



**A Critique of the Chinese Theory of
“One History Shared by Two States”
(一史兩用論) as Applied to
Koguryō History**

Kim Jung Bae, Koguryo Research Foundation

**Journal of Inner and East Asian Studies
volume 3, number 1 (June 2006): 5~26**

*© 2006 by Koguryo Research Foundation. All Right Reserved.
No portion of the contents may be reproduced in any form without
written permission of Koguryo Research Foundation.*



A Critique of the Chinese Theory of “One History Shared by Two States” (一史兩用論) as Applied to Koguryō History

Today's territorial border of China is a separate matter from the ancient history of Koguryō tied to the Korean historical mentality. The theory of the “Unified Multi-ethnic State” of China seeks to promote integration at the same time it declares equal respect for the history and the culture of all ethnic groups in China. Ignoring and devaluing the diverse history and culture of the many ethnic groups is to betray the historical development theory that recognizes the contributions of the Mongol Yuan and Manchu Qing empires in Chinese history. It is also an anti-historical rhetoric that goes against the very principle of the theory of the “Unified Multi-ethnic State.” In order to participate in the scholarly discourse on the ethnicity (or nation), state, and civilization, Chinese scholars should look to the extensive world scholarship and produce works that merge together the history and the culture of the center and the locality.

A Critique of the Chinese Theory of “One History Shared by Two States” (一史兩用論) as Applied to Koguryŏ History

Kim Jung Bae, Koguryo Research Foundation

The Northeast Project (*Dongbei gongcheng* 東北工程) of China was formally launched in 2002, and Chinese historians' erroneous assertions¹ soon faced strong objections from Korean historians and citizens. As is well known, the Three Kingdoms period signifies the historical age during which the three Korean kingdoms of Koguryŏ, Paekche, and Silla fought for hegemony. Although Chinese scholars have tried to claim that Koguryŏ belongs to Chinese history on flimsy minor details, the *Jiu Tang shu* 舊唐書 and *Xin Tang shu* 新唐書 clearly show that the Tang emperors had declared that Koguryŏ, Paekche, and Silla, known as “the three kingdoms east of the sea” (*haedong samguk* 海東三國), did not belong to China.² According to the *Samguk sagi* 三國史記, Silla's unification of the three kingdoms was “unifying the three Han” (一統三韓), or the “three Han becoming one family” (三韓爲一家). Thus, Koguryŏ was clearly a part of Korean history already in the records of the *Ku Samguksa* 舊三國史 and the *Samguk sagi*.

About four decades ago, Chinese scholars had asserted that Parhae was the history of Malgal (Mohe) people and discounted its historical sig-

1 Ma Dazheng 馬大正, ed., *Zhongguo Dongbei bianjiang yanjiu* 中國東北邊疆研究 (Zhongguo Shehui Kexue Chubanshe, 2003); Yang Chunji 楊春吉 and Geng Tiehua 耿鐵華, eds., *Kaogouli guishu wenti yanjiu* 高句麗歸屬問題研究 (Jilin Wenshi Chubanshe, 2000).

2 Kim Chŏngbae 金貞培, “Chungguk sasŏe nat' ananŭn Haedong samguk 中國史書에 나타나는 海東三國,” *Pukpangsa nonch'ong* 北方史論叢 1 (2004): 11-28.

nificance by continually insisting that Parhae was a mere “local regime” (地方政權) of the Tang dynasty. This goes against the very notion of Parhae as the “flourishing state east of the sea” (*haedong sǒngguk* 海東盛國). In the current Northeast Project, China again distorts history by claiming Koguryŏ as a part of Chinese history as it had done previously with Parhae. They assert that Koguryŏ was the history of a local regime of minority people of the Chinese Northeast, but this is a blatant attempt to deemphasize the strong independent characteristics of more than 700 years of Koguryŏ history.

We can discern three Chinese viewpoints regarding Koguryŏ history. A majority of Chinese historians believes that Koguryŏ belongs to Korean history but they have remained silent in the debate so far. However, some scholars in the Chinese Northeast continue to claim that Koguryŏ was a local regime of China and thus belongs to Chinese history. Finally, there are also those who assert that Koguryŏ belongs to both Korea and China as its capital and territory had been located in the territories of modern Korea and China. Here I shall examine and comment on this third view, the so-called theory of “One History Shared by Two States” (一史兩用論), as well as the claim that Koguryŏ was a “local regime” of China.

The Chinese Theory of “One History Shared by Two States”

The Chinese theory of “One History Shared by Two States” asserts that Koguryŏ history belongs to both Korean and Chinese history. Advocated by Jiang Mengshan 姜盟山 and others of the Chinese Northeast, this “theory” is fraught with many problems and cannot be considered proper academic terminology. Jiang analyzed Koguryŏ history using four criteria. First, Koguryŏ’s domain included territories of modern Korean and Chinese states. Second, one must take into account the location of the political, economic, and cultural center of the ancient state as Koguryŏ had transferred its capital from Chiban (Jian) to P’yŏngyang in 427 CE. Third, in terms of blood ties and cultural transmission, they emphasize that many Koguryŏ people moved to “China” after the fall of their state. The fourth criterion is the so-called tributary relations between Koguryŏ

and Han Chinese dynasties. Using these four criteria, Jiang states:

From the above historical facts, we can see that Koguryō is also a part of Korean history. Generally speaking, Koguryō belongs first to Chinese history and then to Korean history. Thus, Koguryō history should be the 'One History Shared by Two States' (*yishi liangyong* 一史兩用). This 'One History Shared by Two States' is not new perspective of this writer. Our [Chinese] historical field has employed this principle to write history for a long time.³

In the *Chaoxian tongshi* 朝鮮通史 (General History of Korea) that he edited, Jiang had expressed a view that Koguryō was an ancient Korean state. Thus, Jiang's assertion of the "One History Shared by Two States" apparently came after 1999 when he changed his view.⁴ A scholar can change or modify one's view in scholarly research, but Jiang's change of mind came without proper historical logic and historical fact. Jiang's four criteria show the lack of sophistication in his treatment of historical sources and interpretation. For instance, just because the territory of Koguryō is today divided between Korea and China, it does not mean that there are two parts of Koguryō's history. That Koguryō moved its capital from Hwanin (Huanren) to Chiban (Jian) and then to P'yōngyang also does not signify that dynastic succession had ended or its ethnic character had changed.

Koguryō, a strong state that lasted for more than 700 years, went through the processes of change, development, and decline. When we compare Koguryō to Han Chinese dynasties that usually lasted for two or three centuries, we know that there were different circumstances in historical development. Here historians merely need to record the various aspects of the 700-year historical developments of Koguryō such as royal succession, culture, and territory by "seeking truth from facts"

3 Jiang Mengshan 姜盟山, "Kaogoulishi de guishu wenti 高句麗史的歸屬問題," *Dongjiang xuekan* 東疆學刊 16.4 (1999); "Kaogoulishi de guishu wenti 高句麗史的歸屬問題," in *Heitudi de gudai wenming* 黑土地的古代文明 (Yuanfang Chubanshe, 2000).

4 Han Zhongfu 韓忠富, "Guonei Kaogouli guishu wenti yanjiu zongshu 國內高句麗歸屬問題研究綜述," in Yang Chunji 楊春吉 and Geng Tiehua 耿鐵華, eds., *Kaogouli guishu wenti yanjiu* 高句麗歸屬問題研究 (Jilin Wenshi Chubanshe, 2000), 152.

(實事求是). Application of modern concepts of territory, nation, and border to the ancient history of Koguryō two thousand years ago can only result in extreme confusion in historical logic.

While there are many criteria in fixing the boundary of Chinese history, two viewpoints are considered as the mainstream. One is the view of Tan Qixiang, who takes as the historical boundary of China the Qing domain from 1750 to the 1840s prior to the Opium War.⁵ Tan states:

It does not matter if it had been for hundreds or even thousands of years. As long as the ethnic groups had been active within the boundary, we consider them all as ethnic groups of Chinese history. We also consider all regimes established within the boundary as the regimes of Chinese history. A simply answer is that if outside the boundary those ethnic groups and regimes were not Chinese.⁶

It is noteworthy that Tan had chosen the greatest territorial extent of the Manchu Qing Empire as the historical boundary of China. This boundary is also different from the current border of China, and we shall return to Tan's view later in this paper.

The second view was proposed by Bai Shouyi, who held that the current territory of the People's Republic of China was the stage for historical actions of all ethnic groups within China, and the historical boundary of China should include the geographical extent in which all historical actions of the past and present took place as described in the *Zhongguo tongshi* 中國通史.⁷ This extremely inclusive view takes the entire area of historical activities of China's various ethnic groups of the past and present as China's historical boundaries. Inclusion of the historical territories of all ethnic groups greatly enlarged China's historical boundary, but at the same time, it was difficult to establish a theoretical foundation of such

5 Tan Qixiang 譚其驤, "Lishi shang de Zhongguo he Zhongguo lidai jiangyu 歷史上的中國和中國歷代疆域," *Zhongguo bianjiang shidi yanjiu* 中國邊疆史地研究 1 (1991), 34.

6 Tan Qixiang, "Lishi shang de Zhongguo he Zhongguo lidai jiangyu," 34.

7 Bai Shouyi 白壽彝, *Zhongguo tongshi* 中國通史, volume 1, (Shanghai Renmin Chubanshe, 1989), 79-80.

a view and there arose endless disputes in historical studies of the border regions (邊疆史).

Thus, there were two major viewpoints, advocated by Tan Qixiang and Bai Shouyi, regarding the historical boundary of China. Tan had taken the Qing domain before 1840 and claimed all groups within it belong to Chinese history. However, Bai defined as Chinese historical territory the place where the Han Chinese and other ethnic groups had resided in past and at present. Bai's view includes those territories falling outside the modern border but that had been held in the past by one of China's ethnic groups. It appears that the writings of Chinese scholars connected to the Northeast Project usually take one or both of these views but without any logical framework.

Here Jiang Mengshan's "One History Shared by Two States" provides one example of such an illogical historical perspective. Jiang had taken the Amnok (Yalu) and Tuman (Tumen) rivers as the boundaries of modern Korea and China, but this is somewhat different from the viewpoints of Tan and Bai. Tan had asserted the prep-840 border as the historical boundary of China and he had used the case of Koguryō to demonstrate his point. Tan stated that the Amnok and Tuman rivers border was formed naturally in historical development without imperialist involvement. Tan stated:

When it [Koguryō] was located to the north of the Yalu River, we consider it as a state established by a minority people within the Chinese border. This is Koguryō that had been established in the late Former Han period and flourished in the Later Han period. It is comparable to the way we consider Xiongnu 匈奴, Tujue 突厥, Nanzhao 南詔, Dali 大理, and Bohai (Parhae 渤海). When Koguryō established its capital in today's Jian north of the Yalu, its territory encompassed both sides of the Yalu, and we consider the entire territory of Koguryō as Chinese territory. However, after the fifth century when Koguryō moved its capital to P'yōngyang, we can no longer take it as a minority regime within the boundary of China, but should consider it as a neighboring state (隣國). Not only the territories south of the Yalu, but also those lying north of the Yalu and east of the Liao River should be taken as the

territory of a neighboring state.⁸

In this view, the Hwanin and Chiban periods of Koguryŏ history belong to China and the Koguryŏ people were “Chinese.” However, after the shifting of the capital to P’yŏngyang, Koguryŏ history then becomes a part of Korean history. In my view, Tan had incorrectly disconnected Koguryŏ history by applying the Qing border of the 1840s to the Koguryŏ history of two thousand years ago. Tan did not advocate “One History Shared by Two States,” but his way of using the Qing domain of 1840 to cut off Koguryŏ history has failed to elicit much support outside China. Jiang’s theory contains similar problems in its logic.

Indeed, there are Chinese scholars who criticize the theory of “One History Shared by Two States.” Zhang Bibo 張碧波 criticized the “fallacy” of China’s ethnic and territorial boundaries drawn by Jiang and Tan. He stated that one could not understand the development of historical boundaries of China by taking the border of either the 1840s or today as the basis. Zhang agrees with Bai Shouyi and includes all former territories of various ethnic groups of China. He believes that P’yŏngyang was located in the Nangnang (Lelang) Commandery of Han China, and even though Koguryŏ occupied P’yŏngyang in 313, the region was still within the “Zhonghua” territory and connected to the Taebang (Daifang) Commandery. He claimed that before the Tang emperor Xuanzong “bestowed” the land south of the P’ae River to Silla in 738, the region remained as a part of Chinese territory as the Daifang Commandery.

Zhang questioned the logic that takes Koguryŏ to be a local ethnic regime of China that was transformed into a neighboring state. How could Koguryŏ history go from China to Korea, he asks?⁹ Zhang asserted that Koguryŏ was a part of Chinese history even after its capital was moved to P’yŏngyang. However, Zhang’s research lacks a careful examination of historical sources. For instance, his quotation from the *Samguk sagi* about

8 Tan Qixiang, “Lishi shang de Zhongguo he Zhongguo lidai jiangyu,” 38.

9 Zhang Bibo 張碧波, “Guanyu lishishang minzu guishu yu jiangyu wenti de zai sikao—jianping ‘yishi liangyong’ shilunguan—關於歷史上民族歸屬與疆域問題的再思考—兼評 ‘一史兩用’ 史觀” *Zhongguo bianjiang shidi yanjiu* 2 (2000), 7.

the Tang bestowal of the land south of the P'ae River in 738 is not factually correct. P'yōngyang was already in the hands of Silla before this time and as the P'ae River was located to the south of P'yōngyang, the territory in question had also been incorporated into Silla territory. Thus, most scholars interpret this record of Tang's "bestowal" to Silla's Kim Ŭich'ung 金義忠 as merely Tang's diplomatic confirmation of the *fait accompli*.

However, Zhang commented on the theory of "One History Shared by Two States":

This kind of historical perspective or 'principle' of 'One History Shared by Two States' is in fact eclecticism in historiography. Koguryō was not merely 'Chinese history in the first place.' When the capital was shifted to P'yōngyang in 427 CE, P'yōngyang was located within the territory of the Han Lelang Commandery that was an 'outer subject' (waichen 外臣) of Han China. It was within the boundary of Weishi Chaoxian (衛氏朝鮮) and Jizi Chaoxian (箕子朝鮮) that had submitted to Zhou and Qin. One can say it was still inside historical territory of China. The shifting of the capital to P'yōngyang represented a move to the east of a political and cultural center within the historical territory of China. Ethnic and political character had not changed, and Koguryō ultimately remained a local regime of the China's ethnic groups (*zhonghua minzu* 中華民族).¹⁰

Zhang criticized the theory of "One History Shared by Two States" as eclecticism, and there is a wide gap between Zhang's view of Koguryō's history and character and the view held by Korean scholars. Zhang had made an arbitrary interpretation by connecting the two totally unrelated historical events of Lelang and Koguryō's shifting of capital. Ignoring Koguryō's height of power under King Kwanggaet'o and King Changsu, Zhang's assertions, such as the "eastern movement within Chinese territory," overstep the bounds of scholarship. Zhang's works are examples of how a serious distortion of history can happen if one arbitrarily and selectively applies historical "theory" even to well-known "facts." Zhang Bibo

10 Zhang Bibo, "Guanyu lishishang minzu guishu yu jiangyu wenti de zai sikao," 8.

continues to claim that all independent and local regimes established by “*zhonghua minzu*” in China proper and the border regions are Chinese regimes and their territories belong to the “Zhonghua.”¹¹

We have examined major viewpoints of Chinese scholars, but none of the criteria put forward by the Chinese historical field can adequately explain the character and territory of Koguryō history. It is impossible for China to interpret the true nature of Koguryō if its historical perspective is based on current territorial boundaries or the limits of the eighteenth century Qing China. None of their “theories” can turn Koguryō into a part of Chinese history, and the theory of “One History Shared by Two States” fails utterly in historical logic. To solve this dilemma, some have recently proposed the theory of “One History Shared by Many States,”¹² but it also fails to come near the true nature of Koguryō history. It is adequate to simply apply the historical domains of Koguryō and Han Chinese states of the time as they were. However, Chinese scholars’ excessive “patriotism” led to willful disregard of historical truth and illogical interpretations of historical sources. In my view, the theory of “One History Shared by Two States” amounts to nothing but a sophistry. It is not eclecticism, a historical viewpoint, or scholarship.

Jin Yufu’s *Dongbei tongshi* and the Northeast Project

After the launching of the Northeast Project, the initial historical clash between Korea and China came in Koguryō history. The Northeast Project did not focus on Koguryō exclusively, but Koguryō was a priority. The Project, along with the Northeast Development Strategy (*Dongbei zhenxing zhanglue* 東北振興戰略), was a state project to promote the northeast region.¹³ However, troubles will surely arise if the project negatively

11 Zhang Bibo, “Zhonghua jiangyu guannian yu lidai bianjiang zhengce yi Dongbei bianjiang weilie 中華疆域觀念與歷代邊疆政策 以東北邊疆為例,” *Zhongguo bianjiang shidi yanjiu* 中國邊疆史地研究 2 (2004), 15.

12 Piao Wenyi 朴文一, “Guanyu zai lishi shang ‘Zhong’ yu ‘Wai’ de huafen wenti zhi chujian-jian tan Kaogoulishi de guishu wenti 關於在歷史上中‘與’‘外’的劃分問題之初見—兼談高句麗史的歸屬問題,” in Li Sheng and Piao Wenyi, eds., *Kaogouli lishi wenti yanjiu lunwenji* 高句麗歷史問題研究論文集 (Yanbian Daxue Chubanshe, 2005).

affects neighboring states. The Chinese attempt to incorporate Koguryō into its history is one example. Patriotic historiography has affected a few scholars in Beijing and the Northeast, and they have approached history through a presentism that has led to serious historical distortions.

There is a remarkable common thread in Chinese works related to the Northeast Project. The Northeast Project researches on Koguryō history follow Jin Yufu's *Dongbei tongshi* and utilize Jin's works to the maximum degree. Ma Dazheng 馬大正 stated briefly regarding Jin:

During this period, there was almost no specialized work on Koguryō history. Koguryō was merely mentioned in a few local histories. Among them, a relatively important significant work was volume 1 of the *Dongbei tongshi* by Jin Yufu. Jin Yufu is a pioneer in the study of Northeast history. While the *Dongbei tongshi* was not a work dedicated to Koguryō, it elucidated the place and functions of Koguryō people and the regime in the Northeast history and laid a foundation for serious study [of Koguryō] by our scholars.¹⁴

Jin had organized the research accomplishments of 1940s focusing on historical source materials, and the *Dongbei tongshi* indeed had scholarly value. However, Ma talks about the *Dongbei tongshi*'s discussion of the *historical significance* of Koguryō people and regime, not the history of Koguryō itself. Ma apparently agrees with Jin's work on the evaluation and interpretation of Koguryō history.

Here we can also look at the view of Li Sheng:

Chinese and foreign scholars have held different perspectives in the study of Koguryō history. From early on, the study of Koguryō, especially the issue of to whose history it belongs, sharply divided China and Japan. Because of the

13 Yun Whit'ak 尹輝鐸, "Hyōndae Chunggukūi Tongbuk pyōn'gang chōngch'aek: 'Tongbuk chinhūng chōllyak' ūl chungsimūro 現代中國의 東北邊疆政策: '東北振興戰略'을 중심으로," *Chungguk ūi minjok pyōn'gang munje yōn'gu tonghyang* 중국의 민족·변강문제 연구 동향, (Koguryō Yōn'gu Chaedan, 2005), 206-64.

14 Ma Dazheng, "Zhongguo xuezhē Kaogoulishi yanjiu de bainian licheng 中國學者高句麗歷史研究的百年歷程," *Kaogouli guishu wenti yanjiu* 高句麗歸屬問題研究 (2000), 3; also published in *Ma Dazheng wenji* 馬大正文集 (Shanghai Cishu Chubanshe, 2005), 357.

political demands of the Japanese militarism that attempted to expand into East Asian continent and turn Korea into a colony, the Japanese historical perspective was to take Koguryō as an ‘independent state.’ Against this, a Chinese scholar put forward a sharply opposing view. Jin Yufu, who in 1941 was teaching at Dongbei University 東北大學 in Sichuan, pointed out, ‘The Koguryō people are an ancient minority people of the Chinese Northeast, and Koguryō was historically an ethnic regime of China’s northeastern border region.’ Jin also stated in volume 1 of the *Dongbei tongshi*, ‘The Koguryō people originally came from Fuyu (Puyō) and are a part of our *zhonghua minzu*. They established the longest-lasting state in the Northeast. However, the study of Koguryō history did not really develop after that time.’¹⁵

There are three main points here. One is the claim that Japan set up Koguryō as an “independent state” to invade the East Asian continent and colonize Korea. This is quite contrary to the understanding of most scholars as it was clearly not Japan that made Koguryō an “independent state.” In Korean historiographical tradition from the compilation of the *Samguk sagi* to the historical writings of the *sirhak* (Practical Learning) scholars of the Chosŏn period, Koguryō had always been recognized and recorded as an “independent state.” Japanese scholars gained their knowledge about Koguryō through reading of the works of the Chosŏn *sirhak* scholars. When the Japanese colonial historiography failed to wholly distort ancient Korean history including Koguryō, it instead over-magnified the Four Han Commanderies 漢四郡 in order to obliterate Korean identity. In other words, to justify the Japanese colonial invasion of Korea, the Japanese government patronized scholarship emphasized Chinese influence in the ancient period. Thus, it is not true at all that Japan set up Koguryō as an “independent state.”

A few Chinese scholars have also mentioned the *Nissen dōsoron* 日鮮同祖論, a well-known theory of Japanese colonial historiography that

15 Li Sheng, “Guanyu ‘Dongbei gongcheng’ yu ‘Kaogouli lishi yanjiu’ de jidian jianjie-zai ‘Kaogouli-shi wenti xueshu yantaohui’ shang de jiangjie關於‘東北工程’與‘高句麗歷史研究’的幾點見解—在‘高句麗歷史問題學術研討會’上的講話,” Li Sheng and Piao Wenyi, eds., *Kaogouli lishi wenti yanjiu lunwenji* 高句麗歷史問題研究論文集 (Yanbian Daxue Chubanshe, 2005), 5.

asserted that Koreans and Japanese shared the same roots. However, after Japan invaded Manchuria, there also came the theory of *Mansen shikan* 滿鮮史觀¹⁶ from which Japan was excluded. The *Mansen shikan* shook the historical circles in East Asian states. To state the conclusion first, the histories of Korea and Manchuria are separate and the ethnic groups of the two regions are also distinctly recorded in historical sources. Chinese historians are not following the right path of historical research when they mention only the *Nissen dōsoron*, but not the problems of the *Mansenshi*. Scholars of the Chinese Northeast should have offered a sharp criticism of Japanese colonial historiography that distorted histories of Korea and Manchuria to argue for the integrated history of the *Mansenshi*. The legacy of Japanese colonial historiography has been cleared away through fierce debates since the 1960s in Korea.

Second, Li Sheng reiterates Jin’s assertion in the *Dongbei tongshi* that the Koguryō people were a minority people of Chinese Northeast and Koguryō was an ethnic regime in the northeastern border region of China. It is curious to note that these scholars often excessively employ the terms “minority” and “ethnic regime” in their discussions. Third, Li again repeats Jin’s view that Koguryō people came from Puyō and thus formed a part of the “*zhonghua minzu*.” In ignoring the historicity of Puyō and merely declaring Koguryō as a part of “*zhonghua minzu*” their research is without any persuasiveness.

I have examined Ma Dazheng and Li Sheng’s comments on the *Dongbei tongshi* because the research on Chinese borderlands promoted by the Northeast Project completely reflects the arguments in the *Dongbei tongshi*. Many scholars in the Chinese Northeast follow the arguments in Jin’s work regarding ethnic and state characteristics of Koguryō. The *Dongbei tongshi* was published in the 1940s and the book is worthy of some praise.¹⁷ The author collected related materials and made brief com-

16 Inaba Iwakichi 稻葉岩吉, *Manshū hattatsushi* 滿洲發達史 (Osakayagō shuppansha, 1915); Shimayama Kiichi 島山喜一, *Mansen bunka shikan* 滿鮮文化史觀 (Tōkō Shoin, 1943), Ikeuchi Hiroshi 池内宏 *Mansenshi kenkyū* 滿鮮史研究 上世篇 (Sokokusha, 1951).

17 Rong Wenku 榮文庫, “Shi ping Jin Yufu de Dongbei difangshi yanjiu 試評金毓黻的東北地方史研究,” *Liaoning daxue xuebao* 遼寧大學學報 (1994), 49-54.

ments, and provided a historical view of Manchuria quite different from the Japanese colonial historiography and instilled patriotism among the Chinese people. Jin's study ranged over an extensive literature, and the *Dongbei tongshi* also received some influence from Japanese scholarship in historical research methods and the organization of archeological materials. In the preface to the *Dongbei tongshi*, Jin declared that he wrote the work in his love for the homeland (愛鄉之心) of Liaodong. Jin also wrote, "There is a strange phenomenon today. The center of the study of *Dongbei* history is not in China but in Japan."¹⁸

Here we can see Jin's anguish as he acknowledged the fact that Japanese scholars were leading the study of Manchurian history and the Japanese historical works were the basic source materials for East Asian history. Thus, Jin mentioned and introduced the views of the early Japanese government-sponsored scholars such as Hayashi Taisuke 林泰輔, Shiratori Kurakichi 白鳥庫吉, Inaba Iwakichi 稻葉岩吉, and others. Jin's ethnic distribution chart in the *Dongbei tongshi* more or less coincides with those of the Japanese scholars. His works also show a mix of the traditional forms of historical narrative and the evidential studies of single historical facts, a feature of modern Japanese historiography.

Jin described Koguryō in his *Dongbei tongshi* in the following way: "Koguryō people came from Puyō and they are a part of our 'zhonghua minzu.' Koguryō was the oldest of the states established in the Northeast region."¹⁹ Many Chinese publications have claimed the Koguryō people as Chinese, but they have all been based on this single line in the *Dongbei tongshi*. Some scholars list Gaoyangshi 高陽氏, Gaoren 高人, Gaoyi 高夷, Yandi 炎帝, and Huimo 濊貊 as ancestors of the Koguryō people and try to make Koguryō as a part of Chinese historical tradition. However, these assertions have not been proven and the Chinese historical claim over Koguryō ultimately depends on the view of Jin.

There is yet another historical distortion in the *Dongbei tongshi*. This

18 "今日有一奇異之現象 即研究東北史之重心 不在吾國 而在日本," (Jin Yufu, *Dongbei tongshi* [1941], yinyan 引言).

19 "高句麗一族本出夫餘 爲吾中華民族成分之一部 且其立國於東北城中最久" (Jin Yufu, *Dongbei tongshi* [1941], juan 4).

claimed that the Koryō and Chosōn dynasties were of different origins from Koguryō.²⁰ Even a superficial understanding of Korean historiography or the epistemological system could have prevented such preposterous and unfounded assertions as these. From the list of quoted names of books and persons, we can see that Jin had consulted both the works of Chosōn-period *sirhak* scholars and Japanese colonial scholars who had based their study on the *sirhak* scholarship. However, Jin still claimed Koguryō as a part of the “*zhonghua minzu*” and denied the historical reality that connected Koguryō to Koryō and Chosōn. Mistakes and misunderstandings are often made in historical research, but there is a strong suspicion that Jin’s case was intentional.

It was only natural that a patriotic historiography would emerge to counter the Japanese invasion of Manchuria. As Jin had stated in his preface, he wrote the work in his love of the Liaodong region and his anti-Japanese feeling. Thus, a few inaccuracies and shallowness of analysis can be forgiven, and Korean historians have given Jin’s work a good evaluation not because they failed to notice his mistakes and distortions but because they accepted the fact that Jin had contributed to the study of Northeast history in a wider sense. The problem is that even after sixty years some Chinese scholars are still making the same mistakes and distorting Koguryō history as Jin had done. They still claim that Koguryō people were different from Korean people, and this mistaken notion can be traced back to the *Dongbei tongshi*. Due to the incorrect historical perspective of later scholars, inaccuracies of the *Dongbei tongshi* are coming to the fore instead of being swept aside. Those who blindly follow Jin’s mistaken notion will inevitably face stern criticism. Those scholars who take the *Dongbei tongshi* as a golden rule need to rethink their approach by utilizing modern historiographical theories and perspectives.

While the anti-Japanese spirit of the *Dongbei tongshi* should be respected, Chinese scholars need to maintain keen insights to criticize inaccuracies and distortions. Jin had mentioned Kija 箕子朝鮮 and Wiman Chosōn 衛滿朝鮮, but he was silent on Tan’gun 檀君 and Tan’gun Chosōn

20 “與後來之王氏高麗李氏朝鮮含有別種 來源者不同 (Jin Yufu, *Dongbei tongshi* [1941], juan 4).

檀君朝鮮. This is reminiscent of typical Japanese colonial historiography that rejected Tan'gun and Old Chosŏn 古朝鮮 as the beginning of Korean history. Jin must have known about Tan'gun and Old Chosŏn as he had quoted from the *Samguk sagi* and the *Samguk yusa* and he also consulted the works of Japanese historians. The *Samguk yusa* has a section on Old Chosŏn in which we find records on Tan'gun, Tan'gun Chosŏn, and the coming east of Kija. The *Chewang un'gi* 帝王韻記, compiled by Yi Sŭnghyu during the Koryŏ period, described Kija Chosŏn as the Later Chosŏn 後朝鮮, which meant that the Tan'gun Chosŏn was the Early Chosŏn 前朝鮮. The *Koryŏsa* also referred them as the Three Chosŏn 三朝鮮,²¹ and the later historical works often called Tan'gun Chosŏn as the Early Chosŏn and Kija Chosŏn as the Later Chosŏn.

However, Jin's *Dongbei tongshi* distorted these historical records by excluding Tan'gun and Tan'gun Chosŏn, and irrationally made Kija the Early Chosŏn and Wiman the Later Chosŏn.²² Here Jin Yufu was ultimately following in the footsteps of early Japanese colonial historiography that intentionally distorted Korean history. Jin had claimed that he had written the *Dongbei tongshi* to recover Manchuria in his patriotism, but he had indeed committed the same distortion of Korean history as the Japanese colonial historians. In my view, Kija's coming to the east is a separate matter from Kija Chosŏn, and I will take up this issue in another paper.

While there are different views on the concept of the "Dongbei" in the *Dongbei tongshi* and the Northeast Project,²³ the boundary of the Chinese Northeast generally indicates the three northeast provinces. The *Dongbei tongshi* mentioned Han Chinese 漢族, Sushen 肅慎族, Fuyu 夫餘族, and Donghu 東胡族 as the four ancient ethnic groups of the Chinese Northeast. Although Koguryŏ people were described as originating from Puyŏ, Koguryŏ was the only state that lasted for 700 years in the region. Moreover, during the late imperial period, the Manchus had estab-

21 *Koryŏsa* 高麗史, 56 *chiri* 地理 3, "Sŏgyŏng yusugwan" 西京留守官.

22 "今爲稱說之便 名箕氏爲前朝鮮 衛氏爲後朝鮮" (Jin Yufu, *Dongbei tongshi* [1941], *juan* 3).

23 Fu Langyun 傅朗云, "Zhongguo Dongbei yu gudai Dongbei yi 中國東北與古代東北夷," *Zhongguo bianjiang shidi yanjiu* 2 (1992), 87.

lished the Qing dynasty, and the "Northeast" was not merely a place for "local history" and "local historiographical writings." However, the *Dongbei tongshi* asserts that the "Northeast's history is a part of Chinese local history (地方史) and a kind of local historiography (地方志)."²⁴ If numerous states rose and fell in the Chinese Northeast, the correct way of writing history is to use the names of those states, and historical descriptions should reflect those states' developments.

Indeed, historical descriptions of dynasties inherently include local histories, and there is really no need to excessively use the words "local history" or "local historiography." Some Chinese scholars define Koguryō as an "ethnic minority regime" or a "local minority regime," but there are absolutely no historical sources either in Korea or in China that had recorded Koguryō people as an "ethnic minority" and Koguryō as a "local regime." The terms such as "ethnic minority" and "local regime" are not from careful studies of historical sources but are of arbitrary evaluation and interpretation of historical facts. They reflect the sinicization projects of distorted historical theory.

In fact, the *Dongbei tongshi* is a general introductory work of the enlightenment period. While the book quotes directly many historical sources with a focus on the Chinese Northeast, it used a broad expression that "the Northeast history is a part of Chinese local history." It did not once state that Koguryō history was a "local history." Jin knew that the capitals of various dynasties were different and thus could distinguish the center and the locality. It could be that the terms "local history" or "local historiography" were employed to distinguish the center and the locality or to claim that Northeast history was a "local history" as viewed from the history of an ambiguous center. In any case, it is incorrect to say "local history" when many dynasties rose and fell in the Northeast. In such a view, the history of the center becomes insignificant as there would merely be a series of local histories in various regions of China. It is also contradictory to claim that only the history of the Han Chinese regimes can be the history of the center while histories of all other peoples are of local [meaning

24 "東北史即中國一部之地方史 亦即地方志一種" (Jin Yufu, *Dongbei tongshi* [1941]).

peripheral] regions. If Jin wrote the work in his love for the Liaodong region, then his use of the term “local history” is contradictory.

Some scholars in the Chinese Northeast make the unfounded claim that Koguryō was a local regime of China,²⁵ but there is little credibility in their assertions. Ma Dazheng wrote as if Jin took the Koguryō people as an ethnic minority and the Koguryō state as a local regime,²⁶ but we need to scrutinize his true intentions through careful reading of the *Dongbei tongshi*. In any case, the idea of the Koguryō state as a “local regime” continues to appear in the writings of some Chinese scholars. Others also use the term “ethnic regime,” but it is not very useful academic terminology as all Chinese dynasties were “ethnic regimes.”

There is not a single Korean or Chinese historical record that provides a basis for the claim that the Koguryō state was a local regime and that the Koguryō people were ethnic minorities. Some scholars take the *Dongbei tongshi* as the golden standard and claim that all the historical facts of their assertions are contained in the work, but there are no such exact words in the *Dongbei tongshi*. Even if there were such assertions in the book, the *Dongbei tongshi* was but a general introductory work. I would like to point out that any study or debate on the ethnicity, culture, and state of Koguryō should take into account the scholarly achievements in world anthropology and archaeology fields. It does not matter if one uses Korean or Chinese sources, but there must be logical interpretation using the most authoritative methodologies and theories in the academic world. The world archeological and anthropological fields had already gone through constructive debates on the city in the 1950s, on civilization in the 1960s, and on the origin of the state in the 1970s.²⁷ I have also participated in the debate over the origin of the Korean state.²⁸ While they

25 For example, see the articles by Sun Jinji 孫進己, Geng Tiehua 耿鐵華, Yang Chunji 楊春吉, and Han Zhongfu 韓忠富 in Yang Chunji and Geng Tiehua, eds., *Kaogouli guishu wenti yanjiu* 高句麗歸屬問題研究 (Jilin Wenshi Chubanshe, 2000), 152.

26 Ma Dazheng et al, *Gudai Zhongguo Kaogouli lishi conglun* 古代中國高句麗歷史叢論 (Heilongjiang Jiaoyu Chubanshe, 2001), 322.

27 K. C. Chang, *Shang Civilization*, (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1980), 364-65.

28 Kim Chōngbae, *Han'guk kodae ūi kukka kiwōn kwa hyōngsōng* 韓國古代의 國家起源과 形成 (Seoul: Koryō Taehakkyo Ch'ulp'anbu, 1986).

have entered the debate late, Chinese scholars from the mid-1990s have also introduced world research trends on the city, civilization, and the state, and that in turn led to lively debates.²⁹ The Chinese study of Koguryō people and state based on the sixty year-old *Dongbei tongshi* looks to be going against the forward direction of today's academic research.

A few still boldly claim the Koguryō people as a Chinese ethnic group as if there is indisputable proof in Chinese historical records. Yet the most persuasive historical records are those that connect Koguryō to the Yemaek people 濊貊族. One of the most surprising results of the modern molecular biological research has been its conclusion that Korean people were different from the Chinese by using Mitochondria DNA research.³⁰ Of course, Chinese scholars have also been active in the studies of Mitochondria DNA.³¹ These studies have shown that Koreans are similar to people of the Chinese Northeast but different from the Han Chinese.

Modern human beings belong to a different species from the Neanderthals.³² They originated in Africa around 100,000 years ago, and the ancestors of Koreans came to Korea through central Eurasia around 50,000 years ago. Chinese and other peoples also settled down after moving through similar routes. Excavations of early Paleolithic relics or fossilized human remains in a given place do not prove that they were the direct ancestors of the modern people living in the same area. Simply put, modern humans did not originate within the boundaries of modern states,

29 Xie Weiyang 謝維揚, *Zhongguo zaoqi goujia* 中國早期國家 (Zhejiang Renmin Chubanshe, 1995); Yan Wenming 嚴文明 and Yasuda Kiken 安田喜憲, *Daozuo taoqi he dushi de qiyuan* 稻作陶器和都市的起源 (Wenwu Chubanshe, 2000); Shehui kexueyuan gudai wenming yanjiu zhongxin 社會科學院古代文明研究中心, ed., *Gudai wenming yanjiu* 古代文明研究 (Wenwu Chubanshe, 2005).

30 Kim W. et al, "Y-chromosomal DNA haplogroups and their implications for the dual origins of the Koreans," *Hum Genet* 114; Kim Uk and Kim Chongnyōl, *Mitok'ontrea DNA pyōni wa Han'gugin chiptan ūi kiwōn e kwanhan yōn'gu* (Seoul: Koguryō Yōn'gu Chaedan, 2005).

31 Tatiana Katafet, Liping Xu, Ruofu Du, William Wang, Shi Feng, S.R. Wells, Alan J. Redd, Stephen L. Zegura, and Michael M. Hammer, "Paternal population history of East Asia: sources, patterns and microevolutionary processes," *Am. J. Hum Genet.* 69 (2001), 615-28; Yong-Gang Yao, Qing-peng Kong, Hans-Jürgen Bandelt, Toomas Kivisild, and Ya-ping Zhang, "Phylogeographic Differentiation of Mitochondrial DNA in Han Chinese," *Am. J. Hum Genet* 70 (2002), 635-51.

32 M. Krings et al., "Neanderthal DNA Sequence and the Origin of Modern Humans," *Cell* 90 (1977).

and the Chinese were no exception.

We have proposed that the debate on the origins of nations or states should be based on clear perspectives and criteria. Chinese scholars have pursued a patriotic historiography and discussed the Koguryō nation and state through the *Dongbei tongshi*, but their researches deviate far from the truth. Calling Koguryō a “local regime” reminds one of the approaches that had previously characterized the Parhae state as a “local regime” in the 1980s.³³ Others call Koguryō a “local ethnic regime,”³⁴ but this term is also not appropriate academically. The terms “local,” “ethnic,” or “regime” all have their own proper connotation and arbitrarily mixing these terms merely causes confusion in scholarly writings. It appears that they have inserted the word “ethnic” because of the problem inherent in the term “local regime.” Most premodern states were established by ethnic units, and the terms “ethnic” and “local” represent different concepts. Thus, it is also hard to accept the terminology of “local ethnic regime” as put forward by Chinese scholars. Perhaps they believed that “ethnic regime” seems to be less coarse than “local regime,” but both terms convey more or less the same meaning. When some scholars of the Chinese Northeast call the Koguryō state a “local regime” or an “ethnic regime,” they are indeed devaluing the significance of the historical and cultural tradition of their own place.

These Chinese scholars are in fact lowering their own scholarship on Koguryō history and culture. They must acquire scholastic insights to differentiate and separate the Koguryō history from the territorial boundaries of China today. The debate over Koguryō history must not be politicized. Zhang Bibo had criticized Tan Qixiang’s works by accusing Tan of “carelessly giving up the national territory.”³⁵ However, a historian only

33 Hui Houcai 回後才 and Dong Zhenxing 董振興 “Shishu ben yijia-cong yishou Tangshi kan gu Bohai yu Tang wangchao de lishu guanxi 詩書本一家—從一首唐詩看古渤海 與唐王朝的隸屬關係” *Beifang luncong* 北方論叢 4 (1980); Yan Shengqin 嚴聖欽 “Bohaiguo shi wo guo shaoshu minzu jianli de yige defang zhengquan 渤海國是我國少數民族建立的一個地方政權” *Shehui kexue jikan* 社會科學輯刊 2 (1981); Wang Chengli 王承禮, *Bohai jianshi* 渤海簡史 (Heilongjiang Renmin Chubanshe, 1984).

34 Zhang Bochuan 張博泉, *Dongbei defang shigao* 東北地方史稿 (Jilin Daxue Chubanshe, 1985); Ning Mengchen 寧夢辰, *Dongbei difangshi* 東北地方史 (Liaoning Daxue Chubanshe, 1999).

has to record the true extent of the Koguryō state as it was at given historical moments, and Piao Wenyi's criticism of Zhang is proper and accurate.³⁶

One final point is that Li Sheng seems to be mistaken when he stated that the Chinese mainstream view of Koguryō as a "local ethnic regime" first appeared in a June 2003 article in the *Guangming ribao* 光明日報.³⁷ As mentioned before, Chinese historians had already asserted in the early 1980s that Parhae was a "local regime" of Tang China and there had been expressions of "local ethnic regime" for Koguryō from the mid-1980s. The assertion in the *Guangming ribao* is anachronistic as June 2003 was after the official launching of the Northeast Project in 2002.

Final Remarks

We have seen that Jin Yufu's *Dongbei tongshi* occupies a central place in the research of Koguryō history in the Northeast Project. Some scholars of the Chinese Northeast are intentionally devaluing Koguryō history through arbitrary quotation of the *Dongbei tongshi* as if the work was basic historical source material. We now often encounter Chinese characterization of the Koguryō state as "local regime," "local ethnic regime," or "ethnic regime." They have over-interpreted Jin's statement that the "Northeast history is a part of Chinese local history" and recklessly substituted Koguryō for "Northeast" in the *Dongbei tongshi*.

The theory of "One History Shared by Two States" merely leads to more confusion as it seeks to expand historical Chinese territory beyond the current boundaries of the People's Republic of China. This is simply not scholarship and it has failed to improve upon the unrefined parts of the *Dongbei tongshi*. One can see a clear contrast with the Taiwanese his-

35 Zhang Bibo 張碧波 "Guanyu lishi shang minzu guishu yu jiangyu wenti de zai sikao 關於歷史上民族歸屬與疆域問題的再思考" *Kaogouli guishu wenti yanjiu* 高句麗歸屬問題研究 2 (2000), 118.

36 Piao Wenyi 朴文一, "Guanyu zai lishi shang 'Zhong' yu 'Wai' de huafen wenti zhi chujian," 25-26.

37 Li Sheng, "Guanyu 'Dongbei gongcheng' yu 'Kaogouli lishi yanjiu' de jidian jianjie-zai 'Kaogouli-shi wenti xueshu yantaohui' shang de jiangjie 關於 '東北工程' 與 '高句麗歷史研究' 的幾點見解," in Li Sheng and Piao Wenyi, eds., *Kaogouli lishi wenti yanjiu lunwenji* 高句麗歷史問題研究論文集 (Yanbian Daxue Chubanshe, 2005), 6.

tory textbooks that clearly incorporate Koguryŏ into the Three Kingdoms and recognize Koguryŏ as a part of Korean history.

I sincerely hope that scholars of the Chinese Northeast will conduct and utilize their research on the 700-year Koguryŏ history and culture without prejudice and distortion. Today's territorial border of China is a separate matter from the ancient history of Koguryŏ tied to the Korean historical mentality. The theory of the "Unified Multi-ethnic State" of China seeks to promote integration at the same time it declares equal respect for the history and the culture of all ethnic groups in China. Ignoring and devaluing the diverse history and culture of the many ethnic groups is to betray the historical development theory that recognizes the contributions of the Mongol Yuan and Manchu Qing empires in Chinese history. It is also an anti-historical rhetoric that goes against the very principle of the theory of the "Unified Multi-ethnic State." In order to participate in the scholarly discourse on the ethnicity (or nation), state, and civilization, Chinese scholars should look to the extensive world scholarship and produce works that merge together the history and the culture of the center and the locality.