research.

### **The Legal Framework for Archaeological Research: Authorizing Excavations**

Korea organized its legislation regarding cultural heritage around a core group of laws, both inherited and new, inspired by the then-current international regulations. The beginnings of the young republic in 1948 were difficult, marked by a scarcity of human and economic resources. The Treasures, Ancient Sites, Scenery, and Natural Monuments Conservation Act (Chosön Pomul, Kojök, Myöngsüng, Chönyön Kinyömmul Pojonnyöng; hereafter TASSNMC), enacted in 1933, regulated cultural heritage protection until the enactment in 1962 of a new law, the Cultural Properties Protection Act (hereafter CPPA). The legal structure and objectives of both laws stressed the central role of the government in the management of archaeological research and Korean heritage, defining what was important to research, excavate, and preserve (Pai 2001, 85). However, the authorization system for archaeological excavation provides a more nuanced picture in terms of the tightness of government control and its continuities.

The heritage laws from the colonial period and those enacted under Park's regime gave the government a dominant position in archaeological research, through the definition of who could perform archaeological research, and furthermore, by evaluating what was worthy of research. The TASSNMC stipulated in its article 3 that the colonial government had to manage investigation of heritage. This article placed the full burden of archaeological research on the government, although the realities of the colony opened the space for researchers close to the colonial government too (Nanta, 2015). The CPPA also specifies the powers of the Ministry of Education to protect archaeological heritage. Article 42 defines the need to inform the Ministry about the existence of "hidden" and "buried" remains. Article 43 also requires authorization from the Ministry of Education to excavate "buried" remains.

Any person desiring to excavate an area of land where buried property is supposed to be found for the purposes of research shall be obliged to obtain the approval of the Minister of Education in accordance with the provisions of the Cabinet Decree. (CPPA, 1962 article 43)

These two articles state the power of the Ministry in the excavation process, continuing the trend of the colonial period. However, they also departed from the colonial act when they allowed private researchers to engage in archaeological excavations with authorization from the Ministry. Such was the reading of the editors of *Komunhwa*, the journal published by the Korean Association of University Museums and focused on debates about cultural heritage. The editors of the journal summarized each chapter of the law and reproduced articles 42 and 43 in particular (Han'guk Taehak Pangmulgwan Hyöphoe 1962, 42–43). They pointed to an opening in the law of an avenue for enlarging artefact collections at university museums through engaging in archaeological research.

The Ministry granted the authorizations, but sought expert advice from the Committee for Cultural Properties. This committee was first established in 1916 (Pai 2001, 77–81), and in 1933 changed its name to “Committee for the Conservation of Chōsen Treasures, Ancient Sites, Famous Places, and Natural Monuments,” defining it as a consultative organ (TASSNMC, article 2). The first record of this committee after 1945 appears as the “Emergency Committee for the Conservation of National Treasures, Ancient Sites, Famous Places, and Natural Monuments” (Kukpo Kojök Myöngsüng Ch'önyön Kinyömmul Imsi Pojon Wiwönhoe; Munhwajae Kwalliguk. Kyöngju Kojök Kwalli Samuso 1992, 3), with the mission of evaluating the heritage damaged during the Korean War (Munhwajae Ch'öng 2011, 36). In 1955, the government eliminated the term “emergency” from the name (Kukpo Kojök Myöngsüng Ch'önyön Kinyömmul Pojon Wiwönhoe), consolidating the committee as a regular institution (Munhwajae Kwalliguk. Kyöngju Kojök Kwalli Samuso 1992, 6). It changed its name to Committee for the Conservation of Cultural Properties in 1960, and again in 1962 to Committee for Cultural Properties (Munhwajae Wiwönhoe). The Committee held the responsibility for managing and researching Korean heritage (Han'guk Pangmulgwan 100-yönsa P'yönch'an Wiwönhoe 2009, 108) under different names and during the colonial regime, and after 1945, the CPPA endorsed that responsibility, defining its competences as deliberating on subjects regarding the preservation of and research on cultural heritage (CPPA, 1962).

The most important change between the colonial and post-Liberation period was the composition of the Committee. The colonial committee was a hybrid body, formed of politicians, bureaucrats, and researchers (Han'guk Pangmulgwan 100-yönsa P'yönch'an Wiwönhoe, 2009, 108, 129). Table 1 shows the members of the committee in 1937, highlighting the overwhelming presence of some of the most important bureaucrats of the colonial government (O Ch'unyöng 2018, 115). Sub-committee One, in charge of resolving matters related to material cultural heritage, was formed by one president, eleven government officials, and fifteen specialists (Han'guk Pangmulgwan 100-yönsa P'yönch'an Wiwönhoe, 2009, 129). The proportion of bureaucrats and scholars and the high profile of bureaucrats

**Table 1.** Members of the Committee for the Conservation of Chōsen Treasures, Ancient Sites, Famous Places, and Natural Monuments, 1937

Position	Name
Superintendent of the General-Government, President (朝鮮總督府 政務總監)	Ōno Rokuichirō 大野綠一郎 (1887–1985)
Colonization Agency (拓務書記官)	Mamuro Tsuguo 眞室亞夫 (dates unknown)
Director of the Home Affairs Bureau (內務局長)	Ōtake Jūrō 大竹十郎 (1888–1979)
Director of the Finance Bureau (財務局長)	Hayashi Shigezō 林繁藏 (1887–1945)
Director of the Industry Bureau (殖産局長)	Hozumi Shinrokurō 穗積貞六郎 (1889–1970)
Director of the Agriculture and Forestry Bureau (農林局長)	Yajima Sugizō 矢島杉造 (1889–?)
Director of the Education Bureau (學務局長)	Shiobara Tokisaburō 鹽原時三郎 (1896–1964)
Director of the Police Bureau (警務局長)	Mihashi Kōichirō 三橋孝一郎 (dates unknown)
Director of the Railways Bureau (鐵道局長)	Yoshida Hiroshi 吉田浩 (1885–1963)
Junior Assistant Official (事務官)	Yamazawa Wasaburō 山澤和三郎 (1895–?)
Junior Assistant Official (事務官)	Fujimoto Shūzō 藤本修三 (dates unknown)
Junior Assistant Official (事務官)	Kim Taeu 金大羽 (1900–1976)
Professor at Keijō Imperial University (京城帝國大學教授)	Tanaka Toyozō 田中豊藏 (1881–1948)
Professor at Keijō Imperial University (京城帝國大學教授)	Fujita Ryōsaku 藤田亮策 (1892–1960)
Professor at Tōkyō Imperial University (東京帝國大學教授)	Ikeuchi Hiroshi 池内宏 (1878–1952)
Professor at Tōkyō Imperial University (東京帝國大學教授)	Fujishima Kaijirō 藤島玄治郎 (1899–2002)
Assistant Professor at Tōkyō Imperial University (東京帝國大學助教授)	Harada Yoshito 原田淑人 (1885–1974)
Professor at Kyōto Imperial University (京都帝國大學教授)	Hamada Kōsaku 濱田耕作 (1881–1938)
Assistant Professor at Kyōto Imperial University (京都帝國大學助教授)	Umehara Sueji 梅原末治 (1893–1983)
Advising Council for the Cabinet of the General-Government (朝鮮總督府中樞院參議)	Yu Chōngsu 柳正秀 (1857–1938)
Public Servant (正三位勳二等)	Kuroita Katsumi 黒板勝美 (1874–1946)
Public Servant (正四位勳二等)	Amanuma Sun'ichi 天沼俊一 (1876–1947)
Public Servant (從三位勳三等)	Oda Shōgo 小田省吾 (1871–1953)
	Ayukai Fusanoshin 鮎貝房之進 (1864–1946)
	Oba Tsunekichi 小場恒吉 (1878–1958)
	Kim Yongjin 金容鎭 (1878–1968)
	Ch'oe Namsōn 崔南善 (1890–1947)

on the committee show the government's interest in controlling the committee, suggesting a political interest in its workings beyond its academic responsibilities. In addition, the connection of many scholars with Japanese orientalism suggests a common interest in developing an imperial discourse through archaeology, as scholars later claimed (Pai Hyung Il 2000, 2001; Tanaka 1995; Yu Chunghyōn 2017).

The division of the committee into specialized sub-committees continued after 1945, but the relationship with the government changed, as its composition suggests. Sub-committee One had twenty members in 1952, but only five were public servants, including Kim Chaewōn 金載元 (1909–1990), director of the

National Museum of Korea (Munhwajae Kwalliguk. Kyöngju Kojök Kwalli Samuso, 1992, 3–4). In 1955, the government reduced the number of members of the administration, and only Kim Chaewön, among its twelve members, was part of the administration (Munhwajae Kwalliguk. Kyöngju Kojök Kwalli Samuso, 1992, 6–7).

The same trend continued with the later reorganizations of the Committee. The regulations of the Committee stated that its members had to be selected “from among influential members of society due to their scholarship and moral influence” (Munhwajae Pojon Wiwönhoe Kyujöng, 1960, article 2; Munhwajae Wiwönhoe Kyujöng, 1963, article 2; Munhwajae Wiwönhoe Kyujöng, 1973, article 2). Sub-committee One, still in charge of material heritage, gathered experts in fields such as history, art, architecture, archaeology, art history, sociology, and Buddhism. The only member who had a career in a ministry before becoming a member of the committee was Kim Yun’gi 金允基 (1904–1979), who worked in the Railways Bureau under the colonial government and continued from 1945 to 1964 in the Ministry of Transportation. In parallel, he developed his academic activity in architecture, focusing on traditional Korean houses, collaborating in the organization of several academic architecture associations (Kim Yongböm 2013). As a member of the Committee for Cultural Properties, he worked on the restoration of Kwanghwamun in particular (Kim Yun’gi, 1975). The appointment of committee members was the prerogative of the Minister of Culture and Education, but the drastic reduction of bureaucrats on the committee points to a different relationship with scholars. The government decided to create a space in which expert voices prevailed over those of bureaucrats.

Archaeologists in Sub-committee One represented a sizable number of seats, raising questions about their influence on archaeological decisions. Table 2 shows the names of the scholars in the Committee related to archaeological research and the total number of members in the sub-committee. These archaeologists represented the most important research centres in archaeology, as they were all university professors or researchers at the NMK.

**Table 2.** Members of Sub-Committee One for Cultural Properties Related to Archaeology

Year	Name of Archaeologists on the Sub-committee	Total No. of Members
1955	Kim Yangsön 金良善 (1908–1970), Kim Chaewön, Yi Yonghüi 李用熙 (1917–1997), Hwang Suyöng 黃壽永 (1918–2011)	10
1960	Kim Chaewön, Yi Hongjik 李弘植 (1909–1970), Kim Wönyong 金元龍 (1922–1993), Hwang Suyöng	17
1962	Kim Chaewön, Yi Hongjik, Kim Wönyong, Hwang Suyöng	8
1963	Kim Chaewön, Yi Hongjik, Kim Wönyong, Hwang Suyöng	9
1966	Yi Hongjik, Kim Wönyong, Chin Hongsöp 秦弘燮 (1918–2010), Hwang Suyöng	10
1969	Yi Hongjik, Kim Wönyong, Son Pogi 孫寶基 (1922–2010), Chin Hongsöp	10
1971	Son Pogi, Chin Hongsöp	9
1973	Kim Wönyong, Chin Hongsöp, Hwang Suyöng	10
1975	Kim Wönyong, Chin Hongsöp, Hwang Suyöng	10
1977	Kim Wönyong, Hwang Suyöng	6
1979	Kim Wönyong, Hwang Suyöng	9

The committee had powers over the authorization process for archaeological excavations (Munhwa Pohoböp Sihaeng, Pömnnyul no. 1462, 1963.12.5, article 4), later publishing their decisions (Munhwajae Kwalliguk 1965–1979; Munhwajae Kwalliguk. Kyöngju Kojök Kwalli Samuso 1992). Archaeologists had a strong voice on the committee regarding these authorizations, as they could support or veto an authorization. Accounts on the authorization to excavate the first Palaeolithic Age site in South Korea can provide insights into this process and the dynamics within the committee. The application for an authorization to excavate the Palaeolithic site at Sökchang-ni 石莊里 by L. Sample and A. Mohr offers a glimpse into academics' power on the committee. Kim Wönyong, then member of Sub-Committee One, recalled the events as follows:

One female and one male student, seemingly in their late 30s, called A. Mohr and L. Sample, visited Korea in late 1962. It appeared their intention was to perform a survey and excavate an archaeological site. Initially, they carried a map on their own and sought out a site, leading to the discovery of [the site at] Sökchang-ni in Kongju. Later, they accompanied students of the Department of Archaeology [Im Hyojae 任孝宰 and Chöng Yöngghwa 鄭永和]—whom I had sent for guidance and training—finding a site with comb pottery on the East Sea. They dug two small trenches (1.5 x 6 m, 1.5 x 8 m) in Tongsam-dong, Pusan, excavating the site without permission and without my knowledge. The rumour of that excavation spread, and one day during a meeting of the Committee for Cultural Properties Kim Chaewön said: “Seoul [National] University rashly takes foreigners to poke around in [archaeological] sites.” I was sitting there, and apparently that was the situation, so there was nothing I could say. After this, first Mohr, then the other student went back [to the US], and later returned to Korea, this time in cooperation with Yonsei University. They formally applied for authorization to excavate Sökchang-ni. When the application arrived at the Committee for Cultural Properties, this time Kim Chaewön made a speech for its approval, but I disagreed, and it was denied [ . . . ]

The excavation of Sökchang-ni by foreigners was interrupted in this manner. As a result, Son Pogi, then director of Yonsei University Museum, started excavating it in 1964. (Kim Wönyong 1985, 202–203)

After this account, Kim Wönyong continues justifying his refusal on the grounds of Korea's political situation—its colonial past and the current confrontation with North Korea made him sensitive to the excavation of the first Palaeolithic site in South Korea by Americans. Accordingly, he concluded that the study of the Palaeolithic Age in South Korea had to be established by Korean researchers, and not foreigners (Kim Wönyong 1985, 204). This account can be supplemented with the testimony of the later director of the excavation at Sökchang-ni, Son Pogi. During an interview, the interviewer and Son Pogi had the following exchange:

**Cho Taesöp:** I have heard that there were many difficulties before in excavating Sökchang-ni.

**Son Pogi:** I thought it was necessary to excavate in order to perform accurate academic research [at Sökchang-ni]. For that reason, I applied for an excavation authorization.

However, the first two times or so, the authorization application was rejected. I met with Kim Sanggi and Kim Chaewön and we visited Kim Wönyong to request to perform the excavation together, but he did not believe in the existence of a Palaeolithic layer. For that reason, I visited each member of the Committee for Cultural Properties and tried to persuade them. Professor Han T'aedong came with me, and I only received authorization on the third attempt. There was only one condition: they told me that I had to do it after Mohr returned to the US. (Son Pogi and Han'guk Kogo Hakhoe 2008, 40)

These two accounts illustrate the importance of individual members of the committee in achieving authorization for an archaeological excavation. When Kim Chaewön was ready to support Mohr and Sample's application, Kim Wönyong's opposition was the reason for the rejection. Kim Wönyong's central role is also evident in Son's account, as he had to visit Kim to try to convince him to work together. Finally, neither of them mentioned any intervention by any bureaucrat or politician, as if they were irrelevant in the process. This evidence suggests that academics were left to freely decide the granting of authorizations for archaeological excavations.

### **Government Institutions for Archaeological Research**

The government inherited the National Museum of Korea (NMK) and developed institutions such as the Office for Cultural Properties (OCP) and the Research Institute for Cultural Properties (RICP) to manage and research archaeological heritage. These institutions became spaces where government representatives and archaeologists interacted intensively, representing the backbone of the government system for archaeological research between 1945 and 1979. However, the origins and relationship of these institutions with the government did not remain the same, changing in relation to the government's cultural policy, the country's economic development, and its associated projects. Thus, the Kyöngju Tourism Development Project and the large development projects starting in 1968 were turning points for these institutions.

Governments changed their cultural policies according to their objectives, affecting the management structure involved in archaeological heritage research. These policies can be organized into three periods. During the first period, from 1945 to 1960, the government did not have the necessary interest or resources to transform the archaeological heritage management system, and continued using the colonial law of cultural heritage, keeping the NMK as the only government institution for archaeological research. Between 1961 and 1968, the government remodelled the administration of cultural heritage and established the OCP and the Cultural Property Protection Act. In the third period, from 1968 to 1979, the government decided to mobilize cultural heritage more decisively under the newly reorganized Ministry of Culture and Public Communication. This period is linked with a general reorganization of the state, which led to the promulgation of a truly dictatorial system known in Korea as the Yusin Regime (1972–1979) (Munhwajaech'öng 2011). As a result, the latter period established the RICP to execute government policies and archaeological projects in the field. During these

three periods, the government and archaeologists in government institutions also changed the terms of their relationship.

The US Army Military Government in Korea (USAMGIK) established the NMK in 1945 over the structure and collections of the colonial museum keeping also some of its procedures, in an attempt to re-establish both the government administrative structure and intellectual life in Korea (Steinberg 1968, 18–33; Knezevich 1991, 100–101). Following this objective, the USAMGIK appointed Kim Chaewön to lead the reorganization of the museum, allowing the extended stay of Arimitsu Kyōichi (有光教一, 1907–2011) to help the transition at Kim's suggestion (Steinberg 1968, 27–28; Arimitsu 1991; Kim Chaewön 1992, 83–85, and 96–97). This secured continuity of the management of the already-formed collections. However, the NMK's new legal structure established a new institutional relationship vis-à-vis the government, allowing the creation of an autonomous space for archaeological research. During the colonial period, the museum was under the direct control of the Japanese authorities, to the point that it had no independent budget, and depended directly on the colonial government (Han'guk Pangmulgwan 100-yōnsa P'yōnch'an Wiwōnhoe 2009, 116). In contrast, the USAMGIK established the museum as an independent organ under the Art and Religions Section of the Ministry of Education (Steinberg 1968, 22), and later, the Republic of Korea maintained that status under the same Ministry (Taet'ongnyōngnyōng no. 234, 1949.12.12).

In addition, the different governments always appointed important scholars connected to the research work conducted at the NMK. The USAMGIK first, and the Republic later, legislated that the director of the NMK had to be an academic (Taet'ongnyōngnyōng no. 234, 1949.12.12, article 5). Between 1945 and 1979, the directors of the NMK were prestigious scholars linked to archaeology and art history: Kim Chaewön (1945–1970), Kim Wōnyong (1970–1971), Hwang Suyōng (1972–1974), and Ch'oe Sun'u 崔淳雨 (1916–1984; NMK director 1974–1984). All this made the museum a space where academics could exercise their autonomy, leaving the prerogative for action to the director.

The OCP and the RICP were administrative innovations of Park Chung Hee's government. The OCP was established in 1961 as an attempt to centralize all cultural heritage institutions under one single unit, becoming an independent organization under the authority of the Ministry of Culture and Education (Munhwajaech'ōng 2011, 47), like the NMK. However, the government appointed a high-level bureaucrat to direct the OCP (Munhwajaech'ōng 2011, 691–692), strengthening the administrative function of the institution. In fact, the OCP had a minimal research capability, at least until 1968.

The first excavations that the OCP coordinated revealed this lack of human resources and experience. The OCP organized its first excavation in 1965 (Munhwajae Yōn'guso 2016), but the lack of qualified personnel forced the institution to rely on seasoned archaeologists. The excavation report mentions that the archaeologists in the field were Kim Wōnyong and Chin Hongsoṑ, members of the Committee for Cultural Properties, and Pak Ilhun 朴日薰, researcher at the NMK. The report also mentions Yi Hogwan 李浩官 and Kang In'gu 姜麟求, junior

researchers at the OCP at that time (Munhwajae Kwalliguk 1969, 7). These kinds of collaborations continued in other excavations organized by the OCP, such as that of a *tumulus* in Hwango-ri 皇吾里 in 1966 (Munhwajae Yŏn'guso 2016; Kungnip Pangmulgwan 1970, 40).

The government initiated a new cultural policy in 1968, after the raid on the presidential residence by North Korean commandos and the capture of the American ship USS Pueblo by North Korea. Within that context, Park Chung Hee pushed for the heavy and chemical industrialization of South Korea as main objectives (Hyung-A Kim 2004). The government promoted nationalism and the exaltation of Korean culture to mobilize Korean society and gather support for the dictatorial regime under the Yusin Constitution (Moon and Jun, 2011). Thus, Park's politics exalted the ancient kingdom of Silla 新羅 (57 BCE–668 CE) and Later or Unified Silla (668–935) as the locus of the golden age of Korean culture and national unity. In order to deliver said program, the government created a new Ministry of Culture and Public Information in charge of culture, arts, national and international public opinion research, and affairs related to broadcast, news, and propaganda (Taet'ongnyŏngnyŏng no. 3519, 1968.7.24). This new ministry ended up taking charge of the NMK and the OCP, among other cultural institutions.

The reconstruction of the old city of Kyŏngju as the ancient capital of Silla through an ambitious tourism development plan (Kyŏngju-si 1969; Tourism Development Planning Group 1971; Kŏnsŏlbu Kyŏngju Kaebal Kŏnsŏl Saŏpso 1979) was integral to that new discourse on the nation. This plan called for large-scale archaeological excavations in the area, as well as reconstruction and restoration projects that tried to support a nationalist narrative which could help in the national mobilization for economic development (Ch'oe Kwangsŭng 2012).

Within the context of economic growth and the new value of Silla within the nationalist discourse, the OCP organized the Research Office for Cultural Properties (Munhwajae Yŏn'gusil) in 1969, a department within the OCP, becoming the Research Institute for Cultural Properties (Munhwajae Yŏn'guso) in 1975 (Munhwajae Yŏn'guso 1999, 24). Its first director was Kim Chŏnggi 金正基 (b. 1930), until 1987 (Munhwajae Yŏn'guso 1999, 404). He was a former researcher at the NMK, with great experience in archaeological fieldwork and the history of ancient architecture, having taken part in the excavation of Buddhist temples in Japan and Korea. In fact, he was appointed in the context of the restoration project of Pulguksa Temple (Son Pogi and Han'guk Kogo Hakhoe 2008, 180–181), one of the key monuments in the redevelopment project of Kyŏngju as the capital of Silla.

The government's interest in archaeology during this period did not limit itself to the revival of Silla culture. The rapid economic development and large-scale infrastructure projects that started in the late 1960s implied the discovery and potential destruction of many archaeological sites, and the government could not ignore those risks without taking any measures. The Cultural Property Protection Act, with its discourse regarding the promotion and defense of the Korean nation and Korean heritage, demanded a reaction, despite the potential hindrance to said economic development projects. Chŏng Chaehun 鄭在鏞 (1938–2011), then a high-ranking official at the OCP, recalled that this debate reached the highest spheres of

the government in relation to the Seoul-Pusan highway. The highway passed very close to Kyōngju, and the plan anticipated the razing of a cemetery with *tumuli* from the Silla period. Under the Cultural Property Protection Act, the OCP could not allow that, and ordered construction to be halted. The Ministry of Construction demanded the continuation of works under any circumstance, but the OCP did not yield. The conflict reached president Park Chung Hee, who decided that the OCP would conduct rescue excavations to save as much of those sites as possible. Moreover, he decided that the Ministry responsible for the construction of the highway would cover the expenses (Son Pogi and Han'guk Kogo Hakhoe 2008, 411–413).

This decision set a precedent for the government's large-scale construction projects, multiplying the volume of work for the RICP, which consequently adopted a collaborative model with non-governmental research institutions to complete the extensive works in the short time available. The P'aldal-Soyang Dam project helps to illustrate the management system and the problems generated by the short timeframe for finishing excavations (Munhwajae Yōn'guso 1974). This project aimed to survey and excavate the area that would be inundated by the dam project by executing two campaigns: the first from June 12, 1972 to July 7, 1972, and the second from July 10, 1972 to July 25, 1972—meaning forty days of work. The campaigns involved members from the OCP, the NMK, Soongsil University, Korea University, Dankook University, Kyung Hee University, Ewha Woman's University, Konkuk University, and Seoul National University, with as many as eighteen archaeologists signing the report (Munhwajae Yōn'guso 1974, 2). Similar characteristics in terms of research length and collaboration between governmental and non-governmental researchers were present in many of this period's archaeological projects. They represented a significant part of all the archaeological excavations performed between 1968 and 1979: The Kyōngju Development Plan (50 excavations) in 1969–1979; P'aldal-Soyang Dam (8 excavations) in 1971–72; Andong Dam (6 excavations) in 1973–74; Changsōng Dam and Yōngsan River Dam (3 excavations) in 1975; Taech'ōng Dam (9 excavations) in 1977–78; Panwōn Industrial Site (6 excavations) in 1978; Ch'angwōn Machine Industry Complex (1 excavation) in 1976 and the Chamsil Development Project (15 excavations) in 1974–76, accounting for 98 out of 297 total excavations for the period between 1969 and 1979 (Munhwajae Yōn'guso 2016).

### **The Funding of Archaeology and the Government**

The government regulated the funding of archaeological research through cultural heritage protection laws, establishing who had to fund the excavation of an archaeological site, including government institutions. Considering the expenses of archaeological excavations, the amount of funding determined their scale.

The first change in the funding structure of archaeological excavations came with the promulgation of the CPPA in 1962. The colonial government had established that the government had to fund the expenses of excavations in article 6.2 of the TASSNMC, making the government the main funding agency for archaeological excavations on the peninsula. The CPPA, however, left the funding

to the institution in charge of the excavation, also regulating conditions when the government was the researching institution (CPPA 1962, Article 44). Thus, non-government institutions had to fund their own excavations. This activity predated the changes in the law, like the excavation of the Ungch'ön shellmound (*p'aech'ong* 貝塚) by Korea University in 1959, funded by the Asiatic Research Institute (Yun Seyöng 2006, 266).

The research institution's need to secure funding for each excavation was an important question. A relevant case is the funding practices adopted by the NMK until the late 1960s. Governmental funding limits limited NMK budgets for archaeological research to the extent that the director of the NMK had to secure funding from international institutions. Kim Chaewön, as director of the NMK, received grants from the Rockefeller Foundation, the Asia Foundation, the Harvard-Yenching Institute, and the Korea Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society to conduct archaeological research in Korea and publish the results. In fact, at least twelve interventions out of seventeen were founded with resources from abroad between 1945 and 1960 (Kim Chaewön 1948; Kim Chaewön and Kim Wönyong 1955; Kim Chaewön and Yun Mubyöng 1961; Kim Chaewön and Yun Mubyöng 1962; Kim Wönyong 1963; Munhwajae Yön'guso 2016). Being able to draw on international funds like this allowed the NMK a great deal of autonomy vis-à-vis the government to plan their research.

The mixed formula for funding at the NMK changed around the 1960s, when the government made available more resources for cultural heritage protection. This change was evident in the funding of the Dolmen Research Project, ending in the publication of a report of all the excavations of dolmens performed between 1961 and 1967 (Kim Chaewön and Yun Mubyöng 1967). The Harvard-Yenching Institute and the Asia Foundation provided funds to support the research on dolmens (Kim Chaewön and Yun Mubyöng 1967, 1–2), but the government also provided funds in the form of rescue archaeology projects. This is evident from Yi Nanyöng's 李蘭映 (b. 1934) memoir, where she talks about the international funding for archaeological research and adds: “emergency research was possible also with state funds, and the dolmen research was considered as a plan with two branches” (Yi Nanyöng 2005, 29). Thus, the NMK used its own funds, funds from rescue archaeology projects, and international grants. Most likely, smaller institutions such as universities had to face similar circumstances to fund their research, but with greater difficulties accessing the same amounts.

This situation changed in 1973 after the amendment of the Cultural Property Protection Act. The new article 44.2 made land developers responsible for the funding of any necessary archaeological excavation in the area of the project. This article extended the aforementioned government practice to all land developers in the country. In parallel to the new responsibility of funding archaeological research by land developers, more funds from government projects were introduced into the field, particularly in relation to many large government construction projects. This transformation of the archaeological economic structure poured large amounts of capital from the private and public sectors into archaeological excavations, making the introduction of new institutions in the field possible. At the same time, the OCP

became the agent in charge of channelling research funds from large government engineering projects to form joint research projects with other agents. Korean archaeology grew enormously, both in terms of institutions and the total number of excavations. The participation of non-government archaeological institutions, mainly universities, during the 1970s, was regulated through contracts, securing economic compensation beyond covering the costs of the excavation (Yung-jo Lee 1984). Consequently, greater number of institutions could excavate thanks to their participation in rescue archaeological projects funded by the government or private contractors.

### **Conclusion**

The institutional system of archaeological research in Korea after the Liberation of the peninsula started on the basis of inherited colonial institutions. The NMK, the TASSNMC, and the Committee for Cultural Properties were all colonial institutions that continued after 1945. However, there were important innovations, for example, in the legal organization of the institutions, and in the management of those institutions by Korean scholars. The NMK changed its status to become an independent institution with its own budget, capable of financing itself through international grants. The committee also changed its composition significantly to incorporate Korean scholars almost exclusively, increasing their power. Through the authorization process, the committee regulated archaeological excavations, allowing a greater and more diverse number of researchers compared to the colonial period (Munhwajae Yŏnguso 2016). More particularly, they enabled the configuration of an academic field beyond government institutions, mainly university museums (Han'guk Taehak Pangmulgwan Hyŏphoe 50-nyŏnsa P'yŏnch'an Wiwŏnhoe 2011). This situation complicates the theoretical delineation of colonial continuities, forcing us to redefine the limits of the colonial legacy in archaeological institutions. Thus, the system of relations between government and archaeologists, even if defined under colonial structures, was reinterpreted, allowing a greater diversity of researchers and more initiative for archaeologists within the system.

The spaces where the government and archaeologists met were not ones of top-down domination. After 1945, they allowed a great degree of autonomy for archaeologists, but when the government interest in archaeology changed, the government demanded a different level of collaboration from archaeologists. The authorization process controlled by the Committee for Cultural Properties reveals the predominance of archaeologists in deciding the future of applications and shows their initiative to decide what and when to grant authorization. Government institutions also presented different levels of autonomy regarding their research policies. The NMK was capable of developing its own research projects thanks to its legal status—as long as it had the budget for it—whether from its own resources or from international research grants. Thus, it developed its own research activity and research goals.

The government did not challenge that autonomy. However, the economic development of the country (primarily) and the transformation of cultural policy

after 1968 (subsequently) implied important changes for government research institutions in archaeology. The government never tried to control NMK research policy, leaving it to the discretion of the museum director. Nevertheless, as public officers, the government made use of human resources to bolster new institutions more closely controlled by the government. The OCP needed NMK archaeologists' expertise during its first years, and Kim Chönggi, former archaeologist at the NMK, directed the new RICP, which was in charge of many of the key government archaeology projects. These two institutions later had much more limited autonomy in terms of their research projects, at least during the late 1960s until 1979, the end of the research period considered here. They had the task of carrying out government research policy, centered on the revival of Kyöngju as the capital of Silla, and rescue excavations in the context of ambitious development projects linked to the industrialization of Korea. However, this mobilization never stopped the NMK from pursuing its own research projects; nor did it stop other institutions from developing their own research, as long as they had the means.

The change in government cultural policy after 1968 shows, in a sense, archaeologists' position vis-à-vis the government. Archaeologists could develop their research projects as long as they had the means to fund them, but at the same time, the government mobilized them to carry out its goals in the field. The government respected the autonomy of those intellectuals who preferred not to be involved, but that meant fewer excavation opportunities for them. Government projects for archaeological research meant many things: money, excavation experience for young researchers, archaeological data, and in many cases the opportunity to collaborate with other researchers. Thus, ignoring them could potentially impact the careers of those professors who did not take part in them.

This situation raises the question of how this structure affected the internal organization of the field, even if it respected the academic autonomy of research. Some research on this idea has already been carried out (Botella and Doménech 2017), but this theme needs further research for a more nuanced answer. Nevertheless, based on the study presented here, different levels of influence among archaeologists, based on their positions in the overall structure, can at least be clearly distinguished. The power of the committee to grant authorizations and the budgets of government institutions raises the question of differences between archaeologists at the core of the structure, and those with weaker links.

In this regard, it is also possible to think about all the differences that could arise in the study of different periods and themes in archaeology. Thus, the mobilization of archaeologists after 1968 focused on rescue archaeology and research on Silla, equating to around a third of all excavations performed in the period, raising the issue of how they affected general research trends in the field.

In summary, the consideration of all these issues represents a contribution to our understanding of the ever-complex and challenging relations between intellectuals and the government. The focus of this research on the meeting spaces of archaeologists and government in the definition of the field helps us to better understand the subtle relationships established among the institutions involved, which at the same time opens up new lines of inquiry for the future. The

comparison of this analysis with others could spawn important ideas for bringing the study of this theme forward. At the same time, the study of this context provides a meaningful starting point for a better understanding of how particular authors developed their interpretations of the archaeological record.

### Abbreviations

Cultural Property Protection Act	CPPA
National Museum of Korea	NMK
Office for Cultural Properties	OCP
Research Institute for Cultural Properties	RICP
Treasures, Ancient Sites, Scenery and Natural Monuments Conservation Act	TASSNMC
United States Army Military Government in Korea	USAMGIK

### REFERENCES

- Arimitsu Kyōichi 有光教一. 1991. “Arimitsu Kyōichi Kyosu ūi Hoego” 有光教一 교수 의 회고 [Recollections of Professor Arimitsu Kyōichi]. In *Kyōngbokkung Yahwa*, edited by Kim Chaewŏn, 94–99. Seoul: T’amgudang.
- Arnol, Bettina. 2008. “The Past as Propaganda: Totalitarian Archaeology in Nazi Germany.” In *Histories of Archaeology: A Reader in the History of Archaeology*, edited by Tim Murray and Christopher Evans, 120–144. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bale, Martin T. 2008. “Archaeological Heritage Management in South Korea: The Nam River Project.” In *Early Korea 1: Reconsidering Early Korean History through Archaeology*, edited by Mark E. Byington, 213–233. Cambridge Mass.: Korea Institute, Harvard University.
- Barnes, Gina Lee. 2015. *Archaeology of East Asia: The Rise of Civilization in China, Korea and Japan*. Philadelphia: Oxbow Books.
- Botella, Luis, and Antonio Doménech. 2017. “Achieving Professional Credentials: South Korean Archaeology and University Degrees (1945–1979).” *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 30, no. 1: 71–96.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. 1996. *Homo Academicus*. Reprinted. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2006. *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Meridian Crossing Aesthetics. Stanford, Calif: Stanford Univ. Press.
- Ch’oe Kwangsŭng 최광승. 2012. “Pak Chŏnghŭi ūi Kyōngju kodo kaebal saöp” 박정희의 경주고도 (慶州古都) 개발사업 [Park Chung Hee’s project for the development of the old capital of Kyōngju]. *Chŏngsin munhwa yŏn’gu* 35, no. 1: 183–212.
- Ch’oe Mongnyong 최몽룡, Cho Yujŏn 조유진, Pae Kidong 배기동, Sin Sukchŏng 신숙정, and Yi Sŏngju 이성주. 1992. *Han’guk sŏnsa kogohaksa* 한국 선사 고고학사 [History of the archaeology of Korean prehistory]. Seoul: Tosŏch’ulp’an Kkach’i.
- Díaz-Andreu, Margarita. 1994. “The Past in the Present: The Search for Roots in

- Cultural Nationalism. The Spanish Case.” In *Nationalism in Europe, Past and Present: Actas Do Congreso Internacional Os Nacionalismos En Europa Pasado E Presente, Santiago de Compostela, 27–29 de Setembro de 1993*, edited by Justo G. Beramendi, Ramón Máiz Suárez, and Xosé M. Núñez Seixas, 199–218. Cursos e Congressos da Universidade de Santiago de Compostela. Santiago de Compostela: Universidade de Santiago de Compostela.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1997. “Nación e Internacionalización. La arqueología en España en las tres primeras décadas del siglo XX [Nation and internationalization: Archaeology in Spain in the first three decades of the 20th century].” In *La cristalización del pasado: génesis y desarrollo de marco institucional de la arqueología en España* [The crystallization of the past: Genesis and institutional development of archaeology in Spain], edited by Gloria Mora, 403–416. Málaga: Servicio de Publ. de la Universidad de Málaga.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. *World History of Nineteenth-Century Archaeology: Nationalism, Colonialism, and the Past*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Díaz-Andreu, Margarita, and Mora, eds. 1997. *La Cristalización del Pasado: Génesis y Desarrollo Institucional de la Arqueología En España* [The crystallization of the past: Genesis and institutional development of archaeology in Spain]. Málaga: Universidad de Málaga.
- Evasdottir, Erika E. S. 2004. *Obedient Autonomy: Chinese Intellectuals and the Achievement of Orderly Life*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Fowler, Don D. 2008. “Uses of the Past: Archaeology in the Service of the State.” In *Histories of Archaeology: A Reader in the History of Archaeology*, edited by Tim Murray and Christopher Evans, 93–119. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Han, Sangwoo. 2001. “Cultural Heritage Management in South Korea.” Ph.D., University of Minnesota.
- Han’guk Pangmulgwan 100-yönsa P’yönc’h’an Wiwönhoe 한국박물관 100년사 편찬위원회, ed. 2009. *Han’guk pangmulgwan 100-yönsa 한국 박물관 100년사* [100-year history of Korean museums]. Ch’op’an. Seoul: Kungnip Chungang Pangmulgwan: Han’guk Pangmulgwan Hyöphoe.
- Han’guk Taehak Pangmulgwan Hyöphoe 50-yönsa P’yönc’h’an Wiwönhoe 한국대학박물관협회 50년사 편찬위원회, ed. 2011. *Han’guk Taehak Pangmulgwan Hyöphoe 50-yönsa, 1961–2011 한국대학박물관협회 50년사* [50-Year History of the Korean Association of University Museums]. Pusan Kwangyöksi: Han’guk Taehak Pangmulgwan Hyöphoe.
- Härke, Heinrich, ed. 2002. *Archaeology, Ideology and Society: The German Experience*. 2nd ed. *Gesellschaften und Staaten im Epochenwandel 7*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.
- Jang, Hosu. 2012. “Fifty Years of Cultural Resource Management in Korea: Achievements and Challenges.” In *The Rediscovery of Kaya in History and Archaeology*, edited by Mark E. Byington, 197–208. *Early Korea 3*. Cambridge, MA: Korea Institute, Harvard Univ.
- Kim Chaewön 김재원. 1948. *Houch’ong kwa Ŭnnyöngch’ong 壺杆塚과 銀鈴塚* [Hou Tomb and Silver Bell Tomb]. Seoul: Ŭryu Munhwasa.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1992. *Pangmulgwan kwa hanp’yöngsaeng 박물관과 한평생* [My life with the

- museum]. Seoul: T'amgudang.
- Kim, Chae-won and Youn Moo-byong. 1961. *Kam Eun Sa, A Temple Site of the Silla Dynasty*. Seoul: National Museum of Korea.
- Kim Chaewön 김재원 and Yun Mubyöng 윤무병. 1962. *Üisöng T'amni kobun 義城塔里古墳* [The ancient tombs in T'amni Üisöng-gun, Kyöngsang Pukto]. Seoul: Üryu Munhwasa.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1967. *Han'guk chisöngmyo yön'gu 韓國支石墓研究* [Studies of dolmens in Korea]. Seoul: Kungnip Chungang Pangmulgwan.
- Kim Chaewön 김재원 and Kim Wönyong 김원룡. 1955. *Kyöngju Nosöri, Ssangsangch'ong, Mach'ong, paek samsipp'arho pun chosa pogo* 慶州路西里 雙床塚馬塚 一三八號墳調查報告 [Excavation report for the Ssangsangch'ong, Mach'ong, and No. 138 tombs in Nosöri, Kyöngju]. Seoul: Üryu Munhwasa.
- Kim Chöngbae 김정배. 2000. *Han'guk kodaesa wa kogohak 韓國 고대사와 고고학* [Korean ancient history and archaeology]. Seoul T'ükpyölsi: Sinsöwön.
- Kim, Hyung-A. 2004. *Korea's Development under Park Chung Hee: Rapid Industrialization, 1961–79*. London: Routledge Curzon.
- Kim Yongböm 김용범. 2013. "Könch'ukka Kim Yun'gi üi ch'on'yön'gi kyoyuk kwajöng kwa könch'uk hwaltong e kwanhan koch'al" [A study on the educational background and architectural activities of architect Kim, Yun'gi in his early times]. *Taehan könch'uk hakhoe nonmunjip—kyehoekkye* 29, no. 6: 173–180.
- Kim Yun'gi 김윤기. 1975. T'ükchip—30nyön hoegodam: namgigo sip'un iyagi 특집—30년 회고담: 남기고 싶은 이야기 [Special issue—30 years of recollections: What I want to say for the record]. *Könch'uk* 19, no. 4: 17–18.
- Kim Wönyong 김원룡. 1963. *Ullüngdo Bu Yöngnam-gun Naedong-ni Onggwanmyo* 울릉도 부 영남군 내동리 웅관묘 [Archaeology of Ullüng-Do Island and the Naedong-ni Tomb]. Seoul: National Museum of Korea.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1981. "Korean Archaeology Today." *Korea Journal* 21, no. 9: 22–43.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1985. *Haru haruwa üi mannam: Kim Wönyong Esei* 하루하루와의 만남: 金元龍에세이 [Everyday meetings: Kim Wönyong's essay]. Seoul: Munünsa.
- Knezevich, Eugene. 1991. "Küneju Paksa üi hoego" 그네즈 박사의 회고 [Recollections of Dr. Knez]. In *Kyöngbokkung Yahwa 京福宮 夜話*, edited by Kim Chaewön, 109–107. Seoul: T'amgudang.
- Kohl, Philip L. and Clare Fawcett. 1995. *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Könsölbü Kyöngju Kaebal Könsöl Saöpsö 건설부경주개발건설사업소. 1979. *Kyöngju kwan'gwang chonghap kaebal saöpchi* 경주관광종합개발사업지 [Report of the project for the comprehensive tourism development of Kyöngju]. Seoul: Könch'ukpu Kyöngju Kaebal Könch'uk Samuso.
- Kungnip Pangmulgwan 국립박물관. 1970. "Kogo Misul Nyusü" 고고미술뉴스 [Archaeology and art news]. *Misul charyo*, no. 14: 40–43.
- Kyöngju-si 경주시. 1969. "Kwan'gwang kaebal kibon kyehoek" 관광개발기본계획 [Basic plan for tourism development]. Kyöngju: Kyöngju-si.
- Lee, Yung-jo. 1984. "1982–1983 Excavation of Archaeological Sites in the Submergence Area of the Ch'unju Dam Construction." *Korea Journal* 24 (November): 4–26.
- Moon, Chung-in and Byung-joon Jun. 2011. "Modernization Strategy: Ideas and

- Influences.” In *The Park Chung Hee Era: The Transformation of South Korea*, edited by Pyöng-guk Kim and Ezra F. Vogel, 115–139. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Munhwajaech’öng 문화재청. 2011. *Munhwajaech’öng 50nyönsa. Pönmun p’yön 문화재청 50년사. 본문편* [Fifty-year history of the Cultural Heritage Administration. Main Text]. Taejön: Cultural Heritage Administration.
- Munhwajae Kwalliguk 문화재 관리국. 1969. Kyöngju Hwango-ri che 133 ho, che 151 ho Kobun palgul chosa pogo 慶州 皇吾里 第一·三三號, 皇南里 第一五日號 古墳發掘調査報告 [Report on the excavation of the Kobun Hwango-ri 133 and 151 in Kyöngju]. Seoul: Munhwajae Kwalliguk.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1965–1979. Munhwajae Wiwönhoe üirok [Committee for Cultural Properties meeting minutes]. *Munhwajae*, nos. 1–12.
- Munhwajae Kwalliguk. Kyöngju Kojök Kwalli Samuso 문화재 관리국. 경주고적관리사무소. 1992. Munhwajae Wiwönhoe hoeüirok (1952-nyön 12-wöl 19-il put’ö 1959-nyön 10-wöl 21-il kkaji) 문화재 위원회 회의록 (1952년 12월 19일부터 1959년 10월 21일까지) [Meeting records of the Committee for Cultural Properties (from December 19, 1952 until October 21, 1959)]. Seoul: Munhwajae Yön’guso.
- Munhwajae Yön’guso 문화재연구소. 1974. *P’altang-Soyang taem sumol chigu yujök palgul chonghap chosa pogoso* 八堂 · 昭陽댐水沒地區遺跡發掘綜合調査報告書 [Comprehensive excavation research report of the archaeological sites in the area flooded by the P’altang · Soyang dam]. Seoul: Munhwajae Yön’guso.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1999. *Munhwajae Yön’guso 30 nyönsa* [Thirty-year history of the Munhwajae Yön’guso]. Seoul: Kungnip Munhwajae Yön’guso.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2016. “Palgul yönp’yo” 발굴연표 [Chronological record of archaeological excavations]. <http://portal.nrich.go.kr/kor/excavationChronologyUsrList.do?menuIdx=566> (accessed March 18, 2016).
- Nelson, Sarah M. 1995. “The Politics of Ethnicity in Prehistoric Korea.” In *Nationalism, Politics and the Practice of Archaeology*, 218–231. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O Ch’unyöng 오춘영. 2018. “Ilche kangjömgi munhwajae chöngch’aek hyöngsöng kwajöng yön’gu: Wiwönhoe kusöng kwa mongnok pyönhwa rül chungsim üro” 일제강점기 문화재 정책 형성과정 연구: 위원회 구성과 목록 변화를 중심으로 [Study on the formulation of the Cultural Property Policy during the Japanese Colonial Period, with a focus on the composition of the committee and changes in the listing of cultural properties]. *Munhwajae. Korean Journal of Cultural Heritage Studies* 51, no. 1: 100–125.
- Pai Hyung Il. 2000. *Constructing “Korean” origins: A Critical Review of Archaeology, Historiography, and Racial Myth in Korean State-Formation Theories*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Asia Center.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2001. “The Creation of National Treasures and Monuments: The 1916 Japanese Laws on the Preservation of Korean Remains and Relics and Their Colonial Legacies.” *Korean Studies* 25, no. 1: 72–95.
- Sekino Tadashi. 1931. *Ancient Remains and Relics in Korea: Efforts toward Research and Preservation*. Tokyo: The Japan Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations.

- Shin, Sook Chung. 2012. “Present and Future of Korean Institutes Specializing in Archaeological Excavations.” In *The Rediscovery of Kaya in History and Archaeology*, edited by Mark E. Byington, 209–223. Early Korea 3. Cambridge, MA: Korea Institute, Harvard University.
- Shoda, Shinya. 2008. “A Brief Introduction to Rescue Archaeology in South Korea.” In *Reconsidering Early Korean History through Archaeology*, edited by Mark E. Byington, 201–212. Early Korea 1. Cambridge, Mass: Early Korea Project, Korea Inst., Harvard University.
- Son Pogi and Han’guk Kogo Hakhoe, eds. 2008. *Ilgop wŏllo ege tŭnnŭn Han’guk kogohak 60-nyŏn* [Sixty years of Korean archaeology, as heard from seven senior scholars]. Seoul: Sahoe P’yŏngnon.
- Steinberg, David I. 1968. “The National Museum of the Republic of Korea.” *Transactions of the Royal Asiatic Society, Korea Branch*, no. 44: 1–69.
- Tanaka, Stefan. 1995. *Japan’s Orient: Rendering Pasts into History*. Berkeley, CA: Univ. of California Press.
- Tourism Development Planning Group. 1971. *The Kyongju Development Plan*. Seoul: Tourism Development Planning Group.
- Yi Nanyŏng 이난영. 2005. *Pangmulgwan ch’anggo chigi* 박물관 창고 지기 [Keeper of the museum warehouse]. Seoul: Tongch’ŏn Munhwasa.
- Yi Sunja 이순자. 2007. “Ilche kangjŏmgi kojŏk chosa saŏp yŏn’gu” 일제강점기 고적조사사업 연구 [Research on the investigation of ancient sites during the colonial period]. Ph.D. diss., Sookmyung Women’s University.
- Yu Chunghyŏn. 2017. “Ilche kangjŏmgi Fujita Ryŏsaku (藤田亮策) ŭi Chosŏn kodaemunhwa insik kwa kŭ pyŏnhwa: *Chŏsen Kŏkogaku Kenkyū* (朝鮮考古学研究) rŭl chungsim ŭro” 일제강점기 후지타 료사쿠 (藤田亮策)의 조선 고대문화 인식과 그 변화 - 『조선고고학연구』를 중심으로 [Fujita Ryŏsaku’s understanding of Chosŏn ancient history and its transformation during the Japanese colonial period: With a focus on his *A Study of Chosŏn Archaeology*]. *Hanil kwan’gyesa yŏn’gu* 56: 185–219.
- Yun Seyŏng 윤세영. 2006. Han’guk Kogo Hakhoe ŭi t’onghap kwajŏng” 한국 고고학회의 통합 과정 [Unification process of the Korean Archaeological Society]. *Kogohakpo* 60: 263–269.

## Legislation

- Chosŏn Pomul · Kojŏk · Myŏngsŭng · Ch’ŏnyŏn Kinyŏmmul Pojonnyŏng 조선보물 · 고적 · 명승 · 천연기념물보존령 [Treasures, Ancient Sites, Scenery, and Natural Monuments Conservation Act], Chosŏn Ch’ongdokpu Chaeryŏng no. 6, 1933.8.9.
- Kungnip Pangmulgwan Chikche 국립박물관직제 [Structure of the National Museum], Taet’ongnyŏngnyŏng no. 234, 1949.12.12.
- Munhwajae Pohopŏp 문화재보호법 [Cultural Property Protection Act], Pŏmnyul no. 961, 1962.1.10.
- Munhwajae Pohobŏp Sihaeng 문화재보호법시행 [Enforcement Regulation of the Cultural Property Protection Act], Pŏmnyul 1462, 1963.12.5.
- Munhwajae Pojon Wiwŏnhoe Kyujŏng 문화재보존위원회규정 [Regulations of the

- Committee for the Conservation of Cultural Properties], Kungmuwŏnnyŏng no. 92, 1960.11.10.
- Munhwajae Wiwŏnhoe Kyujŏng 문화재위원회규정 [Regulations of the Committee for Cultural Properties], Kangnyŏng no. 577, 1962.3.27.
- Munhwajae Wiwŏnhoe Kyujŏng 문화재위원회규정 [Regulations of the Committee for Cultural Properties], Kangnyŏng no. 1158, 1963.1.22.
- Munhwajae Wiwŏnhoe Kyujŏng 문화재위원회규정 [Regulations of the Committee for Cultural Properties], Taet'ongnyŏngnyŏng no. 6861, 1973.9.15.
- Munhwa Kongbobu Chikche 문화공보부직제 [Structure of the Ministry of Culture and Public Information], Taet'ongnyŏngnyŏng no. 3519, 1968.7.24.
- Munhwajae Kwalliguk Chikche 문화재관리국직제 [Structure of the Office for Cultural Properties], Kangnyŏng no. 181, 1961.10.2.
- Munhwajae Kwalliguk Chikche 문화재관리국직제 [Structure of the Office for Cultural Properties], Kangnyŏng no. 181, 1961.10.2.