

**GOGURYEO CONTROVERSY AS A FACTOR IN REPUBLIC OF
KOREA-CHINA RELATIONS,
2004-2014**

*Dissertation submitted to Jawaharlal Nehru University in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the award of the degree of*

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

PRAVIR KUMAR RAM



**CENTRE FOR EAST ASIAN STUDIES
SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI – 110067
2015**

जवाहरलाल नेहरू विश्वविद्यालय
CENTRE FOR EAST ASIAN STUDIES

SCHOOL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES
JAWAHARLAL NEHRU UNIVERSITY
NEW DELHI- 110 067 (INDIA)

Phone : 91-11-2670 4346
FAX : 91-11-2670 4346

Date: 27/7/2015

DECLARATION

I declare that the dissertation entitled "GOGURYEO CONTROVERSY AS A FACTOR IN REPUBLIC OF KOREA-CHINA RELATIONS, 2004-2014" submitted by me in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of the degree of MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY of Jawaharlal Nehru University is my own work. The dissertation has not been submitted for any other degree of this University or any other university.



PRAVIR KUMAR RAM

CERTIFICATE

We recommend that this dissertation be placed before the examiners for evaluation.


Dr. Varaprasad S. Dolla

Chairperson, CEAS

Chairperson
Centre for East Asian Studies
School of International Studies


Dr. Jitendra Uttam

Supervisor

CONTENTS

	Page No.
<i>Acknowledgement</i>	i
<i>Abbreviations</i>	ii
CHAPTER ONE: Overview of Goguryeo Controversy	
1.1 Background	1-7
1.1.1 Goguryeo History	7-9
1.1.2 Goguryeo controversy	10-12
1.1.3 Korea's Response to the Goguryeo Controversy	12-14
1.1.4 Goguryeo Controversy Implications	14-15
1.2 Definition Rationale and Scope of Study	15-16
1.2.1 Research Questions	16
1.2.2 Hypotheses	16
1.3 Research Methodology	16-17
1.4 Chapters	17-18
1.5 Summary	19
CHAPTER TWO: CHINESE AND KOREAN REINTERPRETATION OF GOGURYEO'S HISTORY	
2.1 Introduction	20-21
2.2 Spatiality and Temporality in Manchuria	21-24
2.3 Politics of historiography in China	24-27
2.4 On the Goguryeo issue	28-29
2.5 South Korea's interpretation	29-30
2.6 Korean historiography of Goguryeo	30-32
2.7 China's motivation	32-36
2.8 Korea's response	36-39
2.9 Summary	40
CHAPTER THREE: THE CREATION AND THE REPERCUSSIONS IN THE NATIONAL IDENTITY FORMATION	

3.1 National identity.....	41-43
3.2 Korean national identity.....	43
3.2.1 Genesis of national identity in Korea.....	43-45
3.2.2 Orthodoxy in the Korean nationalism.....	45-46
3.2.3 Enlightenment.....	46-47
3.2.4 Tonghak (동학) (eastern learning)	47-48
3.3 Goguryeo as a national identity.....	48-50
3.4 Chinese Interpretation: Self Centered or Just Independent?	50-52
3.5 Zhonghua Minzu.....	52-55
3.6 Korea's Adaptation Of the 'National Identity' While Addressing Goguryeo	55-56
3.7 Mass media and the Civil Society.....	56-58
3.8 The Government Response and the Scholarship Critique.....	58-59
3.9 The Scholarly Disagreement.....	59-61
3.10 Summary.....	61

CHAPTER FOUR: GOGURYEO CONTROVERSY AND ITS IMPACTS ON THE BILATERAL RELATIONS

4.1 Establishment of South Korea and China Relations.....	62-63
4.2 Korea's views on Chinese Rise and its hegemony in the East Asia.....	63-65
4.3 An insight on the constraints and problems in the South Korea and China relations.....	65-66
4.4 Post Goguryeo Controversy and Relations between South Korea and China...	67-69
4.5 The Scope and Controversial Points of North East Project.....	69-72
4.6 The Gando Problem: The Japanese Incursion in Goguryeo.....	72-73
4.7 The ADIZ Issue: The Defensive Discourse On The Part Of China Controlling Korea's Territoriality	73-76
4.8 Circumstantial Factors within the Relations between South Korea and China....	76-78
4.8.1 The Chinese attitude towards Korean peninsula: Change or Continuity.....	78-80
4.9 Summary.....	80

CHAPTER FOUR: CONCLUSION

5. Conclusion.....	80-87
6. Bibliography.....	88-92

CHAPTER 1: OVERVIEW OF GOGURYEO CONTROVERSY

1.1 Background

The forty years of bitter Sino-South Korean antagonism finally came to an end with the establishment of formal diplomatic relations between two in 1992¹. The end of this hostility helped both Asian countries to further accelerate their growth. Though, historically China and Korea have cultural proximity. Their relationship is characterized by strong historical bonds, cultural affinity and geopolitical interconnectivity. In ancient times Korea's relations with China were formally established during the Song dynasty. In the fourteenth century under the reign of Ming dynasty Sino- Korean relations were at its best when its dynastic change from the military based Koryo to the literati centered Choson was completed. From Chinese perspective Korea was viewed as a model from, where China adopts means of state craft, ruling ideology, the adoption of neo- Confucian teachings and institutional of the national civil service examination system. Traditional Koreans elites were often wholeheartedly supportive of the Chinese dynasties, as their political fate depended heavily on their Chinese superiors. Chosun remains an Independent and Chinese interference in Chosun internal affairs was rare; except for the payment of tribute to Ming Dynasty. As a continental hegemony, China remains a protector and used its soft power to save Korea from political and cultural extinction and Korea was never colonized by China. Korea's geostrategic location as it being situated at the crossroads of continental and maritime powers is often considered as the dagger pointed towards Chinese neck and so the protection of Chosun becomes pivotal for China's security.

The Korean War from 1950 – 1953 had marked its lowest ebb in Sino- Korea relations when China sent its People Liberation army to fight against South Korea and US against North Korea thus resulting in ending of the relations between China and South Korea till the end of cold war².

1 The diplomatic relations between Republic Of Korea and the Peoples Republic of China were formally established on august 24th 1992.

2 Before the establishment of the formal diplomatic relations South Korea recognised only the Republic of China (Taiwan) and China recognised only Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea).

China maintained good relations with North Korea at the expense of South Korea and South Korea in return gave diplomatic recognition to Taiwan and Tibet. Till the end of cold war, Sino-Korean relations were mostly hostile and China maintained good relations with North Korea. The end of cold war and the economic reforms carried out by Deng Xiaoping in 1980's brought China and South Korea closer once again due to their geographical proximity, economic needs and to fulfill their dream of an Asian hegemony. After three decades in 1983 for the first time Chinese 30 member delegation visited South Korea to negotiate with the hijackers of Chinese plane. This marked the beginning of causal exchanges, diplomatic exchanges and increased people to people contact. Citizen of both the countries for the first time after Korean War allowed visiting their divided families on both sides. This resulted in increase in trade between China and South Korea and trust deficit between them were reduced with the formal establishment of diplomatic relations on 24 August 1992.

Then there came the mega storm of history controversy between South Korea and China concerning the Dynasty of Goguryeo (37 BC to 668 AD). Although china's project based research on the Northeast borderland was initiated in 1999 with the establishment of a research point, the South Korea media began to report heavily on the issue after the so called Northeast history project as the systemic effort to incorporate Goguryeo as a part of Chinese local history was launched by the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences in February 2002. The issue became a hot potato in South Korea in June 2003 when China's Guangming Daily characterized Goguryeo as China's non Han local administration. However in summer of 2004, when the Chinese Foreign Ministry deleted the Goguryeo section on its official website, the whole issue erupted as a political diplomatic problem. Some even projected that the History war would become a critical turning point in Sino-South Korean relations. In the immediate aftermath of the controversy, the Korean Broadcasting System (KBS) took an opinion poll, which found that 58.2 percent of the respondents did not like China.



Figure 1.1 Goguryeo kingdom territories at its height 37 BC-668 AD

Source: www.newworldencyclopedia.org:accessed 16th July 2015.



Figure 1.2 present day border demarcation between China, North Korea and South Korea

Source: <http://www.newworldencyclopedia.org>:accessed 16th July 2015

The thesis focuses on the three major dimensions while discussing Sino- South Korean relation from 2004-2014. 1. The reinterpretation of Goguryeo history and the controversy. 2. The Goguryeo

history Identity and Power. 3. The implications of the Goguryo history controversy. While much of the dispute over Goguryo deals with history, it is also closely linked to the concept of national identity. National identity is an important part of constructivist international relations theory (Wendt, 1992 Chekel, 1998 Ruggie, 1998) and is increasingly utilised by scholars to analyze security affairs in East Asia in an effort to address the shortcomings of realist and liberal international frameworks (Berger, 2003, Nau, 2003). In addition, many studies have been done on identity as it applies to Taiwan and China along with the evolving identities on the Korean Peninsula (Wachman, 1994. Cook, 2005. Hays Gries, 2005 Heo and Woo, 2007. Suh 2007.

After extensively reading the contents of the books and articles available for the topic, one can see and adhere to several noticeable loopholes and come out with a holistic critique. One of the major drawbacks and critical attainment is observed in the form in which a political approach is least advertised in the article. The question of Identity formation under the paradigm of Koguryo starts out as an implication rather than an action, we can see that the process of fermentation of the identity is only amicable in the literature and it is not followed practically.

“History as a Strategic Weapon: The Korean and Chinese Struggle of Koguryo”, Terence Roehrig deals with the important question of the formation and the incentives that had taken place historically in the creation of what became the Koguryo identity. As already discussed the topic has always been a bone of contention between China and Korea, where it becomes subsumed much more than a mere representation of a group of people but it ferments into a national crisis: a fight between the Chinese authoritarian state and the Korean civil society, which is essentially conflict between Chinese authoritarian states and the Korean Democratic civil society thus leading to no political repercussions. The civil society of Korea had always believed that Goguryo has always been part of the Three Kingdoms: namely Silla, Baekje and Goguryo. And henceforth the claim came that the identity and the culture of the Goguryo should remain in the domain of the Korean peninsula and there should not be any external claim to it. On the contrary, the Chinese had seen the place to be the historical home for the Manchus and they have claimed that the place is a part of the larger vassalage. And this sparked a serious debate among both the countries on the question of the identity formation and the reference that the Goguryo becomes a part of the permeable geographical foundation.

Also several loopholes can be observed in the sense how Goguryo’s case is presented in the media. China’s growing rise is in constant containment with the Korean issue where Liaoning

and Jilin are historically seen to be the abode of many Koreans (particularly people from the Goguryo forum) and hence forth Korea can claim clemency from China saying that these areas should be included as a part of the Korean peninsula and this poses serious threats to China and her stability, thus hampering the China Rise programme in Asia. Thus, the loophole observed in this statement is that how Goguryo becomes the prima facie in the rise of the Chinese incursion in Asia.

Peter Hays Gries, “The Koguryo Controversy, National Identity and the Sino-Korean Relations Today” has talked about the existential question that emerges from the conflict that had taken place while discussing the larger controversy regarding the Goguryo? This means that while the whole fight that happens between China and South Korea regarding the Goguryo controversy, it stimulates a very existential question: the one on who is trying to assert whose identity? The Koreans essentially view Goguryo belonging to Korea and China seems to believe that Goguryo belongs to China. And this can be seen to be the prevailing of Chinese hegemonic dominance over South Korea.

The existential debate has now taken the turn of something that became a policy of ‘negative interdependence’. Each perceives that the very existence of each other has become a big threat to each other in the matter of international diplomatic reaction. And so if this controversy is given a space to prosper then this would in turn give rise to forces detrimental to China and South Korea’s security concerns and tactics.

Another implication that can be seen in Dinding Chen’s, “Domestic Politics, National Identity, and International Conflict: the case of the Koguryo controversy”, where he is talking about something that he terms as “Shared History and Culture”; which means that he is essentially talking about the impact that nationalism has been hindering the co-operation of both the countries. This growing chauvinist development is creating a diplomatic rift in the relations that transcends political, economical and social boundaries. And this also leads to the establishment of mutual consensus in dealing with the issue wherein China has to stop being inclusive about everything and they have give space to Korea so that they could also create their own historicity and exclusivity regarding the whole Koguryo issue. And hence we could finally say that the article is an interesting look around on the aspect of cultural enmities and eloquent repercussions that evolve in the vehement discussion of the two countries history and cultures.

1.1.1 Goguryo History

The historical dimension of the formation of the Goguryo (Koguryo) is something that has to be looked and observed with the utmost importance. Traditionally, the domain of hegemonic Influence in the Korean Peninsula has been established under the rule of the Three Kingdoms – namely the Koguryo, which was established from the Kojoson in approximately 37 BCE; and it controlled the northern part of the Korean Peninsula, along with the Liaoning and the Jilin provinces of Northeast China. Of this, approximately two third of the territories lay within the North East China and the rest one third territories lay in the present day DPRK (Democratic People’s Republic of Korea) along with the Silla Kingdom (BCE 57-CE 935) in the southeast part of the peninsula and the Baekje Kingdom (BCE 18-CE 660) in the southwestern part of the peninsula.

The mythological origin of the Korean Tradition ascertains itself from the Korean people beginning their origin with the birth of Tan’ gun who was conceived from parents, one of whom was a bear turned woman, and the other was the god Hwan-ung. Tan’ gun eventually established the first Korean kingdom Kojoson somewhere in the Bronze Age, from which the Koguryo had sprouted in BCE 37. From BCE 75- CE 106, Koguryo kings worked with the Han Dynasty, in what was a form of the patron-client relationship, where they paid taxes to the Chinese government to placate the emperor but they were recognized as the independent domain and they were free to govern themselves according to their whims and fancies. Then in BCE 106, they (Koguryo) became increasingly tired with this system of patronizing the Chinese government and they took a step to extricate themselves from this order and as a result, they broke away from this system and control. And after this they had periodically went to war with the Chinese state and they also embezzled themselves as a form of vassalage at a price for the entry to the whole Chinese trading network³ (Byington, 2004).

In CE 666, the Koguryo king had passed away and it torched a succession struggle that had gravely damaged and divided the kingdom. While Koguryo was in this weakened state, the Chinese Tang dynasty formed an alliance with the Silla dynasty and invaded from the north. Simultaneously, Silla had attacked from the south to finish what was left of the Koguryo. The

3 Byington, Mark 2004-a, “A Matter of Territorial Security: Chinese Historiographical Treatment of Koguryo in the Twentieth Century”, paper presented at the International Conference on Nationalism and Textbooks in Asia and Europe, October 7 - 8, 2004, Seoul, The Academy of Korean Studies.

leaders from China had tried to absorb Koguryo but faced heavy resistance from the local populace and from the Silla, deciding in the end to pull back (Byington, 2004). Silla had subsumed the southern portion of Koguryo to become what was to become the unified Silla and controlled most of the peninsula until its demise in CE 935. For the Koreans, the joining of these three kingdoms, under the Silla rule marks the beginning of the unified Korea on the peninsula. Thus the Korean children were raised under the radar and the lament that if only the Koguryo had won the struggle, modern day Korea would have included a large chunk of present day Manchuria.

The inception of a new country by the name of the Balhae or the Bohai in CE 696 came into being from the reminiscence of the last of the Koguryo. The geographical terrain of this new country included large parts of what is currently north east China, but also the land south of the Amnok/Yalu River along with the present day Pyongyang. After the Silla fell, the peninsula was eventually consolidated by the Koryeo Dynasty (CE 918-1392) to be followed by the Chosun Dynasty which ruled until 1910 and the Japanese colonial period.

The region of the Gando had become another important issue for the historical dimension of the Korean region. There is some arbitration about the exact boundary of this region, but approximately 43,000 km² region largely confronts itself to the Yanbian Korean Autonomous Prefecture in the Jilin province. The area is north of the Tumen River in the north east border of the Chinese territory with the boundary of the North Korean region and it got designated status and recognition from Beijing because of the large amounts of ethnic Korean residing there in the region. Yanbian was granted this status in 1957 and contains over 2.1 million people of Korean descent, the majority of China's Korean population. The Gando region had been in the contention between the Chinese and the Korean regarding its demarcation and henceforth it had been disputed, but in 1712, the Manchu dynasty of China and Korea had formally demarcated the borders.

Following the Russo-Japanese War of 1905, Korea had become a formal protectorate with formal annexation to follow in 1910. In 1909, Japanese Resident-General Ito Hirobumi signed Gando over to China in return for exclusive rights to build a railroad through the Manchurian region. Gando also had Paektusan or Mt. Paektu, an important region for China and both Korea, that has also become a content for the dispute. The Amnok/Yalu and Tumen Rivers were generally recognized by most in China and Korea as the border between the two and in 1949, China and

North Korea had formally acknowledged these boundaries (Gomà, 2006). The overall Sino-North Korean border, along with the exact status of the Gando region was codified in a 1962 treaty. In this agreement, China made some significant concessions, ceding approximately 60 percent of the disputed territory to North Korea and settling on current border of Amnok/Yalu and Tumen Rivers (Fravel, 2005)

Following the years, the Chinese authorities have done much in this region to promote Korean cultural activities and institutions, including a large nexus of Korean language schools, local television broadcasts in Korean and a local law that mandates every signs and symbols in the streets in the Korean Prefecture to be written in Korean and Chinese with the supervision and the stipulation that the Korean script be the same size and positioned above the Chinese characters. In addition, Korean receives preferential treatment for the entrance examination into the Yanbian University. Despite these measures, Chinese authorities are watchful that Korean language instruction does not generate Korean nationalism. As a result, the curriculum in the Korean language schools is identical to Chinese schools and the textbooks are the exact translations of their Chinese counterparts (Lankov, 2007)

1.1.2 Goguryeo Controversy

The crisis and the controversy that had recently evolved between China and South Korea regarding the Goguryeo question had been the highlight of the historical and the empirical understanding that cropped out from the end of the mid 1980 s when the historian Sun Jinji had put up his concurrent view that the Goguryeo was not part of the traditional Three Kingdoms (Goguryeo along with the Silla and the Baekje Kingdoms): that became the foundation from the rise of the modern Korean state and acted as the benchmark for the process of development and progress in the area. This argument by Jinji had sensationalized the yet fragile arguments that had been made in regard to the historical inception of the Korean statecraft. The arguments found substantial support by the academic curriculum, who had placed Goguryeo to be a minority group in China rather than being a separate kingdom in the Korean Peninsula⁴. The affiliation of the

⁴ Ahn, Y. (2007) 'China and the Two Koreas Clash over Mount Paekdu/Changbai: Memory Wars Threaten Regional Accommodation', Japan Focus, 27 July.

Goguryeo as being part of a larger more archaic ethnic group in China has definitely given rise to a series of articles and arguments that counters the whole claim and rubbishes it to be absurd. The first challenge came in the year 1993, when North Korean historian Pak Sih-yong had rebutted against this claim saying that the arguments put forward by Jinji were not authentic and they had no means to be believed. He met with severe criticism from Jinji in the following years and despite the fracas that had evolved, the Chinese claims found increasing support and solidarity. Other historians joined in the discussion but all did not agree to what Sun Jinji had to say about the issue, reverting instead that the history of the evolution and the stature of the Goguryeo is shared between China and Korea instead of China claiming the entire share (Ahn, 2006). At this point, the debate was purely academic and had no political or government undertone.

In 1999, the textbooks in China had begun to claim that the Goguryeo was a part of China (International Crisis Group, 2005) and in 2001; some Chinese academicians had argued that Silla and Baekje were also vassal states of China (Chosun Ilbo, 4th June 2007). In February 2002, Chinese academics at the Centre of the China's Borderland History and Geography Research, a group affiliated with the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences began the Northeast Asia Project to investigate the ethnic history of the north-east region of China. The five year \$2.5 million, state funded project examines issues in Heilongjiang, Jilin and Liaoning provinces. While most Koreans assume the purpose of the project is to 'steal' Goguryeo history, the project made some of the same arguments that the Chinese historians made in the earlier years (Byington, 2004).

Another major concern that surfaced was in 2003, when China had applied to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to have their Goguryeo tombs listed as a World Heritage Site, North Korea had applied in 2001 for the inclusion of the Koguryo tombs as the World Heritage Site, the first ever by DPRK. The Chinese motivation for launching the Northeast Asia Project was directed to the North Korean ambitions (Scofield, 2004). While this application was pending in 2003, China had applied for the inclusion of the Koguryo sites in order to block any effort by North Korea to envisage the desire to make the tombs a UNESCO World Heritage Site. Regarding the ownership and the preferential rights and the claimant, the UNESCO had equally retrieved and recognized both the countries preferences. Another bone of contention was when the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs removed the material relating to Koguryo from their website, creating a ripple in South Korea. China's intent

for doing this is unclear, but it is possible that this intent made to certain that the Goguryeo affair was not solely a Korean affair. All these references made by China had shelled out the vicissitudes that saw the Chinese trying to eliminate all referential history of Korea before 1948 and thus this propelled ROK (Republic of Korea) anger. This was looked by Koreans as an effort of China to block all its pre-modern historical references and quell the 'hidden' Chinese ulterior motives. Later, Beijing had blocked access to websites that were critical of its actions including the Chinese edition of the Chosun Ilbo and the World Aritang Forum, an internet discussion site for the Chinese Koreans (Klingner, 2004). These actions of China had scuttled the cordial relations China had with Korea and created newer forms of distractions and delusions. He

Another significant area of contention is the issue relating to Mount Paektusan (white headed mountain) or Changbaisan (forever White Mountain), its Chinese name. The problem that was established was that the Paektusan is located in the borders of North Korea and China; and it straddles through the Yanbian Korean Autonomous Region. The mountain is more than a place of scenic beauty for the Koreans and the Chinese. Paektusan was the birthplace of Tan' gun, the mythical founder of Korea and the birthplace of the Korean nation and henceforth it became important for Korea. Pyongyang also claims Paektusan as the site where Kim Il-sung fought the Japanese in the 1930 s and the birthplace of Kim Jong-Il despite the fact that he was born in Russia. Changbaisan is also the ancestral homeland of the Manchu of northeast China, who had established the Qing Dynasty. In 1962, the Chinese and the North Koreans had demarcated the share of the mountain and North Koreans got 60 percent of the mountains.

In the fall of 2006, Chinese historians at the Centre of China's Borderland History and Geography Research had stirred the pot again by posting papers to their website that argued that Balhae: successor state to the Goguryeo and Korea's first kingdom Kojoson were established by an ethnic minority Chinese tribe. At the Asia-Europe Meeting held that fall, President Roh Moo Hyun met with the Chinese premier Wen Jiabao and voiced his concern for the research project (Ryu, 2006). Thus, while South Koreans were greatly disturbed by the Chinese actions, in the fall of 2009, the Chinese archaeologists reported finding a Balhae crown ornament resembling a Koguryo crown that according to Koreans proved Balhae was a successor to the Kingdom of Koguryo and not a province of China's Tang Dynasty as Chinese researchers announced that they had found new portions of the Great Wall that stretched to Dandong in the north eastern province of Liaoning. The discovery places the Great Wall farther east than previously thought,

extending far into an area believed to venerate into Koguryo (Xinhua, 2009)

1.1.3 Korea's response to the Goguryo controversy

The implications that can be observed while discussing the historical acumen of the Goguryeo can be illuminated by the following areas of discussion and deliberation. The question starts with the Korean's Concern and Responses to deal with the pertinent problems and issues. The Goguryeo is traditionally considered to be the axle of the Korean historiography and the perpetual discussion would debate and argue on the issue of the Gando and the Paektusan along with the question of the Koguryo. Regarding the issue, North Korea has relatively been silent. China is seen to be the largest trading partner of North Korea, accounting to almost 40% of its foreign trade (New York Times, 27th October 2006). In addition, China has been providing 80 to 90% of North Korea's imported oil at cost that is well below the market prices (New York Times, 20th October 2006). In addition to this, the wrath of Beijing is just on the corner because if provoked, then the whole economy of the DPRK could be brought to its knees by China, and North Korea's leverage is also at stake from the ongoing issues.

Again in the year 2000, the Republic of Korea's concern began to escalate when North Korea had made initial application to the World Heritage list. The application process requires that an inspection team to investigate the proposed sites, however the Democratic People Republic of Korea had restricted the access to certain areas and for other sites there had been indications that the sites had been refurbished, thus raising serious questions about the authenticity of the place. To complicate matters, the head of the inspection team was the Chinese, and his reports had been raising these concerns and despite the fact that the problems were legitimate, combined with the start of the Northeast Project and China's own application for the Goguryeo sites in 2003, appeared to many Koreans as a Chinese effort to thwart the North Korean application and have its own take precedence (Byington, 2004). As a result, by the end of 2003, South Korean efforts to counter China's attempt to alter its history began in earnest. By December 2003, many protests had been sparked in South Korea and several ROK historical groups organized to challenge the Chinese claims to Goguryeo.

In the spring of 2004, the tensions reemerged and the concern that was highlighted was the step made by the Chinese government at Beijing to remove the Korean materials regarding the Goguryeo crisis in their foreign material website. This escalated the already rising crisis that was

happening between the Chinese and the Koreans regarding the alteration of the Korean history by China. The lamentation that was made by the Koreans regarding the Chinese incursion was that the history of the Goguryo; the Koreans thought was being replaced and admonished by the Chinese thus reciprocating in the loss of the identity of the region and thus raising serious allegations of China trying to tamper and insidiously decide what the Korean historical repercussion be like. At the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade in South Korea, someone had favored that the materials be relocated to the original form and content at Beijing and made a plea that the Chinese should do something about it. And for this purpose as Klingner has argued Lin Bin, the Chinese ambassador to Korea was summoned and was asked to look into the matter and for this purpose in 2004, a committee was formed to look after the textbooks regarding the South Korean history.

Now, for the Koreans the matter was no longer struck only with the textbook but it became a government jargon to thwart and distort the history of Korea by the Chinese. And this had serious implication regarding the international relations that Korea held with China. Many Koreans had believed that China is conducting a deliberate and highly irrational effort to concur and distort the ancient history of Northeast Asia, as Choi would argue in 2004. , that is seen in as a strategic political attack masquerading as academic research. Yet the response by the ROK was pensive compared to what the Korean had believed to be, the reason for this could be that the diplomatic and the trading relations that Korea had with the Chinese counterparts. And, they had thought that the issue can jeopardize the crucial economic and political benefits that Korea has had with China.

The whole issue was cajoled as a direct arbitration the Chinese State had versus the South Korean Civil Society. So what started as an altercation between historians, soon turned into an open handed discourse and dispute between the governments of the two nations although the civil societies of both countries continued to play different levels of leverages and ardent confrontations? Thus, the simple benevolent response began to emanate itself into a counter force between conflicting egos, rationale and orientations!

1.1.4 Implications

Although the crux of the dispute was based on the history and geography, this had some serious political and strategic implications in the present context. This implication left a cold trail in the Sino-Korea relations. In 2003, China replaced USA as the top trading partner and there were

allegations that South Korea had been shifting their interest from Washington to Beijing. And thus what seems to be a very cozy relationship has suddenly hit a shaky patch and it is expected to have some collateral damage.

This is in turn pummeled by the growing suspicions that Korea has against the Chinese or China in general. The questions that had been raised had touched upon the issue of national identity formation and it has addressed the Goguryeo issue as just another haywire issue: which means that it snatches away any astute form of historicity from the Korean claims. For the Chinese, Goguryeo reminds of a lost ethnic identity that has been sandwiched between umpteen state development and national identity formation from many disparate situations. The effort if it is to fail would see the rise of a lot of secessionist movement and ethnic clashes, unrest and challenges to the legitimacy of the regime. For the Koreans in an alternative, the Chinese efforts seem to be in high demand and face a public wrath stating the destruction of their national and immersive identity that contains elements important to the growth of Korean dynamism. Also, one can see that in the larger run, these problems got associated with the realism and power politics usually relating to the idea of constructivism.

Thirdly, the issue of national identity is corroborated with the increasing role of the civil society in South Korea, and to a lesser extent China too. The closely monitored issue of identity formation has rippled the sense of nationalism in both these countries. For the Chinese the issue had been severely curtailed by the growing constraints of China's authoritarian regime and the issue had been pulsated by the 'Netizens', the Internet community of China that has taken the fight forward and emanated an effort to counter Changbaisan and Gando Agreement of Korea. For the South Koreans, the issue becomes more pertinent and important. This could be highlighted immediately after the Northeast Project begun, several South Korean groups begun to organize counter Chinese claims to Goguryo. In the first few years of the dispute, the groups pushed the ROK government to vigorously tackle the issue and not be mum about it.

1.2 Definition Rationale and Scope of Study

The objectivity of this study to understand the root causes of the controversy which arises in 2004 since then there have been several problems between these two countries. The Chinese claim over the ancient kingdom of Goguryeo, which Koreans took as a strategic attack on their identity. What are the Chinese interest in this region what are the strategic goal which after they are? Apart from the Chinese claim Korea also reviving its old history and the government has

established a Northeast Asian History Foundation to counterbalance of the Chinese claim. After this Goguryeo controversy Korean fear that China action may reflect an offensive strategy either to gain Korean territory after reunification or to influence the character of the northern portion of a reunified Korea to protect its national interest. Beijing might, for example, demand a strategic demilitarized buffer with Korea as well as no US troops north of the current Demilitarized Zone. The estimated 200,000-300,000 North Korean refugees who currently reside illegally in northeastern China, along with Chinese fears of the massive influx that would result from a collapse of the North Korean regime, may also have factored into Beijing's calculus to exert control over its border regions.

1.2.1 Research Questions

Some of the important research questions of this study are as follows.

1. To what extent does the relations between China and South Korea elucidate in the realm of coherence and trust?
2. What is the evaluation of Sino centrism as a counter policy affecting the relations between China and South Korea?
3. Does Goguryeo controversy has implication on Korea's claim to Manchuria and Gando?
4. How permeable do the geographical boundaries play in deciding the demarcation of Goguryeo as multi ethnic kingdom?

1.2.2 Hypotheses

1. China's interest in the region for exertion of their influence is responsible for their interpretation of Goguryeo controversy.
2. Goguryeo controversy has brought element of suspicion in the minds of Korean people, which is hampering historical and cultural bonds between the two countries.

1.3 Research Methodology

This research problem aims to study Goguryeo controversy and its impact on bilateral ties between China and South Korea relations. The Sino-South Korean rivalry began in 2004 with Goguryeo controversy, when China Claims its right over Goguryeo territory located in Northern and Central part of Korean peninsula bordering China and Russia in the East. Historical

perspective and study of time period visualizing the developments, its consequences and stock of achievements in last ten years is the central focus of my study. The reason for grounding the study in a historical perspective is to highlight the Chinese realist policy over Goguryeo controversy. Therefore the proposed research would see the role of Goguryeo controversy under realist approach, neo realist approach and conflict resolution approach. The research will use both primary and secondary sources. The primary sources are government white paper, government statics, and archival material etc. the secondary sources are various newspapers, various online and print journal, and magazines. With this research will aim to attain conclusive conclusion.

1.4 Chapters

The study has been organized into five chapters including introduction and conclusion.

Chapter I: Overview of Goguryeo Controversy

The first chapter is the introduction. This chapter provides an overview of the Goguryeo controversy with inception of China's Northeast project (NEP). This chapter gives the historical background of the Goguryeo kingdom's remarkable history and its vast territory and how after the Mao's era the Chinese claim surfaced in the mid 1980s. The major changes on the Goguryeo Claim came when the Chinese government applied to the UNESCO to have the tombs of Goguryeo listed in the heritage sites. The timing was the same when North Korea had already applied for the heritage sites.

Chapter II: Chinese and Korean Reinterpretation of Goguryeo's History

This chapter elaborates the Goguryeo Controversy and the impact that was felt due to this controversy also the chapter deals with the deliberating on the foundations and discuss the root cause of this controversy and also this chapter discusses the interpretation of the China and the Republic of Korea on the history and heritage of the Goguryeo. This chapter focuses on the politics of historiography and how history and the territorial dispute have been intensifying lately with the growing nationalism in the East Asian region particularly in China and South Korea. In the East Asian region China is the stakeholder for the peace and stability of the Korean peninsula. With the intense nationalism in South Korea anything against the country whether it is territorial, War memorial or history text book controversy has aggravated festering tensions.

Chapter III: The Creation and the Repercussions in the National Identity formation

This chapter extends the growing discourses that evolve in the nucleation of the South Korea and the affect that China has on the whole propaganda. The chapter gives us the two ‘vital’ responses of China and Korea and discusses how the chauvinist development brew up and how intense does the whole relation become vis-a-vis the Goguryeo Crisis.

Chapter IV: Goguryeo Controversy and its Impacts on the Bilateral Relations

This chapter deals with the growing distrust that is emerging between China and South Korea regarding South Korea’s national identity creation and the question of “Illusionary United Korea”. The chapter would also focus on the changing attitude of the Chinese diplomats in regard to the issues penetrating in the South Korean realm. The controversy has forced South Korea to evaluate its foreign policy again. This is not the first time when South Korea has territorial conflict with China, on the Dokdo island conflict where South Korea and Japan are against each other. The Goguryeo controversy definitely brought the suspicion in the mind of Koreans regarding the China emergence as super power in the Northeast region.

Chapter V: Conclusion

The last chapter summarises the whole imburement and explains the points of authority and venality that evolves from our study of the South Korean reminiscence under the purview of the Sino-Korean relations in the modern times.

1.5 Summary

The first chapter dealt with the beginning of the Goguryeo controversy with the inception of China’s Northeast project in 2002. The first chapter gave complete details of the Goguryeo controversy; I have discussed it in this chapter how the Goguryeo history and heritage became a bone of contention between Republic of Korea and China relations. The chapter starts with history of three kingdoms of ancient Korea Goguryeo, Baekje and Silla. In these three kingdoms Goguryeo has the largest territory which expended its territory up to modern day provinces of China Jilin, Liaoning and the Manchuria. In the mid 1980s Sun Jinji a Chinese historian started asserted that the Goguryeo kingdom was China’s vassal state which a firestorm of protest in

South Korea. In South Korea this issue became very sensitive, ROK government and the citizens strongly protested the China's effort to snatch history of Goguryeo and heritage. As Mr. Brahma Chellaaney says nobody plays the history card with quite as much relish as China. The chapter also deals with Republic of South Korea government response to China and its implications.

CHAPTER II: CHINESE AND KOREAN REINTERPRETATION OF GOGURYEO'S HISTORY

2.1 Introduction

After enjoying a smooth two decade bilateral relation, it seemed to have South Korea and China relation evidently hit a snag. This all started with the China's application to the United Nations educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) for the inclusion of Goguryeo Tombs in the world heritage sites, this act was seen in the response of North Korea's application to the UNESCO⁵. In 2002 China launched its ambitious Northeast Asia History Project for the definitive academic research to reestablish historical facts and defend the stability of Northeast China. In 2004, UNESCO dodging the issue, both Pyongyang's and Beijing application for world heritage status were granted on July 1, 2004. The sites in China were labeled "Capital cities and

5 Northeast Asian history foundation, Historical controversy: The Northeast

Tombs of the Ancient Goguryeo Kingdom” were systematically referred as China’s Goguryeo in the Chinese media.

This area has always been claimed by Koreans as an ancestral homeland and the forerunner to modern Korea. In the mid 1980s Chinese historian started asserting and altering the interpretation of Goguryeo history saying that Goguryeo was in fact under the Chinese supremacy for many years and it was a part of the Chinese history. This incident was very Grievous for the Koreans, It really menaces the very core of Korean Identity and it almost brought these two economic giant against each other as an enemy (Korea Times, 2004)⁶. Now this controversy did not remain till the realm of academic debate and it became a full blooded political dispute between China and South Korea. The debate over Goguryeo controversy is not about the past but rather its implications this issue has for the present and future.

This chapter deals with the outgrowth of the Chinese claim over the historical ownership of Goguryeo, in the politics of Historiography of China. Modern day Chinese historiography from where the China and its citizens absorb the core identities has never been fixed or stabilised. The past of china has always been fabricated and re- memorisedbased on their coeval sociopolitical needs. Comparing pre- modern china, extended social spaces in china allowed the Chinese communist party’s ownership over historiography indefensible. Keeping all this in mind it seems that Sino- Korean relation is extremely unpredictable due to the endlessly changes of chin’s national identity. Due to the basal nationalisation of the China’s imperial past, it could also be possible that the future generation might prefer action to modify the situation. The historical facts which provide the information about the National and State Identities are barely negotiable and changeable. Notwithstanding apace increasing governmental, economic and human interaction between the two countries, China’s claim over Goguryeo yielded unparalleled emotional reaction in Korean society. The Goguryeo controversy between China and South Korea lead to a regional instability in the Korean peninsula and the East Asia. Many observers see this controversy as a threat to the stability to in the region, there are other territorial disputes in the region over Dokdo/Takeshima and Senkaku/Diaoyudao but the impact of Goguryeo controversy is bigger and emphatic. This controversy could be possible menace to the smooth relation which China

⁶ China’s Northeast Borderland, the history of Goguryeo, Balhe and Old Joseon all of them were firmly considered to be a part of Ancient Korea by the Korean and the Chinese until the 1980s and the relation between China and Joseon.

and North Korea are having, if there is any radical change in North Korean regime or the carried on intensified nationalism in China. This chapter focuses the growth of the Chinese claim over the ownership of history of Goguryeo and how China is supporting its claim through the politics of historiography.

2.2 Spatiality and temporality in Manchuria

Space and Time acted as a bold concept in defining the expression of Manchuria as a separate and an exclusive identity that portrays this region as an 'Empty Space', which meant that the region was bereft of any form of sovereignty. In the manifesto, there lies a clear distinction between the 'Chinese' as a separate domain and the 'Manchus' as an anonymous entity. The region drastically changed complexion because of the intense process of 'Sinicization', that happened from 1905 as the Qing Dynasty had banned any form of mobility in Manchuria; barring the Manchus to enter their sacred abode and their hinterland. Decimated by all the turmoil that went in the premise, Manchuria became the bone of contention in the Northeast part of China and it became the breeding ground for the collision of several sovereignties and power equations⁷.

And hence, there grew three important interests in the region, who wanted to gain a share of the interest that brewed from the region. The three interests rested viscously on the Chinese, the Japanese and the Koreans, who had seen the region in a state of perpetual decay and decadence. To begin with, the Chinese claims were escalated by the crucial and significant studies of Chinese academicians, who believed that the massive Chinese immigration has led to a virile colonization of Manchuria by the Chinese. This model of demographic insistence based on migratory patterns and formulation has led to an attitude of abjection in the region, thus leading to Manchus losing their 'individuality' and barged the Manchus to become a 'colony' of China. And, according to Chih Meng, the condition of the Manchus in China is similar to the condition of the Indians in the United States, resembling to the mighty and the ingraining capacity of China to colonize and conquer, thus highlighting a classical example of Social Darwinism: which meant that the larger and the stronger nations would prevail over the more diminutive and the petite nations and regions; such as Manchuria in the break of the twentieth century.

⁷ Shanhaiguan is situated approximately 300 kilometer east of Beijing and historically recognised as the front defense line of the Chinese dynasties against the Manchurian tribes such as the Khitan and and the Jurchen.

The combined views of the Japanese and the Koreans were less adverse and were mellowed compared to the resurgent views of the Chinese. And these views were presented on a more historical and a more academic undertone, which was substantiated with historical records and academic context. The Japanese therefore reviewed by saying that the whole incursion of the ban by the Qing Dynasty on the mobility to Manchuria has a historical resemblance and it entrusted that the region of Manchuria would be re-embarked to be an 'Empty Space', which meant that the region would be deemed as an autonomous region and would be besieged by any other power thus showcasing a stark absence in authority and control. And thus in doing so, they (Japanese) had opened up avenues in looking at the question of space and structure in Manchuria. And this went in complete opposition to the Chinese views, which opted for a more demographic and migratory answer as compared to a more historical and empirical source.

The Koreans had also subscribed to the Japanese model of going for a more subtle and academic discourse when they too attuned to a historical and a more resounding argument, while discussing deliberating upon the question of Manchuria in the beginning of the twentieth century. And there evolved two basic formulations, which were astounded by historical facts and figures. Aligning with the Japanese model, the Koreans saw Manchuria as an 'Empty Space' boundless to any opposition and visualized immaculate opportunities and possibilities that could be extracted from the region. And as it has been already seen that the symmetrical flow of migration and the strands of settler history in the time of Imperialism: the 'Demographic Void' is not as important in the formulation of a potential control and coercing a legitimate political outplay in the region. And henceforth, the Koreans saw moving into Manchuria with its already colonized Korean peninsula as an impetus to create a pivotal politico-historical subjectivity in this already disputed 'Empty Space'⁸!

Again the second inducement was presented and brought forward by Shin Chae-ho, who induced a precinct of 'Romantic Nationalism', wherein he saw Manchuria being a lost territory of Korea. Reminiscing on a glorious past and ostensibly highlighting an ingredient for the modern national movement, he saw the image of masculinity and expansionism being the forbearer of Korean nationalism was seen to be this desolate, feminine, helpless victim of Imperialism, and how that flipside was created in addressing the Goguryeo's nationalistic stress. And hence, Korean

⁸ Hyun Ok Park, *Two Dreams in One Bed: Empire, Social life, and the Origins of the North Korean Revolution in Manchuria* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University press, 2005).

ownership of the Goguryeo was seen to be almost in despicable to the Nationalist movement of glory and attainments.

And, finally the question of spatiality and temporality stands and possess some basic problem while addressing Manchuria as the region has been a politically and a culturally contested region since the inception of China in the realm of the PRC. And thus there evolves a difference in perspectives and outlook when looking at the Manchurian question. While the Japanese and the Koreans have gone for a more empirical understanding of the situation highlighting facts and figures to support their research, the Chinese have gone for a more conventional migratory and a more resounding demographic alignment. And the Chinese historians dismiss the Korean claims over Goguryeo by saying that they follow the Japanese model and they adhere to the Japanese representation of Imperial ideologies. And it was as late as the 1990 s, that the Chinese had formulated a historical ownership of the region when they had reconfigured their nationalist historiography. And the cornerstone that evolved and became important for us to deliberate is why China suddenly raises the question of Goguryeo at the expense of remitting their diplomatic relations with South Korea, their biggest investors and North Korea, their historical ally. Maybe the answer could be found in the changing nationalistic historiography of China!

2.3 Politics of historiography in China

During the twentieth century the transformation of a pre-modern political entity to a modern nation state has been a composite process in China, the replacement of the Confucian world order and her tributary system, besides the race categories, ethnicity, and a nation which has the concept of sovereign state, became the focal point the newly developed China. In the case of west, imperialism was seen a new kind of modernity and it was philosophically stressed on the universalistic claim of progress. By making race a scientific and objective category which formed a new typical political hierarchy and the western imperialism somehow managed its two opposite principles: inclusion and hierarchisation⁹. It could also be said that accession of the territories and the inclusion of indigenous people in expansion of the western empires were considered the birth right of the civilised nations. The hierarchisation of the imperial subjects was then based on the race and ethnicity, was cared with the yielding of scientific knowledge and belief system and the pre modern Chinese empire could separate themselves from the firm

⁹ Etienne Balibar, "Racism and Nationalism," in Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein, *Race, Nation, Class: Ambiguous Identities* (New York: verso, 1991).

feeling of universalism, this universal persuasiveness is established on the entreaties to the sense of civilization, instead of the confined national membership in advanced terms and on the basis of this instrument, which separated the Chinese from the East Asian intelligentsia.

The main focus of the new emerging Chinese scholars was to yield new mode of history writing in the later part of the nineteenth century. These scholars witnessed how the Chinese empire collapsed by the contravening western imperialism, the Chinese intelligentsia adopted the belief of the modern nation's "particularity" which they considered it to be significant arm to battle against the imperialistic belief of the "universality" of the western civilisation¹⁰. However it was a big task for the Chinese scholar who were trying to construct new history and it was a never easy Endeavour for them owing to the then China's political reality, which became delicate and fragmented political agency during the declination of the Qing Empire and the and the end of the civil war 1949 (Prasenjit Duara 1995).

It only became possible after the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) came to power and it established the Peoples Republic of China, where China as a state were in a position to accomplished nationalisation of the whole China. In the process of the nationalisation of the China, CCP used its heavy state institutions; they made the education system mandatory for the Chinese people and they also launched legion campaigns for it. However, the major problem of the Peoples Republic China (PRC) in the early days of its rule was to recount the Chinese nation in a cohesive and persuasive manner. As Mr. Lucien Bianco crystallised in his seminal work "origin of the Chinese revolution" if the communists exploited communism for their own ends, it was through communism that nationalism triumphed. In other words it could also be said that it was the Chinese revolution which helped the formation of the Peoples Republic of China it was not the communist revolution¹¹. So it was very crucial for CCP leadership to delimit "Chineseness" and the formation of CCP appeared like a natural consequence of historical progress.

In the beginning of the PRC, China had to choose the Soviet Union side and becoming its partner in the Asia due to the Korean war, were China was involve in the Korean peninsula against

10 Partha Chatterjee, *Nationlist Thought and the Colonial World: A derivative Discourse?* (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Press, 1986).

11 Lucien Bianco, *Origins of Chinese revolution, 1915-1949* (Stanford, Calif.:standford University Press, 1967).

United States. China has its motive by doing so, after the civil war, China as nation was emerging and the Chinese historian were seeking the help of the Soviet for the construction of their own history, it was very important for the China to get help from the Soviet for their Chinese history and culture interpretation conjunction with orthodox Soviet method¹². The Soviet sinology works were translated into Chinese. The works of Soviet Sinology were translated into Chinese and it proved to very disturbing for the Chinese Scholars to digest regarding the China as a nation. It also created resentment among the Chinese scholars. It created more resentment when the Stalin's definition of a nation came, which asserted that a nation should have "common language, common territory, common economic life and common culture" these major factors plays a very crucial role for the making a nation. And the Russian historians reasoned that China as nation never existed till the end of the nineteenth century. Although there was no unanimity among Chinese historian regarding when and how Chinese nation or Han as unified ethnicity came forth there were other historian too who believed that China as nation existed as early as the Qin-Han period.

The process of nationalisation of China resumed after as the political upheaval of the Cultural Revolution finished and the reformation measures were started. Many scholars who were looking all the ongoing changes in the historiography, they witnessed the public discussion, in regarding the nationalisation of China was dense but steady. If we see the books which were written on the Chinese revolution, these books starts with glorifying history of ancient Chinese civilisation which later on declined because of the feudalism and the Opium war in 1840 which led massive suffering for the Chinese people. China main focus was to make a nation instead of state or revolutionaries, and doing it so China exalted the ancient Chinese civilisation and its national humiliation in the history education in contemporary china. The most contrasting epitome in the reforming era of china regarding the historiography can been in the case of Nanjing Massacre where Japanese history text books were kept asides from all this important issues because they wanted to project a different image of Japan through the historiography to the new generation. And in the case of china something similar happened, if we see the nine volumes of selected works of Mao Tse Tung where he has not the mentioned the historical importance of the Nanjing

12 The Soviet influence over Chinese historian, Edward Q. Wang, "Between Marxism and Nationalism: Chinese Historiography and the Soviet Influence, 1949-1963." *Journal of Contemporary China*, Vol. 9, no 23(2000).

Massacre¹³.

The muteness over the Nanjing Massacre in the pre reformed china and its resurfacing in the late 1980s which was the reformed era in the Chinese politics can be explicated through the changing Chinese official historiography which had to distinguish “us” and “them” owing to changing circumstances, and their domestic and international wants. The incident of Nanjing gives a very clear image of the Chinese state changing stances over the period of time on some particular issues. The Nanjing Massacre happened in 1937 when both the party CCP and Kuomintang (KMT) were fighting for their own ideology. Nanjing city was under the influence of Kuomintang (KMT) and it was considered that it represents the urban bourgeoisie which was completely opposite of CCP ideology, they were considered the staunch supporter of the peasants. After the Nanjing Massacre the CCP historians disregarded the fall of the city and the people the Nanjing, the agony of the people were not mentioned in their books.

As the time passed when China’s economy started doing and after the getting permanent seat in the UN Chinese historian started changing their history, now China has got the freedom to interpret the history of Nanjing Massacre. Earlier the CCP historians did not give any importance to the fall of the Nanjing city and its people. Now China remarkably changed its position on the Nanjing Massacre, in the 1980, the Nanjing Massacre was included in the history text books, as it was not in the pre reformed China. The victims were described as “Nanjing Jumin” Nanjing residents or “Nanjing renmin” people of Nanjing and the focus of Chinese historian were the brutality of Japanese imperial army not the agony and sufferings of the victims.

In the reformed China in 1980s the history of Nanjing Massacre essentially altered, all the people who suffered in that massacre became Chinese citizens those who were killed became Chinese compatriots¹⁴. (Beijing shifandaxue chubanshe,1983). In the new text books of history the issue of Nanjing was given significant importance, historian considered it one of the most macabre attacks comparing the attack on “Sanguang” and the ill famed biological experiment which was performed on the Chinese people by Japanese imperialist army unit.

The Chinese nation state wanted to nationalise the imperial past of the china, so it continued

13 Jungmin Seo has elaborated the issue of changing historiography of the Nanjing massacre in his article “ Politics of memory in Korea and China: remembering the comfort women and the Nanjing Massacre” New Political Science.

14 Modern Chinese History, volume.2 1983.

altering the historiography, it faced some jolt too when the Cultural Revolution was on its peak, but after the convulsion it resumed with the concept of China being a multi ethnic state. By disapproving Mao's thesis that "racial (ethnic) struggle is in essence a kind of class struggle" and admitting that china has a history of matchless of multi ethnic nation. This is how China has is altering its history by changing the Historiography.

2.4 On the Goguryeo issue

China's claim on the history of Goguryeo kingdom is very contentious, China main concern here is to incorporate the Northeastern region for its own importance. The Goguryeo controversy is seen as the Chinese Endeavour to make a linear temporality of the multi ethnic state where it is changing the historiography with an intention to comprise the adjacent border regions at the same time. According to the Chinese historians the sole purpose of the border region research to encourage patriotism and maintain the tranquility in those areas. This is the reason why in China research on the border region is flourishing; through the research they are trying to strengthen the contemporary Chinese territory by interpreting opinions and nostalgia¹⁵. (Dazheng Ma and Ti Liu).

The rise of China has been a very important issue in the academia and in the East Asia. With the growing economy of China which has been two digits for the decades and its rapid military modernisation has brought China in a position where it is making a new global and regional order. According to Mr. David Kang, with the Chinese economic development and its military power formed a new order in the East Asia where small and mid-size nations including South Korea are not able to match with China's stature. These countries have just accommodated with China's economy, political and diplomatic emergence instead of balancing for decades. Again he argues that East Asian nations identity developed through the time honored tributary system play a very crucial role in producing a different East Asian style of regional stability which does not want power balancing against China¹⁶.

In the Chinese historiography where Chinese state and its citizens absorb the core identity has

15 Chinese Perceptions of National Border and territory: Chinese scholarship on Border regions in the 20th century, translated by Sehyon Cho.

16 David C Kang, China rising: Peace, Power , and order in East Asia (New York: Columbia University press, 2008)

not been ever constant or stabilised. Chinese past history has always been fabricated and re-memorised in accordance with modern day sociopolitical needs. If we compare the pre modern era of the Chinese empire the diversified spaces provided the opportunity to CCP to make a firm hold on the historiography, basically they had the control over the historiography (Jungmin Seo). With regard to the changing history over the Goguryeo creating tension between two countries The Republic of Korea and the China, in future what sort of relation they will have its tough to predict. Owing to the ceaselessly Chinese national identity and its radical and speedy nationalisation of its imperial past might produce a new generation who might solve the situation aggressively. National and state identity is created in accordance with the historical facts which are barely negotiable or changeable. Therefore the recreation of historiography and facts in China will contribute collateral but central and irreparable aftermath in the Republic of Korea and China relation.

2.5 South Korea's interpretation

In the response of Chinese claim on Goguryeo South Korea launched its Goguryeo research history project to bring out the facts which will prove Chinese claim wrong on Goguryeo. As Chua Song Peng says Goguryeo is the root word of Korea. News papers in South Korea replied that it was the derisory strategy to destruct their historical roots and their national identity. The China's claim on the Goguryeo was seen in South Korea as a threat as John B Duncan director of the center for the Korean studies in the University of California, Los Angeles, says any outside powers like China denial that Goguryeo as a Korea part of Korean history is likely to be seen as the denial of Korean nationhood. This aggressiveness of china on the Goguryeo controversy clearly suggests to Korean historians is an attack on the core existence of Koreans as a community, as populace and as race.

In East Asia historical issues has always been a crucial factor to inter-state relations. The rise of China and its growing stature is affecting the smaller nation in this region. China has also territorial disputes with Japan over Senkaku Island and South Korea with Japan over Dokdo Island. In regard to the Goguryeo controversy Korean academicians and nationalist criminated Chinese scholars as revisionist for distorting the Goguryeo history. But there is very important question arises why this Goguryeo controversy significant to Korea? Goguryeo kingdom holds a key position in the Korean history which separates them from the China and makes them a

distinctive entity and also tells the relationship between China and Korea. Goguryeo, symbol of heroism, bravery, which stood tall against any sort of foreign invasions, which gave Koreans a sense of security where they could feel safe and it is key to a potent and masculine Korean nationalism and snatching it, robbing Korea of Goguryeo it is like robbing Korean nations from the Koreans and the China's claim on Goguryeo it's like castrated, feminised Korea.

In the Korean history Goguryeo holds a very important position, the three kingdoms era (57 BC-AD 676) and especially Goguryeo kingdom (37 BC-668 AD) was the symbol of resistance against the foreign attacks and the later empire Yi/Chosun Dynasty (1392-1910) was not like the Goguryeo kingdom it was the symbol of submission to the Chinese empire¹⁷.

South Korea astoundingly takes pride in the Goguryeo kingdom and Goguryeo history and it has strongly answered the Chinese effort of distorting the Goguryeo history. What are the hidden intentions of China behind the controversy South Korea clearly understands and to support it exclusive right on Goguryeo South Korea launched its own Goguryeo research foundation in 2004.

2.6 Korean historiography of Goguryeo

According to the ancient Korean history Korean people came to existence with the birth of Tangun, it is believed that his mother was a bear turned women and his father was the god Hwang ung. Tangun founded the first Korean kingdom Kojoson during the Bronze Age. Goguryeo Kingdome engrossed from Kojoson around 37 BC.

Goguryeo (고구려) was the ancient kingdom along with the Silla (신라) and Paekche (백제) of the ancient Korea which covered the Korean peninsula during the Samguk (three kingdoms) period (37 BC-668 AD). The location of the Goguryeo was Northern and central part of the Korean Peninsula and the Southern and Central parts of inner and outer Manchuria. The 12th century Samguk Sagi (History of Three Kingdoms) and 13th century Samguk Yusa (Memorabilia of three Kingdoms) according to these memorabilia Goguryeo was founded in 37th BC by the Buyeo Kingdom prince named Jumong, who fled after the power struggle with the same kingdom rival, and founded Goguryeo. Samguk Yusa serving as an account of folklore and legends than as work of historical Scholarship, which narrates the genesis of Goguryeo Kingdom

17 In 2004 republic of Korea took strong measure against the distortion of the ancient history of Goguryeo and heritage by China, as Korea Times wrote in its editorial "Seoul gets tough over Goguryeo dispute".

and its founder extraordinary endeavourer to establish Goguryeo kingdom at age of twelve.

Till 75 BC to 106 AD Goguryeo kings working with Han dynasty in a client relationship, where they were giving taxes to Han Kingdom to appease the king but they were considered as a free state and they governed themselves. But this client relationship could not work long and the Goguryeo king was unhappy with this arrangement and Goguryeo Kingdom till then became so strong enough that they could go to war with the Chinese empire. Now Goguryeo was not any more in control of Han.

At the heydays of Goguryeo kingdom it expanded vast area of territory which covered present day Liaoning, Jilin and Heilongjiang provinces and around three fourths of Korean peninsula. Goguryeo was a bedded and martial society it fought several fights with Sui and Tang Dynasties of China between 6th to 7th centuries, where Goguryeo emerged victorious most of the time. Frequent warfare, internal discord and dearth immensely weakened the Goguryeo kingdom and the confederation of Tang and Silla dynasty against Goguryeo proved to be the pivotal for its fall. After the death of the Goguryeo King in 666, the succession struggle started which weakened the Goguryeo and when it was at the most weakened state, the Tang dynasty from China made an alliance with Silla dynasty.

That alliance was very strategically made to attack Goguryeo, Tang invaded from the North and Silla attacked from the South to finish Goguryeo completely. After the defeat of Goguryeo When the Chinese leaders tried to take Goguryeo under their control they faced heavy resistance from Silla and the local public later they determined to move back (Byington, 2004). After that Silla included the southern part of Goguryeo, later it was known as the unified Silla and controlled the most portion of the Korean peninsula until its fall down in 935 A D. Under the Silla rule the inclusion of the two dynasties Goguryeo in 668 and Baekje in 660 marked the genesis of a unified Korea. In 696 A D Balhae became the new country it was remainder of the Goguryeo and it had vast territory what is known is today the North East China also including the Yalu river along with the modern day Pyongyang. When the Silla kingdom fell down Goryeo dynasty came in power and after that Chosun dynasty it lasted till the Japanese colonial period.

There is another historical issue between China and Korea over the Gando region the controversy is over the boundary line, in Jilin the province around 43,000 km square area has been conformed to the Yanbian Autonomous prefecture. The northern area adjacent to the Tumen River along with northeast border with the North Korea has been provided a designated

status from the China, due to its vast percentage of the ethnic Koreans residing there. This designated status to Yanbian was given in the 1957, which comprises more than two million Korean descent populations in the China (information office of the state council of the People's Republic of China, 2005). The dispute over the Gando region is prevailing from the long time between China and Korea in spite of demarcation of the border by the Manchu dynasty and Chosun Kingdom¹⁸.

After the Russo Japanese war in 1905, Japan with victory signed a Eulsa treaty or Japan-Korea protectorate treaty with Korean Empire this treaty divest Korea's diplomatic sovereignty and made Korea a protectorate Japan. In 1909 Gando agreement was signed between Japan and China, in that agreement Gando region was given to China in return Japan got the exclusive rights to build the rail road in Manchuria. The Gando region comprises mount Paektusan and this mountain region is very crucial for the Koreans and it is also part of the controversy (Daniel Goma, 2006).

2.7 China's motivation

The Goguryeo controversy remained in the hibernation till the 1980s, the Chinese historian Sun Jinji started asserting that Goguryeo history should be isolated from the traditional three Kingdoms of Korea and it should be seen as the important part of the Chinese history. After this assertion of historian Sun Jinji, several other Chinese historians came in his support and argued Goguryeo Kingdom was established by the Chinese ethnic minority group in the past. This was only the start of academic debate over this heated issue. Pak Sih-Yong, North Korean historian in 1993 involved in academic debate with Sun Jinji over the Goguryeo history. After wards many other Chinese historians gave their views on the Goguryeo Kingdom history but not all of them were agree with the Sun Jinji and some of them argued that Goguryeo history is shared by China and Korea (Yonson Ahn, 2006).

Till then this issue remained in the academic circle only and the government engagement was less then. Again in 1999 the controversy arises in the Chinese history text books regarding the Goguryeo history claiming that it is the pat of Chinese history and in 2001 debate was started in Chinese academic circle arguing, Korean states Silla and Baekje were also the vassal states of China (Chosun Ilbo, 4 June 2007). And then the time came in 2002 when China launched its

18 Gando which means the birthplace of the Koreans and originally it belonged to them, at the present time this territory is controlled by the China.

ambitious project to look into the ethnic history of the North East Asian region of china, this project was known as North East Asia project and it was affiliated with the Chinese Academy of Social sciences at the center of China's Borderland History and Geography Research. The million dollar question is that what are China's interests in the Goguryeo controversy? Are these issue only debated in the academic circle or it has anything do with the Chinese state on Goguryeo claim. While China's effort to belittle the issue of the Goguryeo controversy and its response to the Korea on its overreaction on the controversy is not very clear, and there are some question which has not been answered on the involvement of Chinese government in this controversy. China's claims that the Goguryeo controversy debate is only among the Chinese scholars and it has nothing do with the government, but there are some denotations which Cleary suggests the involvement of the Chinese government behind the Goguryeo controversy. The government control media and its full fledge support to the research effort is challenging their own explanation. Despite the government support is intentional but the goal of the Chinese states stay unclear especially their approach regarding to the controversy is defensive or offensive in nature.

Two aspects of the Goguryeo controversy can be seen most arguable to explain Chinese actions. The first priority of the Chinese government is to preserve the unity of the multi ethnic state which comprises more than fifty ethnic groups, for maintaining the stability China has endeavored to include all the deferent ethnic groups to form a national identity, an effort which China has done throughout of its history. This necessity was felt after China launched its economic reforms in 1978, lessening the utility of the ideology to form the identity and debilitated the central control over the state (Choe Jie Ho, 2006s). Since the political system of China remains authoritarian, but it is not foreseeable to bank on communist ideology for providing regime's legitimacy. After the economic reforms China has enjoyed the remarkable growth in the economy and it does not want any hindrance, for the continued economic growth invoked to nationalism to strengthen the legitimacy. As the preamble of the Chinese constitution mentions that China is a unitary multinational state which has built up collectively by the people of all nationalities and it is Endeavour to encourage a new nationalism (Choe Ji Ho, 2006).

Choe Ji Ho, argues that China has started accentuating that different ethnic groups has the common ancestry, a pan- Chinese national identity, for the requirement of holding the territorial and sovereign unity of China. In the 2005, Chinese government white paper, China referred its

ethnic minority people as “Chinese” and promoted the China’s regional ethnic autonomy. And it proved to be successful strategy to address the diversity of its people. Further the Chinese white paper keep on stressing the history of multi ethnic groups as the core of the China as nation, and these ethnic groups stood long united, in the multi ethnic state in the Chinese history which enormously heighten the political, economic and cultural exchanges among other ethnic groups, and continuously advanced the identification of all ethnic groups with government and their loyalty to it and Chinese people from the all ethnic groups discerned that their motherland is common homeland is for the all ethnic groups ,the claim on the Goguryeo is comprise with these Endeavour.

Since the Chinese state comprises multi ethnic this generates a huge concern among Chinese leaders for the long term cohesion of the state. There is fear among the Chinese leaders for the social stability in China; its leaders think that the agitation among the desperate groups could accelerate to bring down the regime (Susan Shirk,2006). Their main concern is to maintain the social stability to maintain the order and produce continued prosperity. China is been concerned especially about the secessionist movements in western china in Tibet and Xingjian along with Inner Mongolia in the northern side. China worries that these Secessionist movements would encourage other ethnic groups to do so. Subsequently China is ascertained to build a unified national identity which would be helpful in meliorating division and ethnic disruption.

The concern of the Chinese leaders about Chinese-Korean people that they would find their identity more closely to tied to their native country to the South and demand for the separation. So the China if they compromise with the Korean pressure over Goguryeo, the Chinese-Korean people might spark further demand for another secession which could to an enhancing unrest, instability and potential astomisation to the Chinese state (Byington, 2004).

The major second concern of China is revolving around the future of the reunified Korea. There could be two assumptions which produce a united Korea, the collapse of the North Korean regime and its reintegration with South Korea or through the negotiation. In every scenario China sees the potential for various negative consequences which can weaken the groundwork done by their historical claims. With the possible North Korea collapse and the China’s claim in this region allow China with justification to interpose and stabilise the region if necessary. If the North Korea collapse there is a strong possibility of ROK-US intervention in the North Korea and the China’s strategy in the North Korea supported by its historical claims makes a buffer

which will defend China from the new US backed Korean state but also it will provide an opportunity to China to become a player in the any multilateral actions which would attempt to stabilise the region. The sizable Chinese-Korean population resides across the Amok/Yalu River, Beijing fears that this population hankers to be reunited with their kin and either crosses the border, increasing the massive refugee problem, or start demanding the territory where they reside in North East china to be included with new greater Korea. At this present time it seems unlikely to happen, but the strong sense of nationalism toward their past in South Korea raising the alarm for the China, and China thinks that a united Korea might be hearten to demand such an irredentist claim ((Yonson Ahn, 2006). Hence, unified Korea attract all the Chinese-Korean as their homeland, although these Chinese-Korean population has not yet expressed any desire to reunite with the unified Korean Homeland but the Chinese government is skeptical about the identity of their own citizen China thinks that their Korean citizens might curve to the Korea subsequent to reunification (Daniel Goma, 2006). Although the China's excessive fear about the Chinese-Korean people loyalty and identity of their Korean citizens and the China's worry is baseless. Korean population which lives in China surely see themselves as "Hyphenated Chinese" and they do not feel as proud citizens as either Koreans state but their loyalties firmly adhered to China (Lankov.A, 2007).

A second aspect of the gradual and peaceful reunification process is also increasing concern to China. As long as Korea stay undivided either Korea is improbable to push for any readjustment regarding the border issue. North Korea dependency on China which will not allow them for any kind of negotiations with China, and South Korea government will also not indulge with China, given the distance of South Korea from the disputed area and its economic relationship with China. Apart from the protesting against the China they cannot do much. Nevertheless reunified Korea in future may feel less cumbered. The united Korea which will be more nationalist Korea, which does not have to depend on China for its survival, and even, will not hesitate to claim any important share of the North-east China and it, could demand the return of Gando also might claim a bigger share of the Paektusan region.

Chinese leaders are cognisant of potential Korean irredentism and their desire to retrieve what some nationalist Korean refers to as the third Korea. In 2004 during the talks, then foreign minister Ban Ki Moon noticed the China's acute reactions over the South Korean politician and scholars, who were making claims that China should return the far eastern provinces (Goguryeo

territory) in reply China demanded South Korean government to prevent them to doing so (Taiwan Times, 2004). Throughout the controversy China has not made any territorial claim but the arguments on the historical controversy may lay the groundwork for the China's future actions and in the counteraction China might change the current borders. Furthermore the Chinese government tried to deemphasise the political significance of the studies and its being critical to those who are trying to politicise it in South Korea.

China's action in South Korea is characterised as an attack against their history and identity and china sees it as a defensive preparation against the internal threat of secession of Minority groups and the external threat of unified Korea which would be more assertive Korean state in the future might demand to change current borders.

2.8 Korea's response

Regardless of, the debate in the academic circle the issue of Goguryeo along with the Gando and Paektusan raised concern in North and South Korea. During the controversy North Korea has been comparatively silent. Given the China and North Korea economic relations, China is North Korea's biggest trading partner besides China supplies 80 to 90 percent of North Korea's imported oil at the low cost compare to the market. There has been some occasion when North Korea has spoken out on Goguryeo and Paektusan but it has not criticised China openly on this controversy. North Korea dependency on China for the aid and China can bring the North Korea economy to its Knees if North Korea criticises China openly on this issue. Korean central Broadcasting system argued in 2004 saying that Goguryeo defended its independence from its beginning and it disdained any foreign interference and pressure while maintain diplomatic and trade relation with ancient Chinese Kingdoms (Yonhap News, 2004). Korea regarded Mount Paektusan is their birthplace and the holy mountain is connected with the Soul of the nation. The North Korean protests over Goguryeo have been silenced due to the economic leverage which China holds over it.

In 2004 when South Korea found out that China's Ministry of Foreign of Affairs had removed the Goguryeo Kingdom history of Korean history from its website, it created a huge resentment in South Korea, for the Korean people it was an insult. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and trade of South Korea demanded to reinstate the original contents of Goguryeo history on the Chinese Foreign Ministry's website. In response to the action South Korean government summoned Chinese ambassador to South Korea, to protest China's move. Even South Korean government

had to form a committee to supervise the Chinese text books about Korean history. Then Foreign Affairs and trade minister Ban Ki Moon asserted, the South Korean government would not tolerate any effort of China's Claim over history of Goguryeo and the ROK government would stop any future effort to distort its history (Klinger, B. 2004).

According to the South Korean scholars this Chinese action was not the academic efforts, but this was well thought governmental strategy to revise their history. There is understandable difference can be noticed between individual, regional and governmental claims. If the claims were made in the past at an individual, academic level, now the worrisome is that china's attempt to rewrite history made at a governmental level (Choi Ji Ho, 2004). Korean scholars believe that China is managing a systematic and comprehensive attempt to distort the ancient history of Northeast Asia, which is seen as deliberated political attack disguising as academic research. Still the ROK government was very cautious to take any strong decision; the government wants to avert a larger rift with its most significant trading partner. Many ROK officials cautioned that to ham the issue could endanger important economic and political relationship.

The response that was preserved and presented by the Koreans withholding the Chinese domination was blamed on the initial slow yet pervasive response of the indigenous government in Korea (the ROK government). Consequently, the authorities in Seoul became more attentive and attuned to the situation while still trying to find out an amicable solution in solving the whole debates ranging on the international Sino-Korean relations. This they tried to do by extracting the historical elements and contradictions form the other dimensions of the ties with China. And what started out saw an absence of a direct state to state dilemma and yet it was perceived more as a dispute between the Chinese state and the Korean civil society. And so subsequently under the government of president Roh, Korea evolved a much more stringent response as compared to the earlier perceived responses. And so what initially began as a state versus the civil society conflict, now eventually envisioned itself to become a conflict between the governments of the two countries, though the civil societies of both the countries had played a more than important role in the whole debacle.

As it is clearly and fairly obvious, the Chinese actions were clearly an 'offensive strike' and an attempt to despise and harm the Korean History for China's strategic purposes. Though the Chinese claimed that this was the view of the historians and not the actual government claims, but the people in Korea had thought otherwise and then they actively launched a foray of

criticism in opposition to the Chinese claims and addressed that the topic should be looked with utmost importance in order to prevent any form of gravities for the Korea. The Korea Times had severely critiqued the Chinese claims by saying that it was a redundant excuse that China was putting up and it had argued that the Chinese views that the comment was purely meant in the academic undertone, got disillusioned because the Academy of Social Science that was engorging in the exercise was bluntly controlled by the Chinese government.

Another discursion was the aforementioned attempt to settle the consummate issues that crept in the diplomatic ties between these two countries. And to resolve this in August 2004, they settled on a five-point verbal understanding that tried to settle the issue. Consequently, the Chinese officials did not acknowledge that Koguryo was part of Korea and agreed to restore the Korean history material to the foreign ministry website. A senior ROK official noted it was to be regarded that both sides took the first step on the issue, rather than it is completely settled. We intended to set a solid direction (Seo, 2004b). However, many remained largely unhappy with the whole agreement and were vaguely unsatisfied.

In September 2004, 59 ROK lawmakers from both the ruling and opposition parties submitted to resolution to nullify the 1909 Gando Agreement whereby Japan handed over the China. According to the resolution, the treaty is 'invalid' since the terrain gave to [China] was not belonging to Japan's (Park, 2004). Furthermore, there is a mention in the resolution that the 1952 peace agreement signed by China and Japan stated that 'all agreements, conventions and treaties are nullified' a measure that should annul the Gando Agreement as well. But the irony was that such a resolution could never actually get passed in the National Assembly following a veto by the Uri Party that was the ruling in ROK.

Another interesting and important development was the creation of the outpour of activities from the Korean civil society as well the inclusion of new and existing groups that presented a combined refutation to the Chinese claims. Among these groups was the History World, an organization that led to a campaign to collect one million signatures on a petition protesting Chinese assertions regarding Koguryo. Another group, the Action Committee against Distortion of Koguryo History, called on China to end its misrepresentation and urged the Korean Foreign Ministry to lodge a protest against the Chinese government (Choi, 2004). Other groups significantly included The Society for Korean Ancient History, Voluntary Agency Network of Korea and the Project for the Rehabilitation of Koguryo. In March 2004, the ROK government

started their own research organization known as the Koguryo Research Foundation which later merged with the Northeast Asia History Foundation.

New research papers posted on the website for the Centre of China's Borderland History and Geography Research in September 2006, groups of 'uibyong', the name used by anti-Japanese guerilla fighters during the occupation, to promote a boycott of China as a ROK tourist destination (Choe, 2006). The South Korean public was outraged by these claims that appeared to violate the 2004 agreement with China. Vice Foreign Minister Lee Kyu-hyung noted and explained that "the government was more or less successful in responding to any issue distorting the local and infringing upon our territorial sovereignty without linking any other issues. The history issue with China is no exception". The attempt made by Lee's statement was to 'delink' this issue from trade and other element of the Sino-ROK relationship while defending the ROK government from public criticism. But this invited criticism from the Korean civil society who saw the move as being coerced and subjected to lukewarm and critical responses.

2.9 Summary

The second chapter has dealt the issue of reinterpretation of Goguryeo history and heritage by the both nations South Korea and China. The chapter has contextualised the emergence of Chinese claim over the historical ownership of Goguryeo in the politics of historiography. The Chinese historiography from which the state and citizens draw core identity has never been fixed or stabilised. This chapter has tried to focus on China's politics of historiography where China past has been created and rememorised based on present sociopolitical needs. According to "Samguk sagi" is a historical record of the three kingdoms Goguryeo, Baekje and Silla. It is the most authentic and oldest surviving chronicle of Korean history. Korea support its claim by providing the history where as China supports its exclusive ownership by distorting the history. Chinese claim and the interpretations create doubt in the mind of Korean with China's concealed intentions.

CHAPTER III: THE CREATION AND THE REPERCUSSIONS IN THE NATIONAL IDENTITY FORMATION

3.1 National identity

National identity is sense of belongings to a one state of a particular nation irrespective of citizenship status, religion or gender and results from current political scenario. The sense of nationalism among citizens is generated when their land is threatened militarily or culturally by an alien empire. For example the sense of nationalism among Indians was first time induced in 19th century when Britishers tries to alter their social fabric of Indian society by their draconian laws although they were in India since 16th century. The sense of national and oneness librated India from British yoke. Lee, Yoonmi (2000). Another glaring example here in this case is national identity of South Korea with regard to China. China by the means of superior military power and sheer size tries to claim its sovereignty of the Goguryeo Kingdom of Korea. The sense of belongingness in South Korea strengthened and fellow Koreans unite for mutual protection against the common Chinese threat. The word “nation” can have many meanings corroborates from the basic definition, “all the people in a country” (Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary) to the most widely known one, claiming it is “a country perceived as a group of people with the same language, culture and history, who live in a unique area under one government” (Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary)

Smith (1993) argues that a named human population sharing an historic territory, common myths and historical memories, a mass, public culture, a common economy and common legal rights and duties for all members constitute a national identity. All features mentioned in Smith's definition are at the same time the cardinal features of national identity. Moreover, Smith states that "nations must have a measure of common culture and civic ideology, a set of common understandings and aspirations, sentiments and ideas that bind the population together in their homeland" and the common culture mentioned above contains a wide scale of elements. On the other hand, this statement is so universal that it contains everything which could be more or less connected to a nation, starting with the language or national symbols and ending with a way of life and common consciousness. A nation refers to a human group conscious of forming a community, sharing a common culture, attached to a clearly separated territory, having a common past and a common project for the future and claiming the right to rule itself. All the above mentioned elements are necessary to evoke nationalist feeling among its citizens. But there are some nations without a state which represent their own identity and desire for self-determination which is generally based on their common culture and history. For example Tibet, Kashmir, Goguryeo and Taiwan all these were never part of the countries they are ruled by and tries to justify their struggle for self determination by their distinct community, religion and history (Guibernau 1996).

Smith (2002) further argues that psychological dimension of national identity arises from the consciousness of forming a group based on closeness uniting those who belong to the nation. The nation is the largest group that can command a person's loyalty because of felt kinship ties, sharing national identity generates emotional bond among fellow nationals which is fundamentally physiological and non rational. The national consciousness or nationalism erupted when the nation is faced with an external or internal enemy threatening its people, its prosperity, its tradition and culture and its territory or Sovereignty. For example Afghanistan which is divided among different ethnic lines and tribal hostility join hand to defeat Soviets who invaded it in 1979 to save their territory and sovereignty and wage holy war *Jihad* to defeat infidels Soviets to preserve their national identity and tribal culture. In this context identity question is paramount for those people who have a fear to lose their own identities. According to Yurudusev (1997), identities can be grouped in two categories granted and gained identities. For example family, ethnic group, society, community and national are granted identities and are exclusive

because of their inborn process. On the other hand identities choose by the free will of individual are gained identities. Smith perceived national identity as multi dimensional and lists five fundamental attributes as historic territory or home land. For ex: Goguryeo and Tibet, common myths and historical memories. For ex: India and Pakistan before partition under British rule, a common mass public culture, common legal rights and duties for all members and common economy for territorial mobility for masses.

Therefore nation as “a term of rhetoric used to aroused feelings of unity in response to a particular situation “Nations, nationalism and national identities should be treated as cultural phenomena” National identities could then be described both as personal and collective loyalties to the people’s nation, at the same time covering their families, regions, religions and so on. It is closely connected with the homeland and the membership. Through the symbols members are reminded of their common heritage and cultural kinship and feel strengthened and exalted by their sense of common identity and belonging (Smith, 1998).

3.2 Korean national identity

More than three decades under the Japanese occupation Korea faced humiliation, their identity as nation were distorted. Their national movements against Japanese colonial rule were brutally suppressed. The nationalism in Korea emerged during the colonial period, nationalist historian such as Shin Chae Ho who advocated for the Korean Minjok (민족) which ethnically and racially specified Korean nation. Shin Chae Ho regarded as the first modern Korean historiography. He stressed that the contemporary Korea is affected by the slavish mentality owing to the centuries of historical, Cultural and Political dependence on the China. According to Shin Chae Ho Korean history belonged to the Korean minjok which had distinct race descended from the god Dangun, which once ruled the Korean peninsula and the large parts of the Manchuria.

It was the Korean nationalism which fought against the imperial rule of the Japan, where thousands of people were fleeing to the Manchuria and china for their safe future still there were people who had staunch feeling of nationalism and when they protested against the Japanese in 1919 the march 1st movement, forced the Japanese rule to make changes in their colonial policies.

3.2.1 Genesis of national identity in Korea

The twentieth century for the South Korea brought two major cruel historical events the Japanese

occupation and the Korean War. After the World War II it's been merely five years when the Korean War broke out. It was one of the most repellent and horror war after the World War II which shook both the Koreas. It was the nationalism for both the Koreas to recover from the gruesome war and focus on the nation building. Forgetting the trauma of cruel Japanese occupation and Korean War, Korean shown tremendous amount of national pride and worked diligently breaking all the shackles of colonization and the war. The nationalistic feeling among Koreans is enormous; they always take pride being Korean. The era of 1950s proved to be disastrous for both the Korea, their economy collapsed due to the Japanese occupation and the Korean War. During the 1950 Korea was considered as poorest country in the world, 35 years of occupation of Japan which drained the wealth from the Korea for its own benefit, destroying Korea's economy structure left them to suffer for the coming ages. However they managed their identity nationalistic feeling for the country. With the aid of United States South Korea moving forward for the reconstruction for their nation. Nationalism has been very significant in nation building of South Korea.

Ethnic homogeneity is the basic ingredient for the South Korean national identity. Their 90% population is ethnic Korean which is a key factor for the single ethnic society for smooth growth of the nationalistic sentiment among the Koreans. The reason behind the strong sense of unity is that they had common blood line and shared ancestry. Koreans have firm belief that their country was established by the Dangun, the legendary son of heavenly god and the bear totem women, which was known as Gojoseon dating back to 2333 B C, which South Korean celebrate as the national foundation day on the 3rd of October as a national holiday to honor and commemorate the foundation of Gojoseon. Believing the Dangun myth Korean proclaims themselves as the descendants of bear.

Korean language also plays a crucial role to unite the Koreans and gives them a feeling of pride. Hangul, the Korean alphabet was created during the Joseon period by the king Sejong. Before the creation of Hangul Korean people were using the Chinese language Hanja which was difficult for commoners to understand and write. This made the king anxious about the creation of language which suits the Korean pronunciation and could be easier for the Korean people to comprehend. During the Japanese occupation Hangul was banned in the schools and Japanese was made it compulsory.

The genesis of nationalism in Korea during the twentieth century can be seen as result of the late nineteenth century theories and movement. While facing the Japanese and the western countries attacks in the latter half of the eighteenth century, some salient ideology build up in Korea these ideologies were defend orthodoxy, ban heterodoxy, enlightenment and eastern learning (tonghak). These ideologies brought the feelings of national identity and enabled the Korean to fight against the Japan and western nations. The rise of these revolutionary movements in the first decade of the twentieth century produced a platform to Korea to fight against colonialism and the latter half it developed into the nationalism. The genesis of nationalism in Korea and the nationalistic movement against western countries and Japan were focused mainly to preserve their nation from the outside intrusion; Korea's concern was to protect its ancient culture and the national identity which was being hampered by the foreign influence and nurturing the independence movement during the Japanese occupation. Korea had to encourage its cultural dependency for obtaining the political and cultural autonomy, demanding the refurbishment and preservation of Korea's traditional culture.

3.2.2 Orthodoxy in the Korean nationalism

The orthodoxy ideology was first developed by the Confucian literati and it was concerned with the defending orthodoxy and banning heterodoxy, for maintaining an orthodox Confucian society in Korea. The intrusion of the western country such as France which was spreading the Christianity which created resentment among the Korean people they were looking it as an attack on their ancient culture, and the orthodoxy ideology was evident in attempt to prevent Catholicism in the early nineteenth century. Most of the conservative literati believed that if Korea signs any friendship treaty with western countries that worships heterodoxy, Korea will also become a barbaric nation and they will turn into a best as the conservative literati stressed. They strictly opposed any relation with western nations and Japan.

The attack on Khangwa Island by the French fleet in 1866 aroused anger in the conservative literati; they condemned the attack and clamored against their demands of unwished foreigners. The literati wanted Korean government to fight against those who were trying to destroy the Korea for their own benefit and attain victory. Choe Ik Hyun one the eminent literati who was the trusted adviser of the King Gojong was called for the signing of Korea Japan treaty 1876, this treaty would open the door for Japan in Korea. Choe Ik Hyun, openly criticised the treaty claiming that this treaty was not in the favor of Korea, which would allow Japan to interfere in

the internal matter of Korea.

After the assassination of Queen Min by Japan the orthodoxy leaders got furious over this incident and literati formed Righteous Army in various places to take the revenge of Queen's death. Several pro Japanese Korean officials were attacked; they destroyed the Japanese army bunkers in the rural areas and their facilities. Orthodoxy leaders played a crucial role causing self consciousness in Koreans about their distinguishable cultural heritage besides boosting resistance to outside influence.

3.2.3 Enlightenment

Thought of enlightenment developed in Korea during the 1870s by Pak Kyu Su and some (Yangban) aristocrats besides by some bureaucrats. Seeing the advanced navel technology and superior military power of France and America, the enlightenment movement accelerated in Korea. After the signing of the Khangwa treaty thus resulted opening the ports in 1876, the number of enlightenment exponent increased. The enlighten activist formed a group which it was called progressive party. This progressive party advocated for the new government organizations, modern school and hospitals. They also advocated sending the students to abroad to get the modern education and technology even they recommended to employ the foreign advisers and technicians. The reason behind doing it so to familiarise the western country achievement in terms of technology and education where Koreans were feeling left out. Activist tried to introduced the education to every citizens so that they can be aware of their country achievement and the western knowledge, how are they lagging behind in that know how department. Hansong Sunbo (한성주보) the first modern Korean news paper was published for the populace its main concern was to educate people.

Other aggressive activists like Kim-Ok-Kyun came up with an idea of abolition of the Yangban (aristocrat) classes for the betterment of the nation and he argued for welcoming the foreign religion Christianity. He asserted Korea should destruct the traditional Yangban administrative system and accept the western thoughts for the encouragement of enlightenment. With the rise of Japanese power in the Korean peninsula brought hop for enlightenment in the Korea. The Japanese legation brought reforms in Seoul, with the rise of progressive party domestic, political, social and economic structures were changes were made which was very crucial for that era. It cannot be denied that Japanese power snatched sovereignty from the Koreans; Koreans believed that it was an attack on their identity. Besides the fundamental changes were the requirement of

that time in Korea which weakened the Orthodoxy position. The enlighten movement somehow overlooked the fundamental issues such as self identity and bombed to gain the widespread support of the populace.

3.2.4 Tonghak (동학) (Eastern learning)

Tonghak movement was started in 1860 by Choe- Je- U. this movement started against the western learning. The declination of the traditional religion and thoughts, which was penetrated by the Christianity seeing this Choe Je U, established a new religion which was called tonghak which was also known as a eastern learning. The central concern of the religion was to counter the spread of Christianity which was rooting the Korea. Choe Je U was worried the intrusion of Christianity and Anglo French occupation. He conceived that introducing democracy and establishing the human rights were the only way to counter the growing foreign influence. There was a fearfulness among the Korean people that the rise of western hegemony will destroy the Korean tradition in terms of culturally and religiously, the way western powers were fighting against their obstacles in the Asia, it was not that far the when these power will capture the entire Korea and rule over it. The philosophy of the new religion was the amalgamation of the philosophy of other religions with the dogma of Choe Je U's own Chondo (천도) (Way of heaven).

Tonghak (동학) was the conjugation of the Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism, and this religion comprised of the teaching of these religions. The spirit of Confucianism, the awakening of Buddhism and the energy of Taoism, these characteristics of the religion are the natural endowments of human nature and these traits were the indispensable parts of the way of heaven. Choe Je u stressed it is impossible to govern the world with the Yao and Shun's administration this statement was seen a massive challenge to existing Confucian sociopolitical structure in Korea. Choe declaration to Yi dynasty that he would serve the nation, bring serenity to the people and safety to the citizens. His demands were to make a reform in the crooked administration of the government, advising to create an idealistic society and responsible government which should response at time of need.

The teaching of this religion was simple and emphatic, believing in Tonghak and practicing it will bring liberation and people will enjoy paradise on the earth. Tonghak religion provides an opportunity to people to experience something new, which Confucian did not provide. Choe Je

U's new religion brought resentment in the government he was arrested for spreading heterodoxy and cozening the masses, later he was executed in 1864 and the government tried to stamp down the movement completely. Tonghak teaching had a great impact on the people, the eastern leaning became very popular, and the Tonghak leaders started recruiting people for the movement. Tonghak demonstrated a massive protest against the government for the legal recognition to their new religion, a large number of peasants turned out for the movement which frightened the government. There was dissatisfaction among the people over the corrupt government, inefficient administrative reforms and growing influence of the western countries. In 1894 under the Tonghak leadership peasants rebelled against the government in the Cholla province government sent troops to suppress the rebellion but it proved to be a futile action, government forces unable to suppress them. Later on the Chinese and the Japanese forces were sent to take control over rebellions at peninsula but these forces turned on against each other in the Sino-Japanese war. The Tonghak forces were suppressed by the Japanese forces and the growing interference of Japan in Korean domestic affairs caused belligerency among the rebellions. At the end the untrained and unorganised Tonghak forces were defeated by superior Japanese army, but one thing was very clear that the Eastern Learning brought the feeling of koreanness among Koreans and for the koreanness they fought against the Chinese and Japanese forces by the end of 1894 this religious movement was no more religious and it turned into a political movement.

3.3 Goguryeo as a national identity

Among stark anticipation for writing and concurring a distinct yet unique historical account for the area specified as the Goguryeo region in the North-eastern fringes of mainland China, we see the implementation of the a series of diplomatic and conscripted academically discourses and dialogues. One such important and vastly debatable issue was the introduction of China's famed Northeast Project (also known by the formal name of the Research Project of the North-eastern China) incepted from the year 2002-2007. The prime objective of such an academic discourse was to foretell the illustrative yet extensive historical account of the North-eastern part of the Chinese territory. From the basic understanding of the sources and the materials available on the topic, one could broadly etch out that the traditional viewpoint would hold that the North-east part of the Chinese mainland and specially the region under the Jilin province and parts of the

Manchuria extension was incorporated under the hegemony the Goguryeo kingdom, a conglomeration of regions falling under the great and inclusive three kingdoms of Silla, Baekje and Goguryeo. The project came about as a part of Chinese academician's means to proselytize and control and provide an extensive history of this elusive region.

The relevance of this region conceives from the riveted controversies that evolve out of this geographical terrain. The controversy that comes out highlights itself here is the fight between the Chinese and the Koreans in over viewing this region as belonging to the sovereign claims of the Chinese and the Koreans. Goguryeo came under the regional discursive variations of the Chinese and with the exception that the region was predominantly inhabited by the Koreans who had initially settled there as refuges and the claims that such a project had was that it had highlighted and addressed the integrities and sublime national aspirations of the ethnic minorities that were residing here and yet it showed or say portrayed the region as being a contestation between a disputed Chinese and a Korean national upheaval. And so to say that the NEP (abbreviated for the Northeast Project), as identified by the Chinese government was basically installed as a five year research project from 2002-2007 that investigated the history and geography of China's north-eastern borderlands. And yet this project posed grave and severe implications for the growth and the development of contemporary Korea¹⁹. This statement can be made based on the consequences that it be held for Korea as such a project tries to snatch away the basic claims of territoriality and sovereign resilience of the Koreans. The problem that comes up is that among the tussle between the nationalistic upheavals of these two nations, the Koreans proclaims that the project throws light into the Chinese ambitions of presenting the history of this region as a measly self centred history, a history based on the Han centred history. The centrality to this argument comes as an implicit threat to the concerns of the Koreans as this region had held significant value to them due to the presence of a large number of Korean immigrants and ethnic minorities residing in the region.

3.4 Chinese Interpretation: Self Centered or Just Independent?

19 Jang- Dong-Jin, Kyung-Ho Song and Min- Hyuk Hwang- China's Northeast Project and Contemporary Korean Nationalism, 2008, ISA Annual Conference, 123. This is an extended paper that was presented in the Korea Journal of Spring 2009, and it featured among the several write-ups that came up subsequently in protest of this famed project initiated by the Chinese government as an insight to look at the history and the geopolitics of its north eastern borderlands.

While discussing the relevance and the importance of the Chinese explanation for the inception of this hugely deemed project, the Northeast Project has come up as an independent discussion of the Chinese historians and academicians to map out history of its borders. The differing and the discursive viewpoints that subsequently exist are because of the agenda that the Project had presented. The agenda that the project had presented was to form an inclusive discussion of the region while comprehending a singular unitary history of China and for the purpose such as this; the NEP was started under the auspices of the Centre of Borderland History and Geography Research, which is under the supervision of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences. It was perpetuated as a solely academic exercise and it was envisioned as a purely conscripted exercise to extensively write down a singular unitary history of China, but the Koreans had expressed concern over its 'hidden' motivations. The most controversial topic in the whole project was the interpretation of the history of the Goguryeo. Although the Chinese academicians who had implemented the project go by the idea that the project clearly states Goguryeo as being one of the many topics of discussions that the contents of the project covers, but the conflicts and the resentments that arise between the Chinese and the Koreans are related to the interpretations of this ancient kingdom (Li 2005)²⁰

Any form and text of historical relevance and academic attainment necessarily its background from the way the author tries to elaborate and explain his facts and figures. **And so**, while addressing the question of the Goguryeo in the broader discussion of the NEP, there evolves a figment of controversy because the Chinese historians and the academicians have broadly claimed that the Goguryeo kingdom in the Jilin province of the northeast part of the Chinese mainland is a region that was inclined in being a strategically important region for China and the fact that the region was situated in a land that was previously part of the Manchuria province, and it would have severe repercussions if it got handed over to any other nation (reference made particularly to Korea). But, the important aspect that crops out here is that

20 Although Sheng Li had stressed that the research about the Goguryeo comprised of only 8.5 percent of the entire research project, other agendas are also related to the historical discussion of Korean history, such as "Local History of China's North eastern Borderland", "History of Nations in China's North-eastern Borderlands", "History of Old Joseon, Goguryeo and Balhae"- all of which were formerly understood to be inclusive within the historiography and the territoriality of the ancient Korea by Koreans and Chinese historians until the 1980s- and "Historical Relationship between China and Joseon" et cetera. Source of this information comes from the same reference as the first footnote.

political changes in Manchuria were influential for the development of the entire East Asian region (Yoon 2005)²¹. And for Korea, the perception has been to attack the Chinese claims by saying that they have infringed their internal rights and in the process denigrated their sacred place and insulted the sentiments of the people who reside in the region.

The claims are furthered by allegations such as the rise of the Chinese exorbitance and hegemonic power in the region and statements such as China's rise is countered as being harmful that it would gobble up the sacredness that the Goguryeo region had for the Koreans and such a change was noticed to be in ardent sense of China infiltrating the cultural values of the Koreans and therefore creating a space for the Chinese nationalistic trends to be declared as self-centred and Han centric. Also, one can say that this project as initiated and introduced by China as a part of an extensive research based and an academical exercise was considered as an unambiguous and a project that tried to austere a Chinese claim to the region and thus posed a severe harm to the nationality of the Koreans. And for the Koreans, again this project created a serious rift in relations between these two countries as this created a hindrance in the socio-economic and the political connections between these two nations.

We can see that there evolves a serious academic and a geopolitical debate that sprung between the ideologies of these two nations and when the question of ethnicity came it hassled a conflict between differing expression of nationalities and identity formations. The questions and indications about the conflicting ideas and spirit of nationalism can be seen right immediately after the Project was launched, and the series of protests came in the visual media and among the civil society of Korea and this was followed by a series of articles and newspaper reports that criticized the Chinese effort and this was based on the a series of resentments and issues that addressed and questioned the very motive of the project: asking important queries and admonitions based on whether the project was an purely academic intention or whether it was a subtle skirmish to the Korean thought, that presented itself as being attached to the place by engaging a 'spiritual' and a 'holistic' element to the place. Then there arose the question of another form and it contented to ask the Chinese motives as being intrusive to see the place as belonging to both China and Korea's essence of historicism.

21 Yoon, Hwyo- Tak- "Jungguk-ui dongbuk byeongang jeongchaek- dongbuk gongjeong jeollyak-eul- jungsim euro" (China's Northeastern Borderland Policy: Focusing on the Plan for Revitalizing Northeast China). *Jungguk geunhyeondaesa yeongu* (Korean Studies of Modern Chinese History), Chapter 27: 121-152

This can be said true for the case of several authors and scholars of Chinese historiography stating that the place held relevance for both Chinese and Korean profits. And one has to point out the fact that Goguryeo as a region was not as important or relevant to the Chinese as it had now become. The reason for such a claim is best argued by the scholar Mark E. Byington. Byington argues that chronologically within the ambit of the Chinese scholarly domain, Goguryeo as a place was not as important to the pre-modern Chinese scholars, who did not regard Goguryeo to be a part of the Chinese history during the period from the fall of the Goguryeo in 668 to early twentieth century²².

3.5 Zhonghua Minzu:

And yet this became only important after the Manchurian Incident in 1931 that Chinese scholars attempted to look for historical evidence contending that Manchuria had been an inseparable part of Chinese history, even in pre-modern times. One of the first Chinese attempts to interpret Goguryeo as part of Chinese history was Fu Sinian's *Dongbei Shigang* (Historical Overview of China's Northeast) in 1932. According to Byington, the book aimed at justifying Chinese claims over the territory of Manchuria, but it was hastily written and it was consumed with historical errors and inaccuracies²³. However stringent the resentments and the controversy was, the academic dispute could be resolved through the academic approach. And if one looks at the whole issue, then we see that the scholars are unable to maintain scholarly neutrality through their studies. The Chinese scholars tried to defend their scholarly accolades and their progressive understanding of history through the use of a distinctive term *Zhonghua Minzu* (Chinese Nation), and this misses the notion of 'harmony' in the term²⁴. The term encompassed the general view that the Chinese maintained during their presentation of the progressive NEP project that they initiated in the year 2002. The view that was put up by the Chinese scholarly discourse was to justify the initiation of the project by saying that the Goguryeo region has always been a disputed area between for the Chinese and the Koreans, and hence there should be an idea to proclaim the

22 Byington, Mark E. - China's studies on Goguryeo in 20th Century in View of Territorial Security taken from *Mingjokjuui- yeoksa gyogwaseo* (Nationalism and History Textbooks in Asia and Europe) - edited by Centre for Information on Korean Culture, the Academy of Korean Studies, and (2006) Sheongnam: The Academy of Korean Studies, 121-126. And it has been subsequently been mentioned in his other book "An Irresoluble Dilemma of Histories Past and Present: Goguryeo in Chinese Historiography", *Journal of Koguryo Studies*, Chapter 18, 373-399. (2004)

23 Ibid, 377-378 (2004)

claims of both the Chinese and the Koreans and they had vouched for a combined history of the region that had to be comprehended and studied.

This proved to be the most peaceful way of analysing and studying the integrities of the region but then again the Koreans had found the method problematic as they thought that the area would still be presumably controlled with absolute hegemony by the Chinese who would look at the area in terms of the Manchu background and this would create ripples in the relationship between the two nation on question of trust, confidence and compliance.

And so to comply with the universal accepted form of allegiance between the two nations, the dictum of *Zhonghua Minzu* or the Chinese Nation presupposed China as a multi ethnic nation state that appears to encompass all national minorities within the boundaries of contemporary China²⁵. In this way, *Zhonghua Minzu* can mean seeking harmony within China, with an emphasis on peaceful coexistence with nations outside of China. And so the idea of *Zhonghua Minzu* may give us a harmonious impression that correlates within the realm of the Chinese national ambitions and ubiquitous desires. On the contrary, this also reflects a Chinese description of a modern state that attains a larger plethora of minorities within its domain. A parable thought could be that in the larger process of nation building corroborating all nations within ambassadorial relations and mutual ambit of China poses a larger threat to the concept of *Zhonghua Minzu* as this idea may degenerate into a hegemonic nationalist dialogue within China under the empirical framework of national harmony²⁶. To go into details and an extensive study of this point, one can comprehend that whether or not this kind of nationalism would really be beneficial to the national minorities in China. The policy might be concurred to defend the exclusive and the inviolable autonomy that justifies every form of discourse and presumptuous

24 Chinese scholars emphasize that *zhonghua minzu* is different from the Western concept of a nation that is related to hegemonic discourses of nationalism in the modern age. See Wang Yiwei (Seeking China's New Identity: the Myth of Chinese Nationalism), taken from *Cross Cultural Studies*, 2007, Chapter 11: 79-106 and also refer to the book by Wang Ke- *Ethnicity and the State: Genealogy of the China's Theory of the Unified Multiethnic States*, 2005, Seoul, Koguryo Research Foundation (translated by Kim Jeong Hui)

25 For a defence of the idea that China has maintained a multi-ethnic state since the ancient times, see Wang Ke (reference given in the previous footnote).

26 Jang- Dong-Jin, Kyung-Ho Song and Min- Hyuk Hwang- *China's Northeast Project and Contemporary Korean Nationalism*, 2008, ISA Annual Conference, 123. This is an extended paper that was presented in the *Korea Journal* of Spring 2009: 130

practices within the refuge of Chinese territory and rebut all external criticism as misunderstanding and ignorance of the Chinese notion of harmony²⁷.

In the NEP, the Chinese interpretation of Goguryeo brought critical responses from Koreans, as it sought to shallow and dampen Korean identity and historical legitimacy. Chinese historians generally cite four reasons supporting the idea that Goguryeo was one of the local regimes in the Chinese nation. First, Goguryeo was conceived within the Chinese current territory; secondly, its central stage was always with the Han dynasty's local realm; Thirdly, Goguryeo was a tributary state of China and finally, a considerable portion of the people from the Goguryeo were assimilated into the Han nation after the fall of the kingdom²⁸.

The articulation and the elocution of the facts and figures contiguous to the understanding and the knowledge of the Goguryeo invited an array of controversies including evidence for and against the argument that Goguryeo was within the Han dynasty's local realm on the basis of participation in the system of tributary-investiture. Even the Chinese historians do not agree to the fact there could be a unitary interpretation of whether historically Goguryeo belongs to Korean history or Chinese history. This can be showcased to explain the tributary-investiture system that cogitate a diplomatic relation between nations especially between prodigious and feeble states²⁹. Then the idea was furthered by the banter of scholars of Chinese discourse whose ideas emanated in their cajoled views that inveigled in their idea of 'one history shared by two

27 Ibid: 130

28 Lee, Da-Long- Goguryeo as a Local Nation's Government of Ancient China- 2004: Ch. 14: 50-53. This is taken from excerpts included in the journal *Minjok yeongu*. The view that Lee provides ostensibly a point that correlates to the importance and the strategic significance that Goguryeo had for the two nation and it somehow extensively highlights that the Goguryeo was important and vis-à-vis significant for the Chinese cause and it justified why China was so interested in the region as it saw a place where forth hegemony and an external and an internal control could have been achieved and sustained. Through his explanation of the four points, comes in the wake of a growing number of academic efforts to re-imbibe the 'Chinese Nationalist' feeling hitherto the other 'Non-Chinese' approaches and feeling.

29 Piao, Wenyi- An Introductory Review on the Demarcation of the Centre (Zhong) and the Outside (Wai) in Chinese History, taken from 'A Collection of Research Papers on the Issue of the History of the Goguryeo', 2005, Koguryo Research Foundation, Seoul, edited by Piao Wenyi. And, also Piao Zhenshi refers to this in his book titled as 'An Preliminary Analysis of the Historical Status of Goguryeo in Old Chinese Historical Records', presented as a collection of essays in 'A Collection of Research Papers on the Issue of the History of the Goguryeo', edited by Piao Wenyi, 2005, Koguryo Research Foundation, Seoul, 76-101.

(or more) nations’, suggesting that Goguryeo belongs to both Chinese and Korean history. Jiang Meng-shan viewed that Goguryeo as belonging to both China and Korea in terms of current territory, political power, economy, culture, and ethnic lineage. He argues ‘one history shared by two nations’ in the case of Goguryeo history³⁰.

And, finally, we see that these controversial debates on the history of the region, we see that the history has been intertwined with the geopolitics and the contemporary social and the national identity and. Diverse interpretations of this historical realm has been a topic of serendipitous conflicts between the two nations or states, but also influence the status of domestic national minorities and hence it got stretched into a lengthy discussion of the forms and the content of resurging an ‘unique’ identity from where both these nations would draw a sense of belonging and an essence of attainment and self belief!

3.6 Korea’s adaptation of the ‘National Identity’ while addressing Goguryeo

In the apparent wake of the questions cropping from the insidious debates raising on the issue of ‘National Identity Formations’, the broader Chinese response eludes the people of the academic misdemeanour that they presented in the name of comprehending an exclusive history of her North-eastern borderlands. The Chinese scholarly discourse presumes itself from the way the Chinese manipulated their claims in the Goguryeo region forbearing it under the hegemon of the Manchurian dominion. Alternatively they had conversed for a debate on whether the land should constitute a particular Chinese apparition or should it be shared by the two nations of Korea and China combusting a singular historical thought.

The Korean response to the whole project was guffawed and criticised by the Koreans in the wake of a series of articulated and orchestrated debates that portrayed the Chinese of trying to embezzle the Koreans claim in the region to configure their traditional Korean dominion and value that they attached to this sacred land. Figuring an expansionist attitude by the Chinese, the Koreans had believed that it was a mock move by the Chinese to precede the project with a overwhelming control that they had exercised in the region by proclaiming that the region had belonged to the Han realm and the fact that the region had been included traditionally into the

30 Jiang, Meng-shun- “On the Issue of Goguryeo History” taken from ‘Chinese Studies on Goguryeo: The Logic of China’s Northeast Project, edited by Shin-Jong Won and translated by Joo Sang Gil, 2005, Seoul. The Academy of Korean Studies

Manchurian domain and this created severe repercussions for the Koreans. Two severe conflicts had occurred between Korea and China in 2004 and 2006 when the project had come out and published their outcomes.

In 2004, there arose between these two periods of aggressive dialectical discourses, the two governments abject a series of dialogues and deliberations along with a set of verbal agreements to describe the issues and the concurring problems³¹, establishing basic issues relating to the prevention of the politicisation of important academic disciplines. And in 2006, the problem was further escalated by the several problems that were provoked by the NEP, which instigated severe gripe from the mass media, civil society, the Korean government and scholarship.

3.7 Mass Media and Civil Society

Dissent and an honorable mention of the problem about the NEP and the effect it had with the Korean spirit was first mentioned by the popular newspaper Joong-Ang Ilbo, in their edition dated on the 14th of July in 2003³². More than a year after it was introduced and implemented in February of 2002, the term ‘Northeast Project’ was first introduced in Korea in July 14th of 2003, almost immediately after declaring broad goals and perspective in the strengthening the global and strategic partnership between the two nations in the ‘Broad Cooperation and Partnership’ between the two countries on July 7, 2003. And then several articles and write-ups regarding China’s ‘true intentions’ were projected³³.

The NEP aroused strong cantankerous nationalist sentiments within Korean society. Citizens had identified themselves as part of a unified “Korean Nation” sans any political alignment, personal ideology, religion or generation. Aforementioned to the beginning of the NEP, strong nationalist feeling against China had prior existed, and this was intensified by the strong nationalist resentment that had erupted there in spark of many protests by some extreme nationalists who

31 Lee, Hee Ok- A Critical Interpretation about Political Disputes of the Research Project of the North eastern China, taken from the East Asian Journal, 2007, Chapter- 53: 9-45

32 Joong-Ang Ilbo, popular newspaper in Korea mentions the tumultuous problems between the NEP and the Korean consequences in their edition of July 14th 2003

33 For example, “Hidden Motives behind China’s Northeast Project”- Korea Herald, dated August 24, 2004. Kang J also points out that “Koreans think of NEP as political matter even though the Chinese don’t” (reference of this could be found in Kang, Jun-young – ‘The Influence of Korea-China relationship of China’s Recognition of the History of Goguryeo: With the Debate of Korea and China’s Historical Recognition about the Northeast Project’, given as an excerpt in Jungguk yeongu (Chinese Studies), 2004-05, Chapter-36: 201-214

were induced that Manchuria should be returned to Korea as it fell within the realm of their archaic ancestral property, and insinuate that many still lived there, and subsequently a slogan of 'return to our territory' was hauled out, without implying any thought to what might be the consequences³⁴. And this created a discursive debate between the two nations highlighted by Damul movement that had happened in the year 1995, which was a kind of a reconquista movement for the old territory of Goguryeo. And this had brought in newer trends and protests that had created ripple effects across Korea, wherein strong anti- China feeling started cropping out and this furthered the need and vow for the growth of a unifies national sentiment that went against the imperialist domain of China, termed as self centred and Han oriented.

Again, one can see that with the nationalist sentiments soaring, many NGOs like Kookhakwon (Institute of Korean Traditional Culture Studies and Kookhak-NGO (NGO Coalition for Korean Traditional Culture Studies) had initiated series of demonstrations and petitions against the NEP. The first petition was launched on the 23rd of December 2003 and signature drives were conducted in as many as 23 cities, acquiring 400,000 signatures within just a few days. As NGO response became more heard and felt, the media pepped up its speed to be in sync with the growing movement. In 2003, 12 major newspaper and magazines published 231 articles about the NEP and 1,499 articles about Goguryeo, along with 62 TV programs on the topic³⁵.

And hence, to conclude this section, one can see that the growing resentment and the dissent of the native Koreans towards the Chinese hegemonic attempts and they envisioned their expression of protest towards the whole NEP (Northeast Project), saying that the project was one which oppressed the Korean sentiments and vitality.

3.8 The Government Response and the Scholarship The Government Response and the Scholarship Critique:

Among the nebulous dissent and unformulated aberration form the normal mode of the expressing national sentiments, we find a clash of national coherent identities. And as already mentioned earlier, the Northeast Project posed a bigger threat not as a misinterpreted historical narrative or an abhorred sense of national identity representation, one cannot ignore but mention

34 Nah, Youngju – 'The Development and Political Characteristic's of China's Northeast Project', as presented in the Minjok yeongu, Chapter- 32: 6-32

35 The Koguryo Research Foundation (2004, 283-388). Recited from Kim, Wi-hyun (The Task of Korean Academic Society after the NEP), taken from an excerpt from Oriental Studies, 2007, Chapter-47:307-321

the response from the Korean government regarding the whole debacle. The Korean government as opposed to the general public and the civil society instigated by the mass media, acted in a suave manner, not letting their sentiments cover their grit decisions and their sensible thinking. Among all the commotion surrounding the hitherto Northeast Project of the Chinese historiography and scholarly accolades, The Korean government came up with an official statement on January 9th, 2004 stating that “Among all the frenzy created by the media and their ostensible notion about the Chinese state, it is hard to consider the NEP as a project propelled by the Chinese government”. And keeping this posture in mind, they have established the Koguryo Research Foundation to engage and focus themselves in a scholarly discourse and discussion³⁶. Furthermore, the institution was established to give a kaleidoscopic view into the Koguryo matter, giving several useful articulations and prospects in looking into the issue with a wide variety of views and thus cutting out the mostly unilateral view that the Chinese had on the topic. To add more into the way the research institution worked, overtly sensational views portrayed by the media and the perspicacious and the particularly arduous views of the civic society was discredited for and a holistic and a more sound logical explanation was applied.

On the 3rd of September, 2004, 59 members of the Korean National Assembly came about with another resolution on the abbreviated invalidity of the Gando Convention³⁷, following this, there was a huge outcry from the media and the civic society who were belligerent about the NEP until February of 2007, when the project was officially concluded and debunked. And since the month of January 2008, there has been little mention of the project in seven daily newspapers, such as Kyunghyang Daily News, Kukmin Daily, Naeil Shinmun, Dong-a Ilbo, Munhwa Ilbo, Seoul Shinmun, Segye Times, and Hankyoreh. In the event, where no possible conclusion was reached, many critics warned that “The real NEP would now begin³⁸”.

36 The Koguryo Research Foundation, now renamed as the Northeast Asian History Foundation, was founded by the Korean government in March 2004; in response to the concerns of the array of scholars and the civic groups.

37 The Gando Convention was signed by the Qing Dynasty and Japan in 1909, affirming the territorial rights of the Qing dynasty over a large part of current Jilin province. A number of Koreans believe the convention is void because it was signed when Japanese had already negated the Korean government’s right to conduct its own foreign affairs. However, whether or not the territorial rights over Gando historically belong to Korea is also a controversial issue.

38 Reference of this could be found in the inputs of the Yonhap News Agency, subsequently broadcasted and aired on the 26th of January 2007

3.9 The Scholarly Disagreement:

There have always been severities and a sense of apprehension when the question of scholarly misjudgments and the topic of Goguryeo are discussed. The Korean scholars have predominantly struck with the views that the NEP is not free from the nationalist discourse. Myung-chul Youn has expressed that the main purpose of his writing is to reveal, “The aim of the NEP is to weaken Korean national identity and to put Korea under the influence of the Chinese culture”³⁹. From 2004-2007, we see a meteoric rise in the number of seminars and discussions concerning the NEP and a variety of articles were published on the topic. The research can be classified in to two broader divisions: historical and political. Researchers on the historical domain made counter claims to the interpretations of the Chinese scholarship. In contrast, the political domain of research had clearly focused to highlight on the intentions of the NEP⁴⁰. Their arguments can be conscripted and summarised in the following points: First, the northeast borderland of China has been a very important area, historically and geopolitically; second, the area is in an unstable situation replete with economic, racial, and national problems; to resolve these issues and extend magnanimous support to the region, redevelopment and re-education of “our [Chinese] history” is needed⁴¹. The two extensive projects of China’s “Development’s Strategy of North-eastern China” and “Research Project of North-eastern China” are based on these political purposes; the NEP aims to imbibe and invoke a Han national identity upon ethnic minorities in the area⁴² as the Chinese government had already done in the other minority areas⁴³. In the political arena, the studies presented a different outlook into the matter, and the criticism came as a direct testimony

39 Youn, Myung-chul- ‘On the Character of Wars between Goguryeo and Sui Tang’, taken from the ‘Journal of Goguryeo Studies’, 2004, Chapter-18: 811-836

40 Kang, Gwon-Chan- ‘Distortion of History Intended by National and Political Policies’, taken from *Minjok yeongu (Chinese Studies)*, Chapter- 14: 98-122

41 Yoon, Hwytak- ‘China’s North-eastern Borderland Policy: Focusing on the Plan for Revitalising Northeast China’, taken from the reference in *Korean Studies of Modern Chinese History*, Chapter-27: 121-152

42 Park Sun-young points out that the main aim of the NEP is not to distort Korean history, but to infuse Chinese nationalism into the area (2004). Park Jung-su also argues that, “One China” is the most important political statement of the Chinese government (2004). Furthermore, the Chinese government plays up patriotism and nationalism to resolve problems in the region, including vacuum spaces of socialism, economic inequality and possible independence movements of minority nations. For examples- Choi (2004, 245-267), Nam (2005, 79-101) and Lee H. (2007, 23-27)

to the fact that the NEP perverts the truth: saying that the Han nationalism is too self centred and violent: thereby infringing a way for the China to show their imperialist motivation and scoff at the Korean ambitions and thus etch out a potential attack towards the Korean peninsula⁴⁴ and some sustained that the Korean government should be more stern in their actions and should subsidize by a more aggressive position and make efforts to claim Gando (the view here comes from the book written by Kim Y and Kim W, 2004, 205-206) and this could be classified into 'defensive' and 'offensive' points of view, owing to the same conclusion that China should do away with their imperialist fervour and a necessary Han centric nationalistic alignment. Subsequently, there has been indicative resurgence in the way the historical accoutrements has been used and employed, the enquiry that had been insinuated here comes from the search for two basic indicators: first, the search for the nationalist tendencies (say chauvinist) allegiance and second, the historical truth. This can be held steadfast for all the debates that concurred from our discussion of the NEP project. The project infused with these two basic corroborative practices, which created ripples between the relations that configured between Korea and China. The nationalist traditions chiselled as a euphemism for a series of epistemological and endemic exercises and dwindled into the consecrated minds of the Korean exponents and the Chinese verbal dictum vis-à-vis led to the entrée of hegemonic dialogue. The question of nationalism further incised the Korean souls as Goguryeo fell into a realm where the 'truth' got abhorred and deselected by the Chinese's coherent viewpoints and ideologies. And so, the enquiry about what the region meant got desiccated into the 'real' and the 'unreal' realm, wherein the 'real' domain coincide the sacred realm; a space where the region is a matter of religious and spiritual importance where the sense of resistance become the sole priori and a matter of great prudence and pride in resisting any form of foreign and alien incursion, and in the 'unreal' domain where the region became leitmotif for political and social incursions by China.

3.10 Summary

This chapter has dealt with the issue of identity relating to the Goguryeo controversy. It is very

43 Ryu Yong-tae argues that the recent NEP can be understood as a typical example of the Chinese reactions to great historical events in the region. According to him, research into these districts increased dramatically when they faced the Manchurian Incident, the Sino-Japanese War, and the recent Open Door and Reformation policies (2005, 204-210)

44 Regardless of the differences that subsist in these arguments, see Ahn (2004, 61-63), Kim W. and Kim Y. (2004, 200-202), Kang (2006, 5) and So (2004,65)

obvious to raise the question that what would be the identity of the Goguryeo kingdom people when China Claims that the Goguryeo belonged to them. The question put the Korean identity on the stake. In this chapter question regarding the Goguryeo controversy and identity has been explained in detail. The quest of a separate identity as a Korean started much earlier in the 19th century when the western penetration was at its peak. Countries such as France and United states were repeatedly trying to enter to the Korean peninsula. Korean people regarded the outsiders as barbarous and uncivilised, they wanted to keep their identity intact without any infiltration of the outsiders. The spread of Christianity in Korea worked as fuel in the fire; this was something which was unacceptable for Koreans they protested violently and killed many Christians .In the second section of this chapter discuss the Korean identity as separate entity from the Chinese, the subordination which they had experienced in the past and in this view the very idea of China's Goguryeo represents a threat to Korean identity. In the Northeastern part of China, Manchuria where ethnically Korean people resides their identity is also on the stake, as they are called Chinese-Korean. Keeping the mind that secessionist movement is going on in the western part of China where the Uyghur demanding for the separate identity which the Chinese Government suppressing ruthlessly. Chinese government fears that the any secessionist movement in the Northeastern region can create political instability.

CHAPTER IV: GOGURYEO CONTROVERSY AND ITS IMPACTS ON THE BILATERAL RELATIONS

4.1 Establishment of South Korea and China Relations

It's been more than 23 years since the bilateral relations have been established between republic of Korea and the China on August 24, 1992. These twenty three years of the establishment of bilateral ties has been definitely unparalleled to the thousands of years which have linked these two countries. In a very short time the relations of the two countries have seen a remarkable progress, exchange and cooperation has enhanced enormously between republic of Korea and China. The hostility which arose after the Korean War has been put to an end in the present time and efforts are being put up to grow "comprehensive cooperative partnership. Given the geographic proximity, shared culture, thousands of years of old history between these countries and the common rapport in their respective economies were the important factors for the

expeditious economic development which enabled them to come closer to each other.

In addition, another crucial factor which emerged from the newly established relationship between these giant Asian economies was the strategic joint benefits. The mutual concern regarding the peace, stability and the development in Korean peninsula shared by the both the Nations, what they experienced before the end of cold war era, the hostility which did not allow to establish the formal relation, which became possible aftermath of the cold War. The end of the cold War provided a significant opportunity to both nations to come closer which concluded with the establishment of the bilateral ties. It was in the benefit for the both the countries to share mutual gain and loss, which provides peace and prosperity in Korean peninsula with the conclusion of the cold war.

Given these reasons, in such a short period of time more than two decades of old relationship within the two countries flourished with an applaud able speed and it appear to go further with this development established on the strategic benefits well into the twenty first century. Nevertheless, in the smooth relationship republic of Korea and China there are cooperative and conflicting elements also exists. Regardless of the frequent exchange and cooperation in the relationship there are possible inherent conflicts creating issues are showing up between two countries. There are several sensitive factors which are hindrance for the South Korea for example; the issue of the North Korean defectors, the issue of Chinese-Korean in the north eastern region of the China, the visit of Dalai Lama to South Korea and the most crucial factors which really rocked the relationship was the disagreement on the historical interpretation of the ancient Korean and Chinese history.

Furthermore, economically China's giant economy and its entrance to the global stage, the trade between China and the republic of Korea shown initially competitive and partial but with China's great grown market, proving the dangerous competitor to South Korea. The political and diplomatic features and the foreign policy of the China towards South Korea have not always been simpatico on the unification policy of the South Korea. The last 23 years old relation between these two countries could be seen and measured to an extended "honeymoon" period, but in the future the South Korean perspective towards China will be seen with the expectation and concerns. At the present time South Korea desire to establish a strong bilateral relationship with the China, given the scenario the northeast Asian where the relationship seems to be inseparable.

Basically, South Korea and China will have to draw a consensus and they need to have mutual understanding of the problematic issues. In the past several endeavors have been made to harden their relationship in order to adjudicate those issues but still there are some several sensitive issues lingering which is creating hostility towards each other and it is becoming difficult to break the impasse. In that regard this chapter aims to analyse South Korea's views towards China and then inquire into the factors that encumbering the relationship between the two nations.

4.2 Korea's views on Chinese Rise and its hegemony in the East Asia

The emergence of the China in the Asia and the world level as great power, the geopolitical location of the China with its close proximity to the Korean peninsula hence it is unimaginable to envision the fate of both the Koreas without China. In the recent years the political thinker's viewpoints have been divided in the two groups on the rise of China. Some thinkers see it an opportunity and where other see it as a Challenge. The school of thought who sees it an opportunity conceive that China's development and growth will provide a significant opportunity from NorthKorean economic perspective. Especially, China's huge population with its growing purchasing power parity is anticipated to boost South Korean economy too by providing it a huge market.⁴⁵

China proved to be a land of opportunity for republic of Korea, surpassing United States in terms of exporting to South Korea in 2003. China emerged as South Korea's top trading partner in 2004, in the very next year the bilateral trade crossed the \$100 billion mark before the estimated schedule. Benefitting from this bilateral trade South Korea experienced biggest trade surpluses. Resulting South Korea growing trade dependency on China, in 2002 China replaced the United States as South Korea number one destination for outbound investment. Even South Korea invested \$1.6 billion in China which made South Korea the third largest trading partner of China surpassing the America and Taiwan.

Nevertheless, the growing economic interdependence of South Korea on China does not equate to only an affirmative aspect regarding the China's rise in Korea. In future it is very much likely that South Korea will have to contend directly with the China on the global economic stage. Irrespective of this fact, Korea perceives the emergence of China as opportunity rather than a

45 Seongho Sheen " Tilting toward the dragon: South Korea's China Debate," in Satu P. Limaye(ed). Asia's China Debate (Honolulu: Asia – pacific center for security studies, 2003).

peril on the economic front.⁴⁶ Therefore the South Korean government officials welcomed the ameliorated ties with China. South Korean government perception on this improved relations with China bring diversification in the South Korean foreign policy, which will abbreviate the dependency on the United States alliance, securing the South Korean interest in the Korean peninsula and boost the south Korean development.

On the contrary the other group of political thinkers started viewing the rise of the China is a Challenge. Since the 2002, the Chinese effort to distort the ancient history Korea with the inception of so called Northeast project. The political thinkers and the government started to see this northeast project as a threat and concern over the potential consequences from China's expansionism and emergence started to escalate. Traditionally and historically China has been the dominant hegemonic power in East Asia. Thus the question arises in the South Korea, will it be wise to confer the friendly neighbor?⁴⁷ Furthermore, in the China's development process, China has beefed up and modernise its military power which South Korea perceives as security threat in the region. If the relations between China and United States gets bitter it will be a serious strategic dilemma for the Korea owing to its military alliance with the United States. The rise of the China for the South Korea presents both opportunity and Challenges, regardless of the possible benefits and opportunities and South Korea has now started to pay close heed to the accompanying challenges. The future relation will depend on the interactions between the two nations and how does it develop, South Korea might face more opportunities than challenges or the opposite. One thing is very visible from the South Korea and China relations that in the future China is becoming very crucial to South Korea's foreign relations in both economic and strategic terms. In future South Korea would like to develop an unthreatening and beneficial relationship with China, seeing the importance of economy and also crucial for the strategic and reunification goals. Nevertheless, South Korea does not see China as a strategic alternative instead of United States.

4.3 An insight on the constraints and problems in the South Korea and China relations

There is no question that the future relations of South Korea and China would generate

46 Changkyu lee and Inkoo lee, "The Rise of China and its Implications for Korean Economy"

47 In the 2003 after the general elections 63 percent of ruling party members (Uri Party) favored closer ties with China compared to the USA, after the Goguryeo controversy the figure changed and the support inclined toward USA.

significant opportunities for more mutually beneficial cooperation and exchanges in the comparison to the Cold War era. Nevertheless it seems that the future relation between South Korea and China is not going to be so warm. As their initial bilateral relationship was extended to comprehensive cooperative partnership and it is likely to that the relationship would extend into the future. Even so, possible constraints factors are also probable to increase likewise. At present there are various constraining factors which could confine the continued development of the relationship. Such constraining factors are China's domestic situations, China and North Korea relations, differences on the China and South Korea political system, differences on the political ideology. Apart from all this factors, the factor which almost jeopardises the relationship was "the issue of Ancient history".

This major constraining factor forced South Korea to re-evaluate its growing strategic relationship with china. China executed its very ambitious so called Northeast project with an intention to incorporate the much of the Korea's ancient history of "Goguryeo" particularly. This act of the China was seen by the Korean people as a potential resurgence of the Chinese hegemony and Sino centrism. Korean people regarded China as close friend and they had friendly feeling towards China prior to the controversy but now in South Korea people show less favourable feeling at present time.⁴⁸ The northeast project of the China, after making the claim on the ancient history of Korea it shows the china's political and strategic intentions. Till now China has not made any particular territorial claims but some South Korean officials and academics dread that by distorting the ancient history, and through the interpretation of the fabricated history China would claim the territories which comprise much of the North Korea.⁴⁹ South Korea does not want to overlook any strategic move by the Chinese government where China can intervene in the North Korea in the coming future during the emergency situation in the North Korea.

In South Korea and China relations the North Korea issue is another constraining factor, the North Korea issue would generate couple of challenges which are tightly related to each other.

48 138 newcomers to the national assembly in 2004, 55% of them chose China as more important foreign policy target than the United States. Dong A Ilbo, April 19, 2004 But right after one year later there was an another survey was conducted with 187 members of the assembly and 68% of them chose United States as a more important foreign policy target. Dong A Ilbo, April 13, 2005.

49 Asia Times, August 25, 2004.

The North Korea factor can influence the South Korea and China relations development, where the other challenge concerned with the reunification of the Korean peninsula itself. In both the challenges the second challenge would become very influential variable in the coming future. China will get more benefit from the stability of Korean peninsula rather than the unification of the two Korea.

4.4 Post Goguryeo controversy and relations between South Korea and China

The Chinese normality regarding the Goguryeo issue has been one of the most addressed and one of the most important issues to have discussed in the international political and social forums in the world. One of the earliest explanations for the Chinese interests in the Goguryeo region prevails from the fact that the region had been held historically within the realm of the Manchurian domain. The region had traditionally belonged to the historical materialism and the reality of the Chinese historical discourse and alternatively it has been in contention for creating a debacle for the arbitration between the Chinese and the Koreans, thus creating a rift between the two nations and these created newer problems of ethnicity and nationalities.

The differences that evolve here comes from the fact that the area has become extensive part of the research and the study of the Northeast Project: also known as the NEP, that was initiated in the year 2003, as a means to study and deliberate the detailed history of the Northeast part of Chinese territory, and create a base for the deliberation on an unique history for this area and thus create a discursive topic through which China could derive the legitimacy over this region and thus prevent the Koreans from attaining any form of resemblance to the area. As a part of a detailed process of saving the historicity of the region, the Chinese had engaged themselves in an attempt to renew the estranged relationship between them and the Koreans and thus give an impetus to developing an amicable and a mutual admiring relationship that would help rejuvenate the relationship between the two countries. Since the normalization of the relationship between China and South Korea in 1992, the pro-China sentiment of the Koreans was continuously and regularly greater than the pro-US relations and sentiments. However, the inception of the Chinese process of the Northeast Project, a political scheme to portray Goguryeo

as a part of China, has grown into a controversy serious enough to draw the unfavourable notice of the Koreans.⁵⁰

The oppositions also came from the ostensive resistance from the North Koreans, who said it was among the Chinese best interests to launch this project as a politically-driven and a staunch social critique to the controversial project, denouncing it as a politically based attempt at distorting the historical legacy of the Korean peninsula (Rodong Shinmun, November 27, 2004).

The issue had implied to cause the Koreans to reconsider their amicable and healthy relations with China and has raised concerns on whether China seeks to engross Sino-centric hegemony over Korea. And regarding this point, President Roh Moo-hyun also insisted that Korea should lead the quest for cooperation in Northeast Asia, having had no history of invading or actively aggressively towards another country⁵¹.

One of the most important discussion on the Goguryeo was to address the various interpretations that had been given to discuss the nature of the issue and it has being promoted as a means whereby China will exert long term governance over the Northeast borderland area (Park 2004, 136). In this sense, one can find out that the Northeast Project is not only meant to be installed as an academic endeavour and it certainly had a politically motivated undertaking. Nonetheless, the historical reconstruction and the reinterpretation had been not beneficial for insinuating a planned explanation for the history of the region, but it was seen as an exercise to claim the territorial jurisdiction over the northern part of the Korean peninsula. This chapter thus focussed to address and etch out the main characteristics of the relationship between the Northeast Project and China's policy towards the Korean peninsula, and the reason for the discord between the intent and the unintended results of the Northeast Project.

The chapter would intend to also discuss the possible solution and seek a way to normalize the

50 According to a joint survey of public opinion by KBS and Media Research (September 8, 2004), the proportion of Koreans harbouring unfavourable sentiments (60%) towards China has surpassed the percentage of Koreans who have favourable impression.

51 During the launch of its age of imperialism, Japan had initiated numerous wars of invasions against its neighbours, and has been unable to overcome a deep feeling of distrust amongst them. If China attempts to play a domineering role in the international order of Northeast Asia, neighbouring countries may become apprehensive. The fact is neighbouring countries are worried about the possibility of China's ethnocentrism turning into a pursuit of hegemony. "The Integration of Europe and the Age of Northeast Asia," Address at the University of Paris IV, the Sorbonne Paris, France, December 6, 2004

relationship between China and South Korea, because the issues and the problems raised by the NEP (Northeast Project) have already grown from academic to political and quandary diplomatic delinquency. And if a solution is not attained soon, then the relationship becomes such that China and South Korea would reach to cessation in matters of international goodwill and diplomacy and this would contravene the affable relations between the two nations. And to thus avert the abjuration of the Chinese claims on the Goguryeo and to impede any further damage to the benevolent relationship between the two countries, the NEP was scrupulously checked and monitored through the instalment of a special centre in 2004 to study the changes that happened there and subsequently, this institution was called the Koguryo Research Foundation.⁵²

4.5 The scope and controversial points of Northeast project:

The Project, as it has been earlier mentioned and discussed was introduced as a valiant effort of the Chinese to study and map out a detailed and an enhanced history of its borderlands and address the related issues in this region and this was done as a larger part of the Chinese concern to study and discourse the strategic importance that the region, and then create an amicable solution for looking through the important role that this region had played for china for so many centuries. The Northeast region of the Chinese had traditionally belonged to the Manchurian heartland and it had become an integral part of the Chinese tradition and historicity. The NEP was introduced in the first hand to delve into a academical and an intuitive study of the region and create a vantage point from where the whole of Chinese history could be mapped and it became part of a larger project to write and compile a comprehensive and a whole history of the nation. The project was first highlighted by the Centre for the Study of Borderland History and Geography (CBHG). Following a series of research and project heads since 2000, the Northeast Project was launched in February 2002 under the title of “Studies of the History and Geography of the Northeast Borderland and a Series of Phenomena”. And for the same the Chinese government had earmarked 15 million Yuan (about US \$2 million) to finance the Northeast project.

The NEP has been dissected into areas of basic studies, applied studies, data compilation and

⁵² In order to solve the issue, impeding with the formulation of this project, the Koreans established the Koguryo Research Foundation (<http://www.koguryo.re.kr>) in 2004, as a countermeasure to Chinese research initiatives and procedures.

translation activities. The five main themes of the project's research efforts include comprehensive studies of the history of the ancient borderland of China, North-eastern provincial areas, North-eastern tribes, Korean-Chinese relations, and the political and economic relations between China's Northeast and the Russian Far East ⁵³. This project had create the space for a variety of difference and dissatisfaction among the Chinese and the Koreans regarding mostly on the adherence of on ubiquitous national identity formation played in both by a sense of anticipation and a feeling of desperation, that was guided by the controversy that was created by the Goguryeo issue and the Gando Agreement, which became the main reason or rather the markers for the difference and the division of opinions between the Chinese and the Koreans.

The differences between Korea and China over the Northeast Project are unambiguous and conspicuous, especially regarding the issues of recognition and political interpretation. China has been emphasizing that the history of Goguryeo was only an academic research object in the Northeast Project aimed for "national unification, racial unity and stabilization of the borderlands". Subsequently, the Chinese had refrained from referring to Goguryeo as Chinese in its government publications and middle and high school textbooks, as referred by Staines in 2004. This is deliberately done because doing so would diminish Chinese political leverage on the Korean peninsula, but it would also make it difficult to gain cooperation from Korea regarding the historical distortions of Japan. And, the project was highlighted clearly as an academic discourse and it directly did not include the political intentions that the Chinese government underlay.

The possibility of the Chinese trying to act in their best interest comes almost immediately after the rebuttal to withdraw the Chinese 'hidden' agenda that comes up, and this becomes one of the most highlighted points so as to explain what this so called 'hidden' agenda was: the question that thus arise here is that whether the Chinese claims were purely based on the inclusive policies of China to overlay their political hegemony over the disputed territories or whether it was just another figment of conflict that effected the interests of both the nations and this also created a bed of arguments upon which the main premise that lay here was to claim that the Northeast part of the Chinese territory and the Goguryeo region in particular should even belong to the Chinese mainland or should it be given back to the Koreans on the basis that the area was the sacred and the spiritual homeland of the Koreans as the Goguryeo had traditionally been part of the 'Three

53 Regarding the research programme after 2002, see Yoon (2005, 142-171)

Great Kingdoms' of the Koreans and that this region should be sacrosanct within the realm of the imbued spirituality and the so called mandate of the Koreans.

The region had also been an important landmark for the historicity of the Koreans, who believed that the region had been politically significant and it had been the homeland for several Koreans who had been living here since the Goguryeo regime and also important here is to mention the whole surge against the Sino centric attitude of the Chinese: a policy of intensified and exclusive Chinese control and domination over any regional entity. This became a serious issue that showcased and portrayed that the Chinese considered that they lay traditionally in the centre of the earth and they had been imbued with the divine authority to rule over the world and this belief grew stronger according to the monarchical system and processes that highlighted that each dynasty in China came for a particular period of time and the idea that each dynasty would begin and then reach its peak and finally get replaced by a succeeding dynasty; which would replace the earlier ancient regime (ancien régime).

The ancien regime of Chinese civilizations had always followed this point and this was spiritually enhanced to countermeasure the precedence of one dynasty over another. And thus it was insisted that the central government would take the undercurrent of the whole Northeast Project and it posted that it would only support the project academically and would not let the project speak in behalf of the government's political intentions. And thus by doing so, it prevented any form of rupture and malignity regarding the historical issue of Goguryeo, thus leaving no scope for the magnification the already truncated problem ⁵⁴

Contrary to these claims, the Koreans had been tight lipped about the whole Chinese claims and it considered that the Northeast Project (NEP) was an important political issue. And they subsequently addressed and presented several reasons for explaining why such a claim was being made: Firstly, the Koreans are aware that this project was to be systematically carried forward by the inner working of the Chinese government. ⁵⁵ Second, according to the NEP result report, the project was to be started with high level of interest and support by local governments and the central government.

⁵⁴ Interview with an Northeast Project advisor in Changchun, Jilin province, China (February 5, 2004)

⁵⁵ According to the first news report, this had been termed a "tremendous national project" to be extended to the capital scale of US\$2.9 billion involving construction businesses, including the maintenance of the historic sites (JoongAng Ilbo), July 14, 2003

Third, as clearly explained in the “Guiding Principles of the Project”, the themes of the research studies being undertaken as a part of the NEP have been described as: “having substantial meaning for the stability and development of the Northeast borderland area; being able to serve as a positive impetus for the creation development of borderland studies department; being intended to develop a theoretical basis or scientific foundation for party and government politics.” Fourth, Koreans believe that the Northeast Project is a theoretical intermediation that can be used to insist on pre-emptive rights for ancient Goguryeo territory after the future collapse of the North Korea regime, specifically on the northern part of the Silla (Song, 2003, 159-183).

4.6 The Gando problem: The Japanese incursion in Goguryeo

The Gando problem acted as another brick in the wall for the Koreans as they thought that the issue pre-empted from the Chinese desire to create a political hegemony and this had added problems regarding the way the objectives of the project went and the way those objective would have to be met out in the whole discussion on the question of comprehending the way the history of the borderland was to be met out and discussed. The objective to begin with was purely meant to be only academics in its discourse and it was clearly found out that the project was only discussing the issue of the Goguryeo, but it clearly also addressed the question of encapsulating the region and creating the detailed discourse on the region. Ever since the inception of the project and among several other intricacies associated from this project, the Gando issue became very bad and it created a lot of nuisance. The original plan was insisted by the Japanese and the Chinese in the year 1909, the problem that came out of here was the fact that the issue gave exclusive rights to the Chinese to conquer and rule over the Gando region. This had been aggravated by the large territorial disputes and an allegation by the Koreans that the Chinese were now trying to intensify the region with their form of Sino-centric values and traditions.

Under this agreement that was signed between the two countries, the proposal agreed upon the fact that Japan ceded territorial claims to Gando, which belonged to the Joseon dynasty, before it was colonised by Japan, to the Qing dynasty of China for exclusive right to build and control a railway in the area. After the issue of Goguryeo history became a point of contention between the Koreans and the Japanese, Koreans raised the new claim that the Gando agreement in itself was invalid. Fifty-nine lawmakers from the ruling and the opposite parties submitted a resolution to nullify the agreement.

This move by the politicians is understood as a multi-purpose strategic card designed to pressure China politically and diplomatically, which may be useful when the two-Koreas are united. However, raising the issue of regaining territory lost under the Gando agreement means that it is no longer an historical problem but a real world issue. In consideration of the dynamism of Chinese politics, China may take an uncompromising attitude, as it does concerning the Taiwan issue. Furthermore, by raising the issue of Gando, South Korea may not only stimulate North Korean arrogance,⁵⁶ but it may have the effect of increasing instability over the existing boundary between China and North Korea, and make future changes in the boundary impossible. Thus, the Gando as it is already mentioned here is a more diplomatic issue than it being a more cultural issue, and henceforth, the sentiments of both the nations were etched out in a binary of oppositions that were hampered due to the construction of the exclusive Northeast Project or the NEP, that created a wide variety of differences and deliberations that could marred the already stable relationship between the two countries. And this had created a new problem that took turn in infringing the relations that were based on mutuality and respect and this project had created a hindrance in the way the nations had created an admiration for each other.

4.7 The ADIZ issue: The defensive discourse on the part of China controlling Korea's territoriality

Additional problems came up when China seemed to take the air out of the Geneva Accord on Iran with its simultaneous announcement last week that it is creating an Air Defence Identification Zone (ADIZ) in the East China Sea. The ADIZ will be implemented by the Chinese Ministry of Defence and obliges all aircraft flying in the zone to accommodate a number of rules including: the identification of flight plans, the presence of any transponders and two way radio communications with Chinese authorities. Predictably, the move was strongly condemned by both Tokyo and Washington and escalates the Senkaku / Diaoyu islands row to an even more dangerous level.

This development also signals Beijing's indifference to the continued descent of Sino Japanese

⁵⁶ In 1962, an agreement between Kim Il Sung, the leader of North Korea, and Zhou Enlai, the Chinese Premier, was reached regarding the North Korea- China order and territorial rights. This was finalized between Bak Seong-cheol of North Korea and Chen Yi of China by an exchange of formal protocols in 1964. The borderland agreement and the full text of the protocol was translated by Yi J. (2002, 318-343)

relations as well as a closed fist challenge to Washington's rebalancing to Asia. Calibrating a firm and united response to this is a crucial test for the U.S. - Japan alliance. The U.S. has already signalled its displeasure with a B 52 flight across the disputed islands. This had created an added problem for Korea because of Chinese heinous and supposedly dangerous expeditions that they had laid out regarding the ADIZ and the constant threat that began to pose in the diplomatic relations between the two countries.

There is fallout from the ADIZ that has the potential to be particularly harmful to China's interests. In an apparent blunder, Beijing stretched its ADIZ boundaries to include South Korean airspace. Specifically, this zone covers a submerged rock in the East China Sea named Ieodo and parts of airspace surrounding Jeju Island. While Ieodo is not allowed, under the UN Convention of the Law of the Sea, to be claimed as territory by either state due its status as a submerged rock, both Seoul and Beijing argue that the reef falls under their Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ). The reaction from Korea to the ADIZ announcement has been bristling. Seoul reportedly summoned a minister from the Chinese Embassy in Korea to denounce the unilateral ADIZ and has warned Beijing that it will not comply with these rules.

In fact the Ministry of Defence in Korea released a statement earlier this week stressing that it "will fly aircraft over Ieodo as usual without informing China." Korea maintains an ocean research centre on Ieodo and has insisted that it is determined to defend its claimed EEZ. China for its part has been backpedalling quickly to mitigate the diplomatic fallout with Seoul, indicating that the intention of the zone is not to box Korea in on Ieodo. The row is further complicated by the fact that Japan also has an ADIZ over Ieodo, but one that is largely benign due to the fact that it does not require Korea to identify aircraft.

The ADIZ dispute between Korea and China comes amid a mini honeymoon in bilateral ties. Korean President Park Geun-hye made a landmark four day trip to China this past June and seemed to be at ease with Xi Jinping. Park appeared willing to quarantine historical differences over North Korea and instead focus on enhancing economic relations with Beijing. This included kick starting long awaited bilateral free trade talks as a complement to trilateral talks with Japan. And Seoul and Beijing have appeared in lockstep with their harsh condemnation and censure of Japanese Prime Minister Shinzo Abe's statements on historical issues. Indeed, China has revealed in the widening rift between Tokyo and Seoul and secured a diplomatic coup when Park made an unprecedented snub of visiting China while ignoring Japan's call for a summit with

Abe.

By the end of around five months, the relationship between the Chinese and the South Korean related to the agreement upon the ADIZ has been recuperating and constantly splurging towards an amicable agreement. But now, five months after the Park Xi summit, it seems that relations between China and South Korea may be creeping back to their normal state: opportunity coupled with mistrust. The ADIZ flap has the potential to exacerbate other simmering coals in the China–Korea relationship, such as their dispute over Baekdu Mountain or concerns over cyber security. While both sides will look to mitigate this disagreement, the ADIZ still elevates the potential for a miscalculation that would effectively erase the goodwill from the June summit. Meanwhile, there are other variables that are outside Seoul and Beijing’s control, such as a provocative action by North Korea aimed at leveraging a break in consensus between the two. Finally, while bilateral ties with Japan will remain cool, this action may ironically resuscitate the languishing trilateral relationship with Tokyo and Washington, simply out of necessity.⁵⁷

And, finally one can conclude by saying that the points or the markers through which the diplomatic and the congenial relationship had been breached was seen through the ways in which China comes out with an answer for the ongoing problems that can be stated related to the amicability of the relationship between the two nations. Also, it could be stated here that the relationship get further strained with the interest that China had showed in the Goguryeo region and the introduction of the controversial NEP project that had subsequently been the disdain for spoiling the mutuality between the two nations. The Goguryeo had been traditionally seen to be the sacred homeland of the Koreans, who claimed that the region had belonged to the ambit of the three kingdoms and it was not wise in China’s favour to infringe that personal space from Koreans and henceforth insinuate the thrust that Korea puts in Chinese ambitions and demands.

4.8 Circumstantial factors within the relations between South Korea and China

Among manifold factors that crop out of the discussion of the Sino-Korean relationship, one can also assert that the Chinese have maintained a very schematic and esoteric explanation for all her

57 Miller, J. Berkshire- Is the China-South Korea Honeymoon Over?- taken from “The Diplomat”- November 29, 2013, the following url for the article could be reached at <http://thediplomat.com/2013/11/isthechinasouthkoreahoneymoonover/>

deeds. They said that the “studies on the history and phenomena of the northeast area” have been endorsed and promoted by several circumstantial factors. Such factors might include Korea’s present nationalistic sentiments over regaining native lands and the registration of Goguryeo relics with UNESCO by North Korea as a subsisted example. These factors help review the extent and conscript the tangible historical “time” and “space”, within which the relationship between the Chinese and the Koreans are formulated.

Anecdotal accounts on the subject might suggest that the circumstantial factors had been preceded by a sense of statements and insights that can be obfuscated with China’s growing interest in creating a hegemony and control, through which a sense of dominion could be constructed and adhered. This domination of China had created “grounds” where the Chinese became wary of disapproval and delusion by her neighbouring countries. This thus pre-empted to the formulation of these circumstantial factors; that are thus mentioned here as:-

Firstly, after Koreans were able to travel around China freely following the Korea-China diplomatic agreement of 1992, they have publicly raised the issue of regaining native lands while travelling in the Chinese northeast area and near Baekdusan Mountain (Mt. Changbai Chinese). This has prompted the Chinese attitude that “sovereignty comes before human rights”. A case in point was the attempt in 2001 of a Korean nationalistic group (say Damul) to regain Manchuria, asserting it was Korea’s traditional territory. In response to this, the Chinese government insisted that “several politicians publicly propagate all sorts of wrong theories for political intentions, creating huge confusion”⁵⁸

Second, the Chinese government was highly shocked by the fact that the North Koreans had applied for registration of complex of Goguryeo tombs as a World Heritage Site (WCH) in 2001. Consequently, China made a systematic international lobbying effort to prevent North Korea’s Goguryeo relics from being exclusively registered as a WCH site. Afterwards it had applied for registration of Goguryeo relics within the Chinese territory as a WCH site in 2002, and succeeded in having Goguryeo relics held by both North Korea and China registered as World Cultural Heritage sites at the same time as the 28th session of UNESCO World Heritage Committee Meeting, held in Suzhou on July 1, 2004.

58 As for Jilin province 155 checkpoints were recently setup along the 200 kilometres long borderlines with North Korea in order to fortify borderline management procedures to prevent escapees. Interview with a Sino-North Korean expert in Changchun, Jilin province (August 27, 2004)

Third, as more Korean Chinese people are being employed in Korea, they have become accustomed to Korean culture, and yearn for learning the Korean language is fast becoming popular in the Chinese mainland, influenced by the “Korean Wave” (hallyu). This trend has kept ethnic Koreans born in China from being assimilated in the Chinese culture. China saw this phenomenon as being weak and purposeful for diverting the basic idea that “Ethnic Koreans are Chinese citizens”. In particular, it carefully monitored the movement to restore the ethnic Koreans nationality in Korea and whether ethnic Koreans wished to regain their legal Korean nationality after the Ethnic Korean Act was instituted.

Fourth, there were problems within the academic research community in China. There was a tendency to begin long-avoided studies on the ancient history of the Chinese northeast borderlands in earnest, in light of the state of relations between China and North Korea (Ma, 2003, 155-157). In particular, the attempt to study Goguryeo history was also meaningful in that it made public the historical achievements accumulated since the 1980s.⁵⁹

Fifth, was that the CBHG (Centre for Borderland History and Geography) and the scholars studying Goguryeo history intended to gain economic benefits by carrying out their research project? Conversely, researchers in the borderland area, having been neglected by the central government and the academic circle, excessively exaggerated the significance of their studies on the northeast area for political purposes and for their own private ambitions. Exaggerating the research problems on the Northeast project could result in partial benefits to CASS, to CBHG, and to research institute in the northeast area. Subsequently, some historical issues were intentionally politicized, taking advantage of the fact that international political agendas were able to garner further financial support for them. In this respect, China’s concentrated studies of Korean ancient history were conducted through the central government’s confirmation on research projects proposed by provincial governments and scholars.

4.8.1 The Chinese attitude towards Korean peninsula: Change or Continuity

The Chinese response is simultaneously has been discussed and deliberated right after the project was launched and formulated. The response was one of coercion and obdurate where the debate or rather the difference disperse from variety of sections from the society and henceforth, when

⁵⁹ China has attempted to incorporate Goguryeo history on the sustainable basis since 1980 (Sin 2003, 1-3)

the issue of Goguryeo cropped out, the issue became one of the most hyped issue: redirecting sentiments from all sections of the Korean civil society. And, the project also elucidated a huge confrontation between the Chinese government and the Korean civil and mass society. The NEP had augmented similar vilification and appraisal. And the project oscillated between a fine form of diplomacy and academic jurisdiction.

The Chinese concern evolves from a deep rooted policy of mapping and writing a comprehensive history of the northeast region: a region that has been less studied and explained in the history of China. The project had severe repercussions in the way it dealt the relations with Korea, wherein Korea openly criticized the move by the Chinese government and said that this was a direct attack on the sacrosanct of the Koreans and an “insult” to the Korean legacy. And, so the project got presumed in the ethics of the Chinese academics and envisioned an ardent and a staunch criticism from the international communion. From the installation of this massive 5 years Northeast Project (NEP), the diplomatic relations between Korea and China has nose-dived into an allurements of suspicion and deceit. This comes in wake of an upsurge of critical thinking and among trepidation of an intense policy of Sino-centric values and conditions. And this creates a wider problem of a difference in opinions and thoughts that merge and convulse the unity and integration of the world systems.

This tempestuous attitude on the part of China makes it vulnerable to a faltering relationship that it could have with Korea. It can be said this because it creates a direct threat to the integrity of the fellow Asian nations and presents itself as a “threat” for strategic reasons. The reasons could be explored from a variety of factors pertaining to the social, political and economic spheres among many others.

China’s values towards the Korean peninsula escalate from schisms among the thoughts and ideologies in the society. The Korean civil society had vehemently deterred the installation of the Northeast Project and they have despised the Chinese claims over the Goguryeo region. The civil society had criticised the move made by the Chinese government on the basis that it had instigated a political and a highly diplomatic endeavour wherein it was suppose to pummel the academic discourse in studying the historicity and geography of the Northeast region in Chinese mainland. The claims that had been formulated here was that the Chinese had purposefully planted the project in order to showcase their hegemonic digression and power. The relationship between the Chinese and the Koreans in the years succeeding the Northeast project and the

Goguryeo crisis had been one of continuity and change. This could be seen in the variety of discourses that happened within the parameters of developing a mutually admirable relationship. The Chinese had emphasized on the policy of “good neighbour”: this inadvertently meant that they have toned down their policy of hegemony, and control and have complied to see that the further policies would not be as exclusively digressive with her neighbours and follow the policy of cordiality and goodwill and eulogized the efforts that Korea has been putting out in their policy of increasingly moving towards a policy of trade benefit.

Thus, the chapter could be concluded by saying that the Chinese and the Korean relations are like intertwined with each other. Each one has to depend on the other for comprehensive growth and progress and etch out a policy wherein they could do their works together consummately thinking about reaching an amicable and a friendly relation. There have been different disparities in the relation and this has marred the deserved progress that Korea and China could have reached at. One of the first issues to have created a sense of separatism was the differences that cropped out of the Goguryeo crisis and this had created a conflict within the national sentiments of the two nations; thus sparking a row between the Chinese government and the Korean civil society.

The policy had created a sense of apprehension and suspicion and this had raised a number of doubts that the Chinese are trying to vie out a policy that would be insulting to the Korean legacy and indirectly raise questions on their integrity. The second and perhaps a more bigger threat came from the instalment of the Northeast project that had created a platform from where the Chinese would exercise their political and diplomatic intentions and control a hegemony based on the their inadvertent policy of domination and power hegemony. The Northeast project had raised an element of doubt and coercion within the greater value of assessing a Sino-centric viewpoint over the larger Asian compound.

4.9 Summary

This chapter has elaborated how the Goguryeo controversy has brought the changes in the relationship with China and Korean people changing perception about China. Since the controversy has surfaced with the China’s northeast project and China’s effort to altering ancient history of Korea has created resentment in South Korea. After the economic crisis South Korea changing views on China brought these two countries together. South Korea inclination towards China for the economic benefit and the China’s rising stature in the Asia tempted South Korea to

make their relationship stronger. China being a stake holder in this region for the stability of the Korean peninsula it was crucial for the South Korea to deter any attack from the North Korea by increasing partnership with China. This chapter evaluates the twenty three relations since the bilateral relation has established. The first dispute started with the garlic battle in 2000. After that the major controversy arose which jolted the relationship.

CHAPTER V: CONCLUSION

5. Conclusion

To subsume and wrap up what has already been raised as an important topic of discourse and discussion, one can see the disparities and the loopholes within the Chinese claims over the territory of Goguryeo in its north-eastern part. The differences arise out of severity of factors and counterclaims that both legitimises and refutes the ‘Chinese claims and aspirations in this region’. Deliberating on these lines, the final epilogue and conclusion can be attained here out of a series of “territorial concerns” to the lands belonging under the domain of the Goguryeo, which lies within the Chinese mainland, as oppose to claiming new lands now in Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK), or more generally push irredentism among the minority peoples. This also pummels a discussion on how this was deep rooted backdrop of several factors like tianxia universalism, which compiles that China is located in the centre of the world and that’s why it has the “divine validity to rule and assimilate any country within its domain” and how it bolstered by the introduction of two evolutionary models of social Darwinism and a Chinese interpretation of historical materialism, as well as a interpretation of “self glorification”.

As the academic discourse on this topic comes up and discusses the various ways for which China is getting the “upper hand” in the issue of “minority” and “their history” and the “borders” and the “border history” and also talk about the different phenomenology and details that proves that the PRC territory has always been Chinese and that there are pure essence that constitute China’s national culture, past and present. It is in this matter, it is then better explained as a “conglomeration of multiple, messy and “estranged histories”, that lies both within and outside

the territorial boundary of the state. And subsequently, authors like Millward and others have seemingly approved for the evolution of 'China's glory should very studied and discussed as a "process" rather than "just places", and fundamentally explained them as contested, negotiated and defined as much as much by the "periphery" as by the "core" regions. And this led to collaborative exchanges where the Chinese histories and the histories of the "non-Chinese" minorities and other subalterns should therefore be viewed as composite and hybrid rather than as being separate and homogenous. And it is here one must try to understand the integrities and essential factors about why a particular place (herein used in reference to China and her subsequent claims over Goguryeo and other areas) becomes an important topic of discussion and deliverance. The point that has to be highlighted here is that related to the question of defining the "core" and the relation with "periphery".

Gayatri Spivak highlights this by giving special purpose to the spaces created by these historical repercussions, which provides platform for the "subalterns" to "speak" have come in handy while trying to harbour recognition for historical plurality. But important here is to note that these "complex stories" and "entangled histories" are not part of the school history textbooks. - Not in China and not in very many other places either. This can be true through a survey which was done to analyse school textbooks all from the world, and all these have demonstrated, that the Grand National narratives marketed by teachers and parents and obligated by school children are for most part simplistic, triumphant and garnered by "great men" from dominant race, class or religious denominations⁶⁰. The purview that comes out of this discussion was that the Chinese school textbook had intermittently discussed and deliberated that the grand history of China was not the one that was perturbed upon a discussion on the cultural values and practices that had highlighted the main focus on how the state had worked and functioned upon the basic normative values and customs, that had discussed and deliberated in the schism of the "ordinary" and highlighted the faction that had been "different". To further explain this point, I want to state that the history of the Chinese had deliberated in the discussion of what had been the "so called dominant ideology": an ideology that had been decimated by the majorly Han ideology and an

60 Xiao, Ren – "Korea's New Administration and Challenges for China's Relations with the Korean Peninsula"; taken from *Asian Perspective*; Volume 32, Number.2, p-133 (published by Lynne Rienner Publishers.) 2008

ideology that has subsumed the “inner intricacies of other groups and sub-groups”, discarding the ones that were based outside the realm of the Chinese domain (states like that of the Goguryeo, among many others).

The primordial’s claims to the problem has been one that can be stated in the true sense to be coerced within the frame of the “indivisible sacred territory”, which would then mean that, it is this process of ‘civilization’- that consolidates the unity of the national “geo body”. The main premise than it is found is predicated and legitimised by two essential approaches that can be seen to elide contradictory claims: one that absorbs the minority people and the lands they inhabit into the imagined bio-cultural community of the greater Zhonghua minzu, and another that acknowledges the jurisdictional autonomy of peripheral states, but lays a protective paternalistic claims on them of hierarchical historical relations of cultural kinship and unequal military alliances. In both cases, the Chinese imperial metropolis is portrayed as the dominant partner and it is assumed that the periphery is in constant need and requires and desires domination and assimilation.⁶¹

The history of the Korean peninsula can wisely and intricately be placed in the second category as, it is generally depicted to be a quasi-independent state or group of states, paying a particular tributary value to the Chinese emperor, but only rarely being under direct imperial rule. This is an interesting proposition that again pummels the Chinese interest as being within the realm of the dominant and the Koreans being pushed to be in the brink of being the “colonised” state, that means that they had already been contextually been subdued under the hegemon of China and submitted to the might of the so called “dominant hegemony”; thus Koreans like the Chinese ethnic minorities (of which the Koreans living mainly in the People’s Republic of China’s Northeast, once part of Goguryeo, are themselves an official member group) are depicted as having required or desired “Chinese” civilization. And as it has been ascertained here already, the Korea in history thus comes almost ascend as assorted “Chinese rescue missions”, as the Chinese have seen to send *armies* to abet the Korean people fight off the barbarian or foreign imperialists. This has serious repercussions on the way the hegemony of the Chinese had insinuated the history of the so called “minority” nations and this becomes the cornerstone on how the errand

61 Ibid, p-133

ties between both these nation had been formulated and composed.⁶²

This as I have already mentioned is hardly any different from the depiction of the history of any other minority people and is not much of a leap, therefore to re-imagine the states on China's historical periphery as ethnic minority groups; certainly by the tactics and the nuances of the geopolitical activities and the schism of politics within which the historical locale and the periphery within which the Goguryeo crisis can be located and paraphrased. One thing that becomes extremely important for us to understand here is the historical distortion and the paradigm within which the crisis evolves: is it then the crisis that evolves between the turgid dominant clan and the minorities or is it merely becomes the statutory problem of associating and placing the history of the Goguryeo in a realm that clearly budes to accept any form of alternate history apart from that of the Chinese framework.

We have to garner these evidences and categorically seek to come up with a solution: a solution that is amicable to both the parties and a possibility that could harness the allegiance to re-imagine the states on the Chinese historical periphery as ethnic minority groups as some subsumed by an ulterior PRC state and recast them as being "minorities" and putting an invigorating idea of placing certain 'ethnic groups' as having their freedom of forming independent nation states. Thus the claims of China on Goguryeo become esoteric to many as being fitted in the rubric of the Chinese nation, however contradictory that may be.

Goguryeo in this schema is justified as Chinese by the presence of the ethnic Koreans in the region (falling directly under the pretext of belonging to the spatial and the temporal realm of the "imagined" Zhonghua minzu, hence the territory naturally falls into the Chinese pantheon) by the presence of the Han Chinese in the region (the territory being naturalized and assimilated); and by the second virtue, it falls into the paternalistic approach of the Chinese historical repertoire. Then this becomes part of an estranged and an entangled historical dimension of China axiomatic to what happens within the inner realms of the Goguryeo. It can thus finally be postulated that the Chinese claims are as much of a forceful veneration into the creating an umpteen hegemony over her 'localised neighbours': neighbours that would crop out to be "minority ethnic claims as compared to the Chinese hegemonic domain", as much as creating an ambit of mutual amicability and respect.

62 Ibid, p-134

At an existential level, the problem of the Goguryeo lands and claims to the sovereignty and territorial acquisition becomes a far more complex issue. An issue if not treated and handled properly aiming to become very problematic in creating a rift between the Chinese and the Korean relations. As it has been discerned by many western theorists and authors, the relations between Korea and China relating the Goguryeo crisis becomes one of the most covered topic of discussion among the contemporary panellist stating that the relations that had been cordial for all these years have suddenly turned ugly and controversial when the topic of Goguryeo came in and it as already discussed became much more than a political issue and transcended into a realm of a bigger existential problem with both parties arguing for their share of the land and claiming that the area had its own significance and thus debated for alternate forms of legitimacy that would be subservient to the demands and the whims of their respective agendas. The question of looking at the inner intricacies of the problem (say controversy) in a more existential level, where the whole identity of China and Korea has been put in question and this had created serious repercussions for both the countries, thus challenging any form of compromise and is not easily amenable.

The position held by the Chinese and the Koreans are explicitly rigid. The Koreans views the Goguryeo region to be part of Korea and does not accept the Chinese presumed claims. And many then see the Chinese claims on the region as evidence of Chinese arrogance and unbound hegemony. And the discourse on this approach by China's arrogance is furthered by writings by news agencies such as Chosun Ilbo, which have put forward views opposing China's intention by asking "Why does China behave so arrogantly towards us?", and this posed some grave questions on the immediate concerns that were phased out at Korea by the Chinese interests. They site China's inference in Korea's internal matters as forceful hegemonic arrogance and this is furthered by several threatening 'phone calls' made by the Chinese and addressed the high handedness that China shows in the whole matter of Goguryeo and the fact that the hegemony of the Chinese continue to rue the Korean ambition and it now transcend into a almost derogatory remark on the way they looked at the Korean response by humiliating them with threatening calls and other nuisance.

On counter, many Chinese have been seen to hold similar dissuasive views regarding the rigid claims by the Koreans. For instance, Sun Hong of the Centre for East Asian Studies in Shenyang was adamant to the *Yonhap* that the Goguryeo was a Chinese vassal state and maintained that the

legitimacy that the Koreans show is completely absurd and should be rejected at all because the legitimacy for the same does not fit in according to the Chinese protocols. Also put forward is the view that the Goguryeo region had always used the Chinese language as their main language and thus almost all the scholars from the Chinese discourse have argued that the Goguryeo is a part of the Chinese mainland. These, thus highlight the hate and the disassociation among the Chinese regarding the Goguryeo and insinuates strong and resentful comments and critiques (some scholarly) against these disputed land and sovereignty. Existential crisis normally at always act as an escape from a real situation wherein doubts within you creep in and force you to act against your presupposed and presumed views and ideology.

The Goguryeo thus falls into these rare categories that force to you amend an inner conflict and discern decisions that affect your relations and mutuality with other countries and her Neighbours, and this is scampering their international relations and constricting any viable trading or mutual admirations and respect that they shared previously, before the crisis emerged. Existential crisis then be persuaded and perceived to be very intense and coherent passionate (extremely chauvinistic, at times by its nature. The physiologist Herbert Kelman has come out with some really amazing and counter-effective solutions, and while addressing his arguments, he takes the question of the identity competition, while describing the Israeli-Palestinian relations. He visualize that the two nations have coerced a state of 'negative interdependency', which then imbibes the shattering relations between both the countries: highlighting that "Each perceives the very existence of each other and predicate each other's existence to be a threat to its own existence and status as a nations"- Israel and Palestinians, thus in Kelman's view arbitrates and antagonises their inner abhorrence and revulsion towards each other among competition for natural resources and material goods, but also incur a policy of zero-sum mêlée against each other's existence and identity. The pyrotechnics that embeds a sense of schism and disillusion in the relations between the Chinese and the Koreans is also based on these lines that transcend and reposition it based on a more coerced and cajoled discernment against each other. And so allegorically orchestrated the relations as already mentioned pummels into a space where the fight between traditional customs of the Koreans and the modern euphemisms for control and power authority ranges on into an inconclusive discussion. Thus, the Sino-Korean relations is also precariously seen to be the *raison d'être* for a more existential jargon for showing and portraying a series of delinquencies and discrepancies about the encapsulation of the Goguryeo

region as a region that has been turbulent and tumultuous for constraining the relations between the two countries and creating a discourse that categorically critique and condescend the protracted aspects and aspirations that both the countries have towards each other, and thus igniting a reprisal of public anger and wraith, thus inviting a very existential allocation in the discussion of their fortuitous fate regarding the Goguryeo regions. And so finally one can see that these forms of altercations and dissonance bind the countries in this whole conversation into a very existential yet very persuading involvement wherein the self interests and inner ideologies surfaces and comes about. And thus finally one can see that the Goguryeo is actually two faces of the same coin axiomatically connected to each other's dependent and severely associated with a bifurcated discourse on as to why Goguryeo should be given to Korea and why should China retain it as a part of their hegemonic discourse, thus alluding to a mixed discourse and spacing out chances for a comprehensive unified judgment.

6. Bibliography

(* indicate a primary source)

Cumings, Bruce. (2004), *North Korea: Another Country*, New York: The New Press.

Duara, Prasenjit. (1995), *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern*

China, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gries, Peter Hays. (2005), *China's New Nationalism: Pride, Politics and Diplomacy*, Berkeley And Los Angeles: University of California press.

Kang, David C. (2008), *China Rising: Peace, Power, and Order in East Asia*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Lary, Dana. (2004), *The Chinese States at the Borders*, Vancouver: UBC Press.

Pai, Hyung-il, (2000), *Constructing "Korean" Origins: A Critical Review of Archeology, Historiography, and Racial Myth in Korean State-Formation Theories*, Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center.

Powers, John. (2004), *History as Propaganda: Tibetan Exiles versus the People's Republic of China*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Roehrig, Terence. Seo, Jungmin and Heo, Uk (2007) *Korean Security in Changing East Asia*, London: Praeger Security International.

Ahn, Yonson (2005), "Nationalism and the Mobilization of the History in the East Asia: The War of History over on Koguryeo/Goagouli", *East Asian History*, Vol. 27, No. 1, 15-30.

Brooke, James (2004), "Seeking peace in a once and future kingdom," *The New York Times*, New York, August 25th 2004.

Brook, James (2004), "Reviving a Korean Kingdom" *The International Herald Tribune*, La Defense, August 25th 2004.

Chellaney, Bramha (2004), "China reconstructs past to chart future", *The Japan Times*, Tokyo, October 25th 2004.

Choi, Young Jong (2009), "South Korea's Regional Strategies", *The Journal of East Asian Affairs*, Vol. 23, No. 1, 47-67.

Chung, Jae Ho (2007) *Between Ally and Partner*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Chung, Jae Ho (2009), "China's "Soft" Clash with South Korea: The History War and Beyond", *Asian Survey*, Vol. 49, No. 3, 468-483.

Chung, Jae Ho (2012), "Korean Views of Korea-China Relations: Evolving Perceptions and Upcoming Challenges" *Asian Perspective*, Vol, 36, No.2. 219-236

Dong, Jin Jang, and Hwang Min Hyuk, (2009), "China's Northeast Project and Contemporary Korean Nationalism" *Korea Journal*, Vol, 49, No. 1. 120-153.

Dong, Lee Chi (2004), "Korean, Chinese Academics Debate Claims to Koguryeo kingdom", *Yonhap News Agency*, Seoul, September 16th 2004.

Goma, Daniel (2006), "The Chinese-Korean Border Issue: An Analysis of Contested Frontier", *Asian Survey*, Vol, 46, No, 6, pp: 867-880.

Gries, Peter Hays (2005), "The Koguryeo Controversy, National Identity, and Sino- Korean Relations Today" *East Asia: An International Quarterly*, Vol, 22, No. 4. 3-17.

Han, Sukhee (2004), "The Rise of China and the Responsible Great Power" *The Korean Journal of International Relations*, Vol, 44, No, 1. 191-210.

Hwang Jaeho. (2007), "China future rise and South Korea security implication," *The Journal of East Asian Affairs*, Vol. 21, No. 2, 89-115.

Hwang, Jihwan. (2013) "The Two Koreas after U.S. Unipolarity : In Search of a New North Korea Policy" *Journal of International and Area Studies*, Vol, 20, No, 1. 77-88.

Hymans, Jacques E. C, Kim, Seung-Young and Riecke, Hennings (2001) "To Go or Not to Go: South and North Korea's Nuclear Decisions in Comparative Context" *Journal of East Asian Studies*, Vol, 1. No 1, 91-153.

Kim, Hyun. Wook and Paik, woon.k (2009) "Cohesion in the Post-Cold War US-South Korea security relations" *The Journal of East Asian Affairs*, Vol. 23, No. 2, 1-40.

Kim, Yeikyong and Chung, Jongpil (2013 "Mutual Perceptions in South Korea-China Relations: The Need for Creative Arguing" *Asian Perspective* 37. 281-304.

Kirk, Donald (2004), "Chinese history a cause that unites two Koreas", *South China Morning Post*, Hong Kong, February 28th 2004.

Kown, Yong (2014), "Korea and China's clashing histories", *The Diplomat*, Tokyo, July 11th 2014.

Linbo, Jin. (2010), "Sino-South Korean Differences over Koguryeo and the U.S Role" In Gilbert Rozman, (eds.) *U.S. Leadership, History, and Bilateral Relations in Northeast Asia*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp.171-189.

Look, Heeok (2010) "China's policy toward (South) Korea: objectives of and obstacles to the Strategic partnership" *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, Vol. 22, No. 3, 283-301.

Nye, Joseph S (1998), "China's Re- Emergence and the Future of the Asia Pacific", *Survival*, Vol, 39, No. 4, 65-79.

Ok, Hee Lee, (2005), "China' Northeast Project and South Korean- Chinese Relations" *Korea Journal*, Vol, 45, No. 2, 239-264.

Park, Min Hyoung (2011), "A Cooperative Security System in North East Asia: The ROK's strategic choices" *The Journal of East Asian Affairs*, Vol. 25, No. 1, 85-114.

Park, Hyun Ok (2000) "Korean Manchuria: The Racial Politics of Territorial Osmosis", *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, Vol. 99, No. 1, 193-215.

Parry, Richard Lloyd (2004), "South Korea and China argue over Camelot kingdom" *The Times*, London, August 24th 2004.

Peng, Chua sok (2004), "Tussle over ancient kingdom: Beijing removes mention of Koguryeo in Korean history, sparking protests by Seoul", *The Straits Times*, Singapore, August 7th 2004.

Ramzy, Austin, (2004), "Rewriting History: China and Korea feud over the ancient kingdom of Koguryeo" *Time Magazine*, New York, August 23rd 2004.

Roehring, Terence (2010) "History as a strategic Weapon: The Korean and Chinese struggle over Koguryo" *journal of Asian and African Studies*. Vol, 45, No. 1, 5-28.

Tak, Yoon Hwy (2005) "China's Northeast and Korean History" *Korea Journal*, Vol, 45, No. 1. 141-171.

*The State Administration of Cultural Heritage of the People's Republic of China (2003) *World Heritage Scanned Nomination: capital cities and tombs of the Ancient Koguryeo Kingdom*,

Beijing.

* United Nations educational scientific cultural organization (2002), *Nominations of the complex of the Koguryeo Tombs located in Democratic People's Republic of Korea for inclusion in the World Heritage List*, Paris, France.

*United Nations educational scientific cultural organization World Heritage Council (1972), *World Heritage Conventions*, Paris, France.

*World Heritage Committee (2003), *UNESCO convention concerning the protection of the World Culture and Natural Heritage 27th session*, (WHC-03/27.COM/8C) Paris. France

Xiangrong,Dong (2013) "China's Dilemma on the Korean Peninsula" *The Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, Vol. 25, No, 2, 243-255.

Yi,Xiaoxiong (2000) "Dynamics of china's South Korea Policy: Assertive nationalism, Beijing's Changing strategic evaluation of the United States, and the North Korea factor, *Asian Perspective*, Vol. 24, No. 1, 71-102.

Yoo,Hyun Joo (2013) "The China factor in the US-South Korea alliance: the perceived usefulness of China in the Korean Peninsula" *Australian Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 68, No. 1, 85-104.

Zhimin,Chen (2012) "Embracing the Complexities in China-ROK Relations: A View from China" *Asian Perspective* 36, 195-218.