

ASPECTS OF COLONIALISM IN ASIA: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE JAPANESE IN KOREA (1910–1945) AND THE BRITISH IN INDIA (1757–1947)

Mortuza Khaled

Associate Professor

Department of History

University of Rajshahi, Bangladesh

E-mail: mkhaled@librabd.net

The period between the mid-1750s and through the end of the World War II may be regarded as period of colonialism in the East, Southeast and South Asia. India had become a British colony since 1757 while Korea was occupied and turned into a Japanese colony in the early twentieth century. Korea was the only country in East Asia to be governed by a colonial power. Japan was an Asiatic colonial power, which upset the balance of power in the East Asian region was competed for possession of colonies with the western powers. Colonialism has always been oppressive and exploitative in nature and historians have always condemned different aspects of colonialism in fierce language. Both British and Japanese colonialism have been evaluated by historians from different points of view and hold that the Japanese one was more harsh, brutal and lacked humane aspect. Of course, there was much common in them, but they do differ on several fundamental aspects such as the promotion colonial nationalism, genesis of liberal sentiments amongst the intellectuals, freedom of speech as well the development of democratic institutions. An attempt has been made in this paper to examine whether the Japanese colonialism was a manifestation of undemocratic and despotic tyrannical sentiment of East Asian traditional politics. The paper will further throw light on the liberal and democratic aspects inherent in British colonialism on similar issues in India which led to the establishment of a democratic South Asia at the end of the British rule in 1947.

British and Japanese Colonialism

Great Britain ruled India between 1757 and 1947, while the Japanese ruled the Korean Peninsula from 1910 to 1945. But that was the official history of Japanese rule in Korea. The real history of Japanese influences in Korea dates further back to 1876, i.e. after the opening of Korea by Japan. Actually, the Japanese government controlled everything in Korea since the Sino-Japanese War of 1894–95 (Vinacke, 143–144). After 1910 the Japanese formally annexed Korea and brought an end to the rule of the *Chosen* dynasty (Ki-baik Lee, 313).

Contrary to this hurried Japanese policy of annexation, the English followed in India a gradual policy of expansion and its first hundred years of expansion i.e. 1757 to 1857 the East India Company did not achieve significant progress both in terms of administrative reforms and foreign policy affairs. After the Indian War of Independence in 1857, the British Parliament took over the charge of Indian administration. In 1876 i.e.

during the Governor Generalship of Lord Lytton, Queen Victoria assumed the title *Kaiser-e-Hind* or the Empress of India (Roberts, 461). With this, India was virtually incorporated into the British Empire. Judging from historical perspective, there had been procedural and other fundamental differences between Japan and Britain in the establishment of colonial empires in India and Korea. It is to be mentioned here that Japan an Asiatic power, was a latecomer in the world of colonial empires. Several factors were responsible for this late empire building process. Japan was opened by America in 1853 (Morton, 140). In 1868 the Meiji Restoration took place and Japanese emperor got back his power from the Shogun. With the restoration of monarchical power in Japan, there started a period of modernization and industrialization. Therefore, Japanese industrialization was late in comparison to other industrialized countries in Europe (Cumings 1984:482). With industrialization Japan got many of the vices and imperialistic characteristics of industrialist nations too. As for example, Japan needed to buy raw materials from underdeveloped countries at a cheaper rate (Fairbank, *et al*, 883–84). After transformation of these materials into industrial goods Japan needed to sell them at higher prices to the same Asian countries. In short, Japan needed colonial markets for the sake of further expansion of its business and industry, but there was no opening left for colonization in the East and South East Asia for Japan. Japan needed to establish its own colonial empire in the neighboring countries but it was a pity that the western powers were controlling China and other countries of South and South East Asia, at that time. Therefore, it was necessary for Japan to kick out all these western powers from the East and South East Asian regions and establish its control on all these countries. With this end in view, the Japanese government presented the Twenty One Demands on China in December 1915 (Harrison, 118). Later on, Japan pronounced "the Asia for the Asians" and the greater "East Asia Co–prosperity Sphere Doctrine." But Korea had become the first prey of Japanese aggressive colonialism in Asia where Japan did not follow the gradual course of expansionist policy like Great Britain.

Both India and Korea had bitter experiences of colonial rule. There have been considerable points of similarities in the nature of exploitation and colonial administration of the two countries. Both countries used their colonies as a source of supplying raw materials and a potential market for their finished goods. The ruling power often imposed its own wish on the subject population and was tried to destroy their culture. Japanese rule was more harsh and brutal in nature in comparison to the British rule in India. There are however, points of differences between Japanese rule in Korea and the British rule in India. Britain recognized Indian self–government in order to get the political supports of the Indian bourgeoisie. Second, as British recognized Indians’ political rights, they were allowed to form political organizations of their own. Third, the history of bourgeois national movement in India was much older than that of the proletariat national movement. That is why it was difficult for proletariats to challenge the initiative of bourgeois national movement. On the other hand, Korean enterprises were not able to lead the national movement and hence they could not get support of the civil society at the beginning. Therefore, the bargaining power with the Japanese government–general was based on very weak foundation. The reasons for this are as follows. First, Japan denied self–government to Koreans, so that Korean enterprisers could not get political support. Second, Japan thoroughly suppressed any form of nationalist movement in Korea which made it difficult for Korean enterprises to participate in national movement than laborers and peasants.

Land policy issue of both powers

Britain established its Indian colony in the second half of the Eighteenth-century. Indian economy at that time was based on agriculture and land revenue was the main source of income of the government. Therefore, the British government gave priority to the land revenue system (Spear, 90). The English East India Company wanted such a secure land revenue system which would ensure a continuous flow of money supply to their treasury. As a result, various experiments on land revenue took place. At last, in March 1793 Lord Cornwallis, the then Governor-General, introduced the Permanent Settlement in India (Spear, 94). According to the provisions of the settlement, the Zaminders were given proprietary rights over land on condition that in case of a default a part of their land could be taken over by the state with a view to dispose of the same and realize its dues. The peasants became tenants who would rent land from the landlords, created by the British. The legitimate successors of the Zaminders were entitled to hold the estates at the rates already been fixed (Roberts, 230). The system increased and fixed the income of the state almost doubled. The Permanent Settlement created a class of loyal Indians who stood by the English through thick and thin. In India this system gave rise to a class of absentee landlords. Contrary to the expectations of the English, Zaminders did not take much interest in their land. They let out their lands to the tenants at exorbitant rates and started living in the cities. They never visited their lands and led a luxurious life in cities and fell victim to various vices. This system created a division in the rural society into two hostile classes ---- the Zaminders and tenants and served the purpose of only British Government (See Raychoudhary, 158-161). Japan also introduced in Korea a kind of exploitive system which was more harsh and oppressive in nature than the British one in India.

In Korea, the colonial government confiscated all lands, which belonged to the Koreans. The land survey, which was completed in 1918, led the colonial government to extend ownership of 21.9 million acres or 40 percent of farm and forestlands out of which these 10.8 million acres were cultivated. Some Korean landlords took advantage of the ordinance to expand their ownership one way or another (Nahm, 236).

Under the Japanese land system, some of the land appropriated was turned over to the Oriental Development Company, a Japanese business company and other Japanese firms such as the Fuji Industrial Company. The Oriental Development Company alone held 73,500 acres of land in 1910, and by 1931 its ownership increased to 292,800 acres. An increasing number of Japanese farmers arrived in Korea and were given free lands or were allowed to purchase a large amount of farmland at a low price. The Japanese population in Korea grew from 171,543, at the end of 1910 to 424,700 in 1925, and to 650,100 in 1939. In 1939 some 45,000 Japanese were engaged in agricultural activities as landowners. The amount of land owned by the Japanese citizens increased from 217,50 acres in 1910, to 820,750 by 1923 (Nahm, 238-39). This picture shows how the colonial Japanese government exploited Korean lands for their prosperity. Thus the British system made the Zaminders, the owners of land and the farmers became tenants. On the other-hand, under the Japanese system, the Japanese proprietors became the owners while the Korean farmers had lost their lands and became day laborers.

Cultural Policy

The Press: Marked differences can be noticed between the British and Japanese colonialism with regard to the cultural policy in their respective colonies. In Korea, Japan followed a policy of cultural assimilation while the British introduced western education

and culture retaining the traditional Indian culture intact. The cultural policy of Japan in Korea was the destruction of Korean nationalism and racial consciousness. In 1910 all speeches and public assemblies were banned, all Korean newspapers and most magazines and periodicals were forced to cease publication. All school textbooks written by Koreans were banned and hundreds of private schools were closed (Nahm, 229). Initially there remained only one Korean-language and one English-language newspaper published by the government and a few Japanese language newspapers for Japanese in Korea. The government adopted various programs to promote the acceptance of Japanese policy by the Koreans through the use of publications and the promotion of public speaking tours by officials and educators.

Even a Japanese reporter from the *Tokyo Nichi Nichi Shimbun* commented on the absence of the freedom of speech and press in Korea in an editorial on October 2, 1910:

Newspapers were checked one by one; controls on companies were exercised to an extreme, unsatisfactory companies being destroyed one after another. Reporters and writers were at their wit's end, gasping. If one grumbled, he would be arrested.... I felt as if I were in hell (Quoted in Nahm, 229).

After the March First Movement of 1919 Saito authorized the publication of Korean language newspapers. As a result, only five Korean newspapers emerged between March 1920 and November 1931. The police, however, continued to censor the contents of Korean newspapers, and any thing anti-Japanese, be it an article or a statement, remarks or articles led to the confiscation of certain issues or the suspension of publication for good.

Policy of assimilation: In addition to the imposition of rigid press censorship, the Japanese colonial government in Korea undertook several black measures in order to destroy the cultural and ethnic identity of the Koreans. In December 1922, the colonial government organized the Committee for Compilation of Korean History, and the *History of Korea* was published. However, it contained many fabrications and distortions, which aimed at justifying the actions taken by the Japanese before and after 1905, as well as the policy of the colonial government. The Japanese changed the name of Korea to *Chosen* and called the Koreans *senjins*. On November 10, 1939, Japan issued the Ordinance No.20, which allowed Koreans to change their family and personal names to a Japanese form in order to bring about "a more perfect union" between Japan and Korea. Under the supplementary regulations of December 1939, however, Koreans were not allowed to copy names of Japanese Emperors, aristocrats, or certain other important figures past or present. Fearing retaliation against those who refused to change their names, 84 percent of the Koreans changed their family names, or the reading of their family names, as well as their given names, to a Japanese style (Nahm, 132). Under this ordinance, the Koreans lost their names and their Korean identity. But this practice of Japanization of Koreans didn't work well according to the expectation of the Japanese. Adoption of Japanese names did not, however, serve to conceal Korean identity or to eradicate discrimination, for all public documents, family registration records, and school and job applications required the Koreans to indicate their original family and given names and the place of the clan origin.

On the other hand, the British pursued in India comparatively a moderate and soft policy. They never tried to impose their own language in India on the basis of force. Even

the credit for introducing a regular and uniform system of education in India goes to the British.

British Press and Publications Policy: 1780 saw the beginning of Press in India when Thomas Hickey stated in India's first weekly paper entitled *The Bengal Gazette*. Soon Hickey came in conflict with the Governor-General (Warren Hastings) of India as he openly criticized Hastings' policy. Consequently, Hickey was arrested and imprisoned and the Publication of the journal was stopped in 1782. The British Government pursued a firm and hard policy in controlling press. First in 1799 Governor-General Lord Wellesley imposed Censorship of Press Act. This act imposed serious restrictions on the freedom of press and looked more of a wartime measure. Under the Act the newspapers were required to print clearly the names of the printer, the editor and proprietor of the paper in every issue. All materials were to be submitted by the publisher to the Secretary to the Government of India for pre-censorship. The violation of the above rules was punishable with immediate deportation (Raychoudhary, 175-76).

Later on, the British government to some extent relaxed its policy toward the press. But they always tried to control the press by enacting various laws. They passed the Registration Act of 1867, the Vernacular Press Act of 1878 (Roberts, 459), the Newspaper Act of 1908, the Indian Press Act of 1910 and the Indian Press Act of 1931 with this end in view. Under provisions of these acts, Indians could publish Newspapers and circulate in a limited scale. But the government could interfere and create problems for the freedom of the press. Despite limitations, a large number of vernacular newspapers published in various places in India which played a vital role in creating nationalist feelings and political consciousness amongst Indians. Like the Japanese the British in India did not limit the number of newspapers and stop publishing newspaper and journals in an abrupt manner.

Impact of the Japanese Press Laws: On the other hand, Control of the written word, an important aspect of Japanese colonial policy. (Robinson, 312). Japanese publication policy directly affected the development of Korean nationalist movement. The Japanese attempted to introduce a thought control policy in Korea. This policy of the Japanese was not only based on their reading of the colonial political situation but also on their experience in Japan. With the expansion of radical thought in the *Taisho* period, publication policy was important to them as they sought to control the avenues of ideological debate and inquiry. The Japanese had to control dissent in Korea without creating a unifying focus for nationalist demands through increased oppression. Japanese colonial government's publication policy eventually encouraged the suppression of radical movements and the promotion of cooperative attitude amongst the Koreans toward the Japanese government. This manipulative policy toward Korean publications industry produced just that effect.

The legal foundation of the Japanese publication policy in Korea was laid with the promulgation of the Newspaper Law (1907) and the Publication Law (1909) during the protectorate period. Formally, these laws were issued in the name of the Korean government, but they were in fact a creation of the Japanese advisors of the Korean king. The immediate impetus for these two laws was the apprehension of the resident-general concerning widespread criticism of Japanese activity in Korea and the increasingly strident nature of press support for violent demonstrations against the Japanese after the disbanding of the Korean army in 1907. The principal target of the Japanese newspaper

law was the *Korea Daily News*. The *Korea Daily News* was the main anti-Japanese newspaper in Korea between 1905 and 1910. The newspaper continued to publish while other papers ceased as it was owned and edited by a foreigner, E.T. Bethell. The Publication Law previous to the 1907 and 1909 laws did not provide the Japanese with means for pre-publication examination of foreign-owned publication. The Newspaper Regulations and Publication Law together brought the system of publication control in Korea in line with practices in Japan, but the power of the government over the press was even greater. The Publication Law promulgated in 1909 applied to magazines and books also.

In 1908 the Japanese promulgated amendments to the 1907 law, bringing foreign newspapers published in Korea under the existing censorship regulations. By 1910, the Japanese system of publication control in Korea was in full operation and remained substantially unchanged until the end of Japanese rule (Robinson, 318). The Newspaper and Publication Law gave colonial authorities the power to censor publications in the colonies. In the second half of the colonial period the censorship standards continued to expand. By 1939 detailed lists of prescribed topic had been distributed by the Publication Police. Certain categories were given special attention such as defamation of the Japanese emperor or imperial institution, military matters, radical ideology, Korean-Japanese relations, and Korean nationalism etc.

The colonial authorities flexibly applied the instruments of censorship in Korea. In implementing publication control, the Japanese manipulated the issue of permits, exercised a sophisticated pre-publication warning system to avoid problems before the fact, and ultimately used their power to delete passages or articles, ban entire editions of newspapers and magazines, and suspend publication. The power to issue permits for publication was absolute. In the 1910-1919 period the Japanese choked off Korean publication by simply issuing no permits for Korean language newspaper, the *Daily News*. During the colonial period three magazines were suspended permanently. These were the *Sinsaeng-hawal*, (November 1922), the *Sinch onji*, (November 1922), and the *Kaebiyok*, (July 1926). After 1931 the Japanese did allow a number of specialized permits for religious and youth magazines, the so-called "enlightenment" journals. Japanese press law directly affected the development of the nationalist movement. The suppression of radical thought removed the discussion of socialism and other radical ideas from the Korean press. In doing so, the Japanese greatly hampered the more radical wing of the Korean nationalist movement in its ideological struggle with the moderate cultural nationalists (Robinson, 318). Thus was created a different pattern of thought control as the British in India practiced it. While the press played a significant role in the development of Indian nationalist feelings, in Korea it was greatly hampered by the Press Act.

Educational Policy

British Education Policy: When the English came to India, the educational institutions were completely in private hands and the state did not enjoy any control over them. There were two types of institutions *viz.* *Pathshalas* and *Madrasas* or *maqtabs*. While the former were attached to the religious institutions of the Hindus, the latter were linked with the mosques. The British occupied Bengal (a province of India) in 1757. But they did not interfere in education as well as religion and permitted the existing system to operate unhindered. The British took the first formal step in education in 1781 when they set up a *Madarasa*

(an institute for Islamic education) in Calcutta in order to train the sons of Muslim aristocrats in order to enable them for governmental jobs (Spear, 205). This *Madarasa* imparted instructions in theology, logic, rhetoric, grammar, law, natural philosophy, astronomy, geometry, arithmetic etc. With the lapse of time, similar educational institutions were set up in Banaras, Uttar Pradesh to impart similar training to the sons of Hindus. In 1811 Lord Minto, the Governor General of India criticized the prevailing educational system of India on the ground that it completely neglected science and literature. At the very beginning, the British Government in India was not sure whether education should be provided through English or vernacular language as they didn't want to attack the sentiments of the Indians. At first they favored the introduction of native type of education through vernacular language. But later on, they decided to introduce western type of education to be imparted in English (Raychoudhary, 157). At last Lord William Bentinck, the Governor General of India in a resolution of March 7, 1835 declared, "the great object of British Government ought to be the promotion of literature and science among the natives, and that the funds appropriated for education should be best employed on English education alone"(Raychoudhary, 157).

Western education received an impetus in 1854 when the Government implemented the Charles Wood's Despatch. In 1854 Charles Wood, the President of the Board of Control, drafted a Despatch on the future of Indian education system. This Despatch is considered as the Magna Charta of English education in India. In this Despatch, Wood recommended that the study of Indian languages should be encouraged to make the communication between the people and the government easier. It suggested that indigenous school should be made a foundation of the system (Raychoudhary,158). It also suggested the setting up of vernacular primary schools followed by Anglo-Vernacular High Schools and affiliated colleges at the district level. It emphasized on vocational instructions and emphasis on vocational education and establishment of technical institutions for training in law, medicine, agriculture, and teachers' training. Female education was highly promoted. Lastly, the Despatch favored the establishment of Universities in India on the pattern of the London University. Shortly afterward, the British Government had set up Universities in Calcutta, Madras and Bombay in 1857 (Raychoudhary,158).

The British Government took another significant step for the development of Indian education through the formation of Sadder Commission in 1917. The Commission after a detailed study of the existing education system submitted a report which dealt comprehensively with almost all aspects of secondary and higher education and possessed all-India significance. It recommended the need for extension of facilities for female education and it again assured the medium of instruction for most of the subjects up to high school should be vernacular and English should be used only stage (Raychoudhary,165). Like education policy the British Government also take comparatively liberal policy comparatively the Japanese in Korea.

Japanese Educational Policy: On the other hand, the Japanese colonial government in Korea issued an education ordinance in August 1911 in which it was stated that the purpose of education in Korea was to produce "loyal and obedient" and useful subjects of the Japanese emperor (Nahm, 252). It adopted a system of four-year secondary curriculum for girls. However, only a handful of schools were established during this time while a large number of private schools were closed. The ordinance made

the study of Japanese language compulsory at all approved schools and banned instruction in Korean history and geography. All textbooks, which had been previously used in Korean schools, were confiscated and only those approved by the government were allowed.

In 1919, 84,306 or 3.7 percent of Korean children and 42,732 or 91.5 per cent of Japanese children attended Korean public primary school in Korea. Some 245,000 Korean children attended 25,524 traditional village schools studied the Chinese language and Confucian classics. There were only five public and seven approved private high schools for Korean boys and only two public and four private high schools for Korean girls. The number of unapproved schools decreased from 1,317 in 1912 to 690 in 1919 (Nahm, 252). A handful of private schools were given official approval and were allowed to remain open, but Japanese police constantly watched them, and they were often closed or certain classes were cancelled under the slightest suspicion of anti-Japanese or pro-Korean activity. Having been denied educational opportunities in Korea, an increasing number of young Koreans went to Japan to attend school (Nahm, 253).

In 1929, a plan was adopted to establish one public primary school in each geographic unit comprising three districts and one public high school in each of the thirteen provinces. Between 1919 and 1935 approved private secondary schools increased from 18 to 45 and the number of students from 2781 to 3841. The number of children attending primary schools grew from 88827 to 186,145, although this was only about 2.2 per cent of the school age population. In rural areas 579 two-year primary schools were established, permitting some 35,700 Korean children to received basic education. The number of unaccredited primary and secondary schools decreased from 778 in 1918 to 406 with 79,998 students in 1935. In 1935 while only one out of 2,200 Korean attended secondary schools, all Japanese students did so.

Efforts made by several Koreans in the early 1920s to establish a Korean university in Seoul did not materialize. Not only was educational opportunity for Korean students limited, but also facilities and the quality of instruction at public and private Korean schools were in most cases inferior to those of Japanese schools, or of schools which were more or less for Japanese students. Class size of Korean schools was usually larger than those Japanese schools. The Education Ordinance of May 1924 established Keijo Imperial University and its preparatory school. But the hopes of the Koreans were frustrated when it was clear that the only university in Korea was primarily available for the Japanese. For example, out of 308 students in the preparatory school in 1927 only were Koreans and only 89 Korean students were enrolled in the university compared to 220 Japanese student (Nahm, 254).

The situation remained the same after 1927, and the ratio of Japanese and Korean students remained almost constantly 2.5 to 1. New textbooks were introduced and the quality of teachers improved during the 1920s and early 1930s. Chances for Korean students however, to receive high-level training in law, economics, engineering and technology were extremely limited. The unhappiness and dissatisfaction of the Korean students was reflected in an article which appeared in the *Korean Student Bulletin* in December 1928:

Education means nothing here. The young people are going to school because they have nothing else to do in the village or the city.....The graduation from a school in itself brings them nothing.... (Quoted in Nahm, 253)

Public Service Commission and the Bureaucracy

Public Service Commission and bureaucracy were two major sectors where sharp differences can be noticed between British and Japanese system of dealings. Public Service Commission started in India from the time of the English East India Company (Raychoudhary 180),. During the time of Lord Cornwallis radical changes were made in the Civil Service of the East India Company. Cornwallis had no faith in the capacity of the Indians to hold responsible position and consequently reserved all-important positions for the Englishmen and Europeans. However, he continued to employ the Indians in subordinate posts. He took firm steps to put an end of corruption in the existing Public Service Commission. In 1793 the British Government passed the Charter Act. Which provided that "all vacancies happening in any of the offices, places or employment in the civil line of the Company's service in India shall be from time to time filled up and supplied from amongst the Civil Servants of the Company belonging to the Presidency wherein such vacancies shall respectively happen". After the Mutiny of 1857 the Queen Victoria in her Proclamation of 1858 promised to throw open the jobs to the Indians. The Proclamation stated " It is our further will that so far as may be qualified by their education: ability and integrity duly to discharge" (Raychoudhary 181). To implement the pledge contained to Queen's Proclamation the Secretary of State for India set up a Committee. The Committee favored the holding of simultaneously examinations in England as well as India, and thus ended the discrimination that the Indians suffered so far.

In 1861 the Indian Civil Service Act permitted the Government of India to make appointments of even those persons who were not members of the Covenanted Civil Services in contravention of the provisions of the Charter Act of 1793 (Thompson, Edward, 583). For the recruitment of members of Covenanted Civil Service, an open competitive examination was to be held at London every year. In 1870 another Act was passed which made provision for the appointment of those Indians, who had not passed Civil Service Examination to posts reserved for Covenanted Service "subjects to such rules as may be prescribed by the Governor-General-in-Council and sanctioned by the Secretary of State-in-Council, with the concurrence of the majority of the members present"(Raychoudhary 182).

In spite of all these developments, Indians were not happy with the pace of Indianisation in services. In view of the deteriorating political condition in the country even the Europeans and Englishmen were not forthcoming to join the Indian Civil Services in sufficient numbers. Viewing this imposing condition, a Royal Commission on Superior Civil Services in India was appointed in 1923. The Commission recommended that the Security depended on all these services and direct recruitment was to be made on the basis of equal numbers between Europeans and Indians. Ten percent of superior positions were reserved for the members of the Provincial services (Thompson, 620).

Thus, between the two colonial rule Japanese rules in Korea was harsher than that of British rule in India. Under the Japanese rule there had been no scope for participation in Civil Service for the Koreans. Japanese held all the highest positions and those positions above the rank of clerk in both central and local governments---none of

them spoke the Korean language. Koreans were employed only in the lowest levels of governmental units and in the police force. As late as 1936, 52,270 out of 87,552 officials were Japanese. Japanese held more than 80 per cent of the highest ranks, 60 per cent of the intermediary ranks, and about 50 per cent of clerical positions. Carter Eckert and others put the situation in the following language:

The assimilation policy required the Japanese to change their recruitment practices within government. However, although the total numbers of Korean working within the Government General increased after 1931, the percentage of higher Korean officials actually dropped due to an expansion of the number of positions. About fifty percent of the 87,552 central government, provincial, municipal, and educational officials in the Government-General were Korean in 1943. Yet, eighty percent of high officials and over sixty percent of middle rank officials were Japanese. Banks, businesses, semi-governmental organizations, the police force, and the Japanese army represented other avenues for real participation in the colonial system. As in the government bureaucracy, however, Koreans continued to be relegated to inferior positions, and to the jobs most offensive in their impact on the Korean populace. The notorious example of the colonial police highlighted the warped effects of such discriminatory inclusion: while the recruitment of lower class elements to the force provided a limited mobility for some luckless Koreans, at the same time it engendered tremendous resentment among the general population, turning Korean against Korean. (Eckert *et.al.*, 317)

CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENTS

In the wake of the revolt of 1857, there was a growing demand in England for taking away political power from the East India Company. In view of this growing demand in England, the British Parliament passed the Government of India Act, 1858. This Act brought the rule of the English East Company to an end and the administration of the country was directly taken over by the Crown (Raychoudhary, 264). The Act that transferred power from the hands of the Company to the Crown, did not introduce any changes in the administration of the country. The Indian Councils Act of 1861 was the first constitutional enactment in this regard. Meanwhile political parties emerged in India in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. In 1885 the Indian National Congress and in 1906 the Muslim League was established. At first, the two parties pressurized the British Government for constitutional concessions and autonomy (Griffiths, 309). The Indians started agitation for reforms and the government responded by the enactment of the Indian Council Act, 1909. It marked an important stage in the evolution of representative institutions in India. This Act provided an opportunity for the Indians to ventilate their grievances through the Councils.

The Morley- Minto Reforms of 1909 however, failed to satisfy the people of India. On the outbreak of World War I the Indians offered wholesale support to the British Government in its war efforts by contributing men and money and demanded self-government for India. In November 1917 Lord Montague, the Secretary of State came to India to discuss his scheme of reforms with the Indians political leaders. On the basis of his discussion and upon his recommendation, the Indian Reform Act of 1919 was enacted. It made a line of demarcation between the legislative and executive authority (Spear, 343) Now Indians were to govern, so to speak, on their own. As Ministers of various departments they encouraged recruitment of Indians as civil servants. Finally, the Indian Constitution Act of 1935 achieved notable progress in terms of provincial autonomy.

The Government of India Act 1935 contained the seeds of independence. The Act provided a chance for the Indians to acquire experience in the art of administration. Under the act, Indians could contest in elections and form ministries in the provinces. These ministries worked on the basis of the principle of collective responsibility and helped the growth of healthy conventions of Parliamentary form of government.

Constitutional Developments and Japanese Policy in Korea: In comparison to the political developments and constitutional concessions made by the British government in India, the Japanese colonial government didn't make the slightest concessions in the political area in accordance with the demands of the Korean nationalists. Instead it followed a ruthless policy of persecution of the nationalists. Under Japanese colonial rule Korea was ruled by the Government-General of Korea, which was established in Seoul and headed by a Governor-General. The Governor-General was appointed by the Japanese emperor and was responsible to him as well as to the Prime Minister of Japan. He was empowered to issue laws, ordinances, and regulations, and to mobilize Japanese troops in Korea. All governor-generals with the exception of retired admirals were army generals on active duty. The premier, the ministry of Home Affairs, the Army, the Navy and the ministry of colonization supervised the Governor-General and the Japanese Diet controlled its financial affairs (Nahm, 225-26).

The Director-General of Administration, who was appointed by the Japanese prime minister, assisted the Governor Generals. In the beginning, the Government General consisted of the Secretariat, and five departments: General Affairs, Internal Affairs, Finance, Agriculture-Commerce-Industry, and Justice. The Secretariat consisted of six bureaus i.e.,: Police, Investigation, Railway, Monopoly, Communication, and Land Survey. In administration, Japanese gendarmerie and the civil police were two powerful arms of the Governor-General. In 1910, the Central Advisory Council was established to assist the Governor-General. A few Koreans, who had helped the Japanese in the past, were among the 65 council members. Judges who were appointed by the Governor-General controlled judicial matters (Nahm, 225-26).

During this time Korea was divided into thirteen provinces each of which was divided into counties. Each county consisted of districts, villages and hamlets. A provincial governor, each large city by a mayor, headed each province; a provincial governor, each large city by a superintendent, and each district by a chief headed each province. The Governor-General, except chiefs of districts and villages who were appointed by county superintendents, appointed all these officials. None of the officials was elected. Occasionally, one or two Koreans were appointed as provincial governor. The Japanese citizens in Korea enjoyed self-rule with their own organizations such as school associations which were governed in accordance with the Japanese constitution.

Even the Japanese were not ready to see Koreans getting united in their demands for political and constitutional changes. No sooner had the colonial government been established than the Japanese began to suppress nationalistic activities. They ordered all kinds of Korean political organizations to be dissolved and prohibited all meetings, debates, and public speeches by the Koreans. In December 1910, the possession of firearms and other weapons, including swords and knives by Koreans was prohibited. In this way, the Japanese made Korea a military state where there was no any scope for democracy. In comparison to the Japanese the Indians enjoyed better treatment from the British in their demands for constitutional concessions.

Skilled Labor Force Issue

There had been fundamental differences between the Japanese and British colonial governments' attitude with regard to the development of a skilled labor force. The relatively high rate of literacy and well-educated and well-disciplined labor-force, which resulted from education, were the basis from which the Korean state and business were able to attain economic development in a short time. During the *Chosen Dynasty* (1392–1910) education was considered important, but only for social mobility among the aristocracy (*Yangban*) and for the reproduction of class-structure for the lower classes. During the Japanese colonial period (1910–1945) formal and universal education was implemented. Primary education was broadly provided without discrimination based on gender or class (Nahm, 225–26). However, the problem of Japanese universal education was that the Japanese language had become the only formal language taught in public schools in the beginning, and later in both public and private schools (In Young Kim, 172).

On the other side of the curtain, the British authorities in India didn't take any serious step toward educating the labor force of India. The education that was available both in primary and higher levels were beyond the reach of the labor class population. Mostly poor, they completely depended on the concessions and education facilities offered by the factory or industry owners. Majority of the labor force was unskilled. It didn't bring any benefit to the overall society in terms of production.

Big Capitalism in the Colonial Era

Under Japanese colonialism, the Korean economy was considered a part of the Japanese market and an object of exploitation especially for rice, human and natural resources (Wells, 826). Korean economy was integrated into Japanese economic system. The colonial government promoted Japanese wholly or majority owned businesses rather than joint ventures or minority owned business. The *Kaisha-rei* issued in 1910 controlled the flow of Japanese capital into Korea. Large-scale investment in the manufacturing sector was restricted in order to prevent any competition between the Japanese and Korean industries as part of the same empire till 1931. The *Kaisha-rei* also restricted the rise of Korean capitalists (King, 1971:6). Thus few Korean entrepreneurs had chances to build their own businesses (Grajdanzev, 171–177). For example, by 1920 Japanese capitalists owned 445 companies or 81.8 per cent of the total paid up capital, compared with 99 firms owned by Koreans. In addition to the unfavorable Japanese colonial government's attitude there were other reasons behind this low numbers of Korean entrepreneurs (for details, see In young Kim, vi) Only after being collaborators did Korean entrepreneurs received bank credits, which was an essential element in doing business in Korea. The Koreans usually didn't like to be considered as collaborators. Above all, most Korean human resources were transferred to the fight for Korean independence from Japanese rule in various ways. In one sense, the colonial period hindered the accumulation of capital by Korean national capitalists or *Minjok Chabonga* in Korea. As a result, there were not many Korean business entrepreneurs available in the face of Japanese colonial government's policy of assimilation. As Bruce Cumings says,

By the end of 1930s, *Mitsui*, *Mitsubisini*, and *Sumitomo* controlled half the copper and coal production, half the total ship tonnage, 70 percent of flour milling, 90 percent of paper production, most of the aircraft industry, nearly all sugar refining, and with some smaller and newer *Zaibatus*, nearly all of the colonial industrialization in Korea, Manchuria and Taiwan. (Cumings, 1987:58).

In sum, the Japanese mostly ran the Korean economy during the period, and *Zaibatsu* were the dominant rival of Korean entrepreneurs. *Zaibatsu*, thus, served as a model for Korean entrepreneurs and exposure to *Zaibatsu* activities was an important learning 'experience for future Korean entrepreneurs'. Consequently, Korean entrepreneurs came to "covet the *Zaibatsu's* monopoly position and close relation with the colonial government" (Kim, in Young: 66).

Since there existed large indigenous industrial organizations, though not on a massive scale, the Korean nationalist scholars try to refute the existence of entrepreneurship in colonial times. They even don't want to bring the existence of *Kyongbong*, *Hwashin*, *Samsung* and the like into consideration in this regard. The idea that everything of the colonial era was bad molded their negative attitude toward entrepreneurship.

History or historical truth shouldn't be distorted or taken on the basis of emotions. The colonial capitalism in Korea had originated as a by-product of Japanese rule and exploitation (Rahman, p.234). The Japanese did not want the existence of a Korean entrepreneurship class as a competitor of *Zaibatsu*. But it emerged as an "unconscious tool of history" to use Karl Mark's phraseology. In India the *Tata*, the *Birla*, the *Adamjee*, as well as several other *Chaebols* came into prominence mainly through their close cooperation with the colonial British government. During 1947, when India and Pakistan gained freedom from Britain these *Chaebols* were in their formative stages. Gradually they began to expand and attained maturity like the present-day Korean *Chaebols*. Similarly, in Bangladesh, there had been unequal competition of Bangladesh *Chaebols* with the twenty-two big families of Pakistan. At the moment, the Bangladesh *Chaebols* have gained enough strength to undertake joint-venture products with other world *Chaebols* (Rahman, p.236).

Every phenomenon appears smaller at its initial stage. It takes time for expansion and maturity. The Korean *Chaebols* are no exception to this law. Moreover, everything must be evaluated in the proper historical context to get its real meaning. Therefore, the Korean *Chaebols* in 1945 must not be viewed in the context of 1990s. To do so, would not be a fair judgment to the colonial entrepreneurs in Korea (Rahman, p.235).

Nationalism Issue

Sir Percival Griffiths, a famous historian on the British rule in India, observes the genesis of Indian Nationalism as a byproduct of the British rule in India. To him, throughout its history India had never been unified into a single political entity. The British for the first time in history after Aurangzeb politically unified the whole of India into a single territory. Since 1857 onward, Indians began to think themselves as member of a single community from which the Indian nationalism developed later on (Griffith, 245.).

The history of English domination in India goes back to the mid-seventeenth century when the East India Company built several trading posts in different parts of India. But the battle of Plassey in 1757 in Bengal (a province in Eastern India) was the first solid military victory in the process of establishing a colony. The battle of Buxar (1764) was the next important landmark event in history of East India Company's military successes when it defeated the allied military powers of the Nawab of Bengal, the Nawab of Oudh and the

Mughal emperor of Delhi (the central ruler) and took over the Diwani or the revenue department in its own hands. Later on, the English domination was extended to a greater part of India during the Governor-Generalships of Warren Hastings (1772–1785), Lord Wellesley (1798–1805), Lord Amherst (1823–28) and Lord Dalhousie (1848–1856). Till 1857, this expansion procedure continued. In 1857, there took place the Indian War of Independence against ruthless and continuous English expansion and imperialistic activities. The English suppressed it with much difficulty. Afterwards, the British Parliament took over the administration of India from the East India Company and ruled it till 1947. Through out its two hundred years oppressive rule and exploitation, the British for its own sake had developed in India an efficient administration, introduced western education and laid the foundation stone of Indian nationalism. Throughout its history India was never united into one nation and there were numerous independent states both in the South and in the North. The conquest of entire India and the beginning of British rule indirectly brought the Indians together and helped the genesis of Indian nationalism.

It is to be mentioned here that western education practically helped the developmental procedure of Indian nationalism. Compare to these constructive elements of British rule in the formation of Indian nationalism, the Japanese policy in Korea was often destructive. They tried to destroy or uproot the basic elements of Korean nationalism, both politically and culturally. The Japanese looked toward Korea as a new province of their country and started selling Korean lands amongst Japanese farmers, merchants, investors, capitalist and Shinto religious authorities.

The Japanese followed a rapid course in the dismemberment of a unified and independent Korea. Moreover, the cultural assimilation policy of Japan followed by the imposition of harsh rules for the disbandment of Korea's ethnic identity and nationalist sentiment deeply affected the Korean language and its education system. To quote Carter J. Eckert:

Korea an ancient state, and society with a long historical experience and high degree of racial, ethnic, cultural and linguistic homogeneity. Moreover, responding to external pressures, Korea had already begun the process of transforming its traditional institutions. The annexation disrupts the indigenous political movement to create a modern Korean national state (Eckert *et. al.* 298).

Thus, while the British rule indirectly helped the promotion of Indian nationalism, the Japanese rule in Korea intended to dismantle the basic roots of Korean nationalism.

Responsibility and Accountability of the Executives

The English East India Company and later on the Viceroy Governor Generals were accountable to the British Parliament for their expansionist policy as well as for their administration in India. Since 1858 the Parliament exercised more control on the viceroys and enacted laws to limit the powers of the Governor-Generals. The fundamental reason behind this was that the British Public opinion was very much susceptible to the exaggeration done by the East India Company or by other British representatives in India. This is true that the British parliament as well as the opposition party or the British public opinion was never sympathetic to the cause of the Indians. Rather they were afraid of the probable risks and damages that may occur due to the exaggeration and repressive policies followed by their agents in India.

Contrary to the policy of responsibility and accountability followed by the British government in India, the Japanese administrative policy in Korea was often inhumane, brutal and despotic in nature like French rule in Indo-China and North Africa, especially in Algeria. Even before the formal annexation of Korea i.e. since 1905, the Japanese conducted destructive activities in Korea and destroyed the military, political and economic systems of Korea which was quite inhumane. Despite the fact that Japanese agents were conducting wholesale massacres and suppressive policies in Korea, neither the Japanese emperor nor the Diet admonish them not to do so. They were not held responsible for their excesses in Korea. Even the Japanese authorities did not seek any explanations from their civil and military officials for the wrong they had perpetrated in Korea. The Japanese newspapers and public opinion maintained a policy of silence in this regard. The Japanese media deliberately kept the Japanese people in a state of ignorance. As a result, the Japanese public opinion didn't challenge this brutality. At the Tokyo War Crimes Tribunal (1946–1948) some of the Japanese nationals testified that they were completely in the dark about these brutal aspects of Japan's colonial rule in Korea and elsewhere (Hosoya, C. et. al., 106). On the basis of this discussion it can be said that there had been no accountability, humane and liberal aspects inherent in Japanese style of colonialism as it had been in British India. It was oppressive and exploitative in nature.

Aims and Objects and the Perpetuation of Colonial Rule

There were differences with regard to the aims and objects of colonial rule between the two powers. Like all other European nations, the English had come for trade, commerce and for other forms of economic purposes to South and South East Asia. They established themselves as the ruling power in Burma, Srilanka, Malaya, Singapore and in India. Like their Japanese counterparts, the English intended to ensure maximum exploitation of these countries and enrich their homeland with these resources. The British destroyed the traditional self-dependent economy of India as a result of which the salt, sugar, textile and jute industries failed to compete with the latest machine and technology-oriented industries of Britain and withered away (Sarkar, 15). The English began to buy cotton, jute, indigo and other raw materials from India, processed them in Britain's mechanized industries and again sold these to Indian markets as industrial goods. With the closure or failure of Indian indigenous industries, many laborers and employees lost their jobs. Again there was hardly chance for the Indian merchants to develop any entrepreneurship of their own, as they could not deal with the English traders in uneven competition even in the local markets. It is to be mentioned here that from the state level the British merchants enjoyed exemption of tariffs and revenues in most cases. Consequently within a short time the mercantile middle class of India was almost ruined and with them the Indian capital in competition with the English merchants (Sarkar, 16). During the British rule there didn't develop any big-capitalism in India other than some native collaborators who got indirect benefit in this regard. The Japanese, on their part, in a similar fashion, destroyed the traditional economic structure of Korea and took up its rice trade in their hands. The Japanese investors began to arrive in Korea and invested capital in different sectors. Gradually, there was an expanded sphere of Japanese market and capital investments in Korea, Manchuria and Taiwan. There had been much in common in the two systems of colonialism in terms of economic exploitation, although the procedures were different.

There had been considerable differences and inconsistencies with regard to the ends and objects of both powers in Korea and India, although there was much in common

between Japanese and British rule. From the very beginning, the Japanese intended to transform Korea into one of their provinces. They declared Korea a province of Japan and changed its name to *Chosen*. Before the March First Movement the Japanese systematically conducted different repressive measures on Koreans and oppressed them a lot. At first, they disbanded the Korean language, abolished Korean names and declared Korean culture, textbooks, clubs and organizations illegal. In short, it was the intention of the Japanese to destroy the separate identity of the Korean people so they forgot their separate national identity. The Japanese rulers wanted to force the Koreans to think themselves Japanese. It was somewhat like the efforts of the Pakistani to teach the Bengali language in Arabic alphabets. In a word, the Japanese intended to make a perpetual absorption of Korea. They did never think of leaving Korea (Eckert *et.al*, 281–289).

On the other hand, the British authorities in India adopted a policy that was less harsh. Despite the fact that English was made the medium of instruction, Indian languages such as *Sanskrit*, *Arabic* and *Persian* continued to exist. The English also patronized and encouraged the development of literature in the vernacular. In short, it was the aim of the English to develop such a literate middle class and English education oriented who would come forward to defend the British rule in India against all sorts of peasant rebellion and other forms of local uprising and also could act as pillars or basis of British rule in India. Even they cooperated with the British suppressing local uprisings.

In 1885 and 1906 the Indian National Congress and the Indian Muslim League were formed. The British intellectuals, bureaucrats and well wishers came forward to cooperate with the Indians in this regard. By doing this, the English intended to enable the Indians for Home Rule or independence. In other words, the English wanted to help the Indians achieve their Independence. Considering all these aspects it can be said that the English didn't intend to stay perpetually in India. Specially, after the defeat in the American War of Independence in 1783, British did not express its intention to stay permanently anywhere in the colonial world.

Non-Violent and Peaceful Movement for Liberation

Since the Japanese occupation of Korea in 1910, there existed a strong nationalist sentiment among the Koreans, both home and abroad. Inside Korea, the students, teachers, shopkeepers and merchants, farmers, Christian and Buddhist churchmen, and members of the former royal family were ingredients of nationalism against foreign domination. On the other hand, various Korean nationalist groups were very active in the mainland USA and Hawaii, in Manchuria and North China, in Chungking as well as in other parts of East and Southeast Asia. Even the Korean students in Japan were always engaged in secret propaganda and in revolutionary activities which in turn were suppressed ruthlessly by the Japanese police.

On the occasion of the funeral of former emperor Kojong on March 3, 1919, the Korean nationalist leaders and student groups adopted a planned demonstration on March 1, 1919. The leaders debated and decided to declare the independence of Korea unilaterally. The March First Movement was declared, "to be non-violent, reflecting the conservative bent of its organizers." Signers of the Declaration of Independence gathered at a Seoul restaurant and dispatched a student with a copy of the declaration to the

Governor-General and notified the police of their intentions. At the same time the declaration of Korean independence was being read at the Pagoda Park in downtown Seoul. On this day people from all walks of life joined together, paraded and demonstrated through the streets and shouted " *Taeahan tongnip manse* (long live an independent Korea). This incident sparked a nation-wide movement in the following months. The Japanese reacted to subsequent gatherings "with an orgy of arrests, beatings and even village burnings" which "invited Korean reprisals" and bloody classes took place between the police and the Korean people at large in the following months (Eckert *et.al*, 278).

Interestingly, principles of non-cooperation developed by Mahatma Gandhi in the 1920s at least a part of the Korean nationalist movement. Reflection of Gandhi's elements of non-cooperation movement can also be traced in the Korean Production Movement Programs of Korean nationalists. In order to mobilize mass support for the creation of a modern nation, Korean progressive elites, under the influence of Gandhian politics in India had devised programs for raising national consciousness, for education and for economic development. As a result, the entire Korean nation became aware of the political, cultural, and economic inequities inherent in Japanese imperial rule. The condition was further aggravated by the cultural policy innovated by Saito by the Rice Riots in Japan of 1918 and by the Company Law (See, Eckert *et.al*, 281-289). Under the Company Law it was difficult for Korean businessmen to develop entrepreneurship of their own due to the lack of capital and colonial government's cooperation. As a result, it was not possible for the Koreans to compete with the Japanese entrepreneurs. In order to promote the issue of national economic development moderate nationalist approached the economic crisis on a different track. As Carter Eckert and other put it,

Their (moderate nationalists) plan was to mobilize national sentiment in support of Korean industry and handicrafts, thus to encourage self-sufficiency and the development of national capital in competition with Japanese capitalism. They were joined immediately by Korean businessmen who saw the advantage of such political support (Eckert *et.al*, 291).

In these way Korean nationalists established link between economic power and political economic power and political economy. In order to ensure self-sufficiency in national development a number of consumer cooperatives were established. In July 1920, Cho Man-sik, the Gandhi of Korea had created the Society for the promotion of Korean production. To quote Carter Eckert and others:

Cho had come in contact with the Gandhian ideas of non-violence and self-sufficiency while attending college in Japan. Cho later joined with Yi Kwang-su and Yom Tae-Jin and the leaders of Uther consumer cooperatives, to form a national league that in turn gave birth to the Korean production moment..... (Eckert.*et.al*/292).

Thus Gandhi's non-cooperation policy against British rule was successfully imitated and applied to the arena of nationalist movement of Korean. It is to be mentioned that since the Russo-Japanese War Japan had become a refuge of Indian nationalists who dreamed the overthrowing of the British rule in India in the way the Japanese had defeated Russia. During this time, the Korean nationalists often came in touch in Tokyo and other places of Japan with the Indians and adopted the tactics followed by Gandhi and other Indian leaders.

Conclusion

Colonialism in the South and East Asian regions left many legacies which have been taken by the historians as curse in the lives of people. Colonialism was never a good thing, although as a byproduct of which western education, western political systems and a new socio-economic and political infrastructure had been developed in many countries of Asia. But the dark side of colonialism out-numbered its benevolent aspects. Both in Korea as well as in Japan many divisive elements were permeated into the society which eventually led to the divisions of both India and Korea, although the surrender of the Japanese soldiers in Korea played the final game in the division of that peninsula. Japanese rule deliberately exacerbated class tensions among the Koreans as a result of which Korean nationalists stationed in different parts of the world could never get united under the leadership of the Korean provisional government formed in Shanghai 1919. The British rulers in India, on their part, promoted conflicts between different communities, principally between Hindus and Muslims. It led to the ultimate division of the sub-continent---Pakistan and India. In addition, as an impact of colonial rule, tyrannical and despotic elements hinder the proper functioning of democracy and the development of liberal democratic culture in Korea, Pakistan and India. There is always an undemocratic attitude inherent in the activities of the party leaders of the two regions.

This paper finds the principal similarities and differences between the two forms of colonialism in Asia. None of the two systems however, was benevolent or beneficial to the people of the respective region. Both of them were oppressive and exploitative in nature. The British rule in India however, contained many liberal aspects of western civilization which later on sustained the developmental process of a democratic political systems, accountability and responsibility of the executive to the legislature and above all, the creation of such an intellectual class who were trained in western education and philosophy and helped the politicians conducting enlightened reforms for the overall progress and advancement of their societies.

References

1. Eckert, Carter, J. Lee, Ki-baik, Lew, Young Ick, Robinson, Michael and Wagner, Edward W., *Korea Old and New: A History*, (Seoul: Ilchokak, 1990).
2. Clyde, Paul H. *The Far East, A History of the Western Impact and the Eastern Response (1830-1970)*, (New Delhi: Prentice-Hall of India Private Lt, 1972)
3. Cumings, Bruce, "The Legacy of Japanese Colonialism in Korea" in Myers, Ramon H. (ed.), *The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895-1945*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
4. Cumings, Bruce, "The Origins and Development of the Northeast Asian Political Economy: Industrial Sectors, Product Cycles and Political Consequences", in Frederic C. Deyo (ed.), *The Political Economy of the Northeast Asian Industrialization*. (Ithaca, New York, Cornell University, 1987).
5. Grajdanzev, Andrew, J., *Modern Korea*, (New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1944).
6. Griffiths, Sir Percival, *The British Impact on India*, (London: Frank Cass & Company, 1965)
7. Harrison, John.A., *China Since 1800*, New York: Harcourt, Brace & World Inc, 1967.
8. Hosoya, C. et. al, *The Tokyo War crimes trial: An International Symposium*, (Tokyo: Kodansha Ltd., 1986).
9. Kim, In Young, *The Political Economy of a Chaebol's Capital Accumulation in South Korea: The Case of Samsung, 1938-1947*. (Ph.D. Dissertation University of Hawaii, 1996).
10. King, Betty L., "Japanese Colonialism and Korean Economic Development, 1910-1945", *Asian Studies*, 9 (1), 1971.
11. Lee, Ki-Baik, *A New History of Korea*, (Seoul: IL Cho-kak Publishers, 1984).
12. Robinson, Michael E., "Colonial Publication Policy and the Korean Nationalist Movement" in Ramon H, Myers (ed.), *The Japanese Colonial Empire, 1895-1945*, (Princeton : Princeton University Press. 1984)
13. Morton, Scott.W., *Japan: Its History and Culture*, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company. 1975.
14. Nahm, Andrew C., *A History of the Korean People Tradition & Transformation*, (Seoul: Hollym International Corporation. 1988).
15. Rahman, A.F.M. Shamsur, " Japanese Colonial Rule and the Origins of Chaebols (Big-Capitalists) in Korea (1919-1945): Continuity or Discontinuity", *Rajshahi University Studies*, Part-A Vol.25. 1997.
16. Raychoudhary, S.C. *History of Modern India*. (Delhi: Surjeet Publications. 1990)

17. Roberts, P.E., *History of British India Under the Company and the Crown*, (Oxford University Press, 1970)
18. Sarkar, Sumit, *Modern India: 1885-1947*, (New Delhi: Macmillan India Ltd. 1990).
19. Spear, Pervical, *The Oxford History of Modern India, 1740-1947*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1965)
20. Thompson, Edward and Garrett, G.T., *Rise and Fulfillment of British Rule in India*, (Allahabad: Central Book Depot, 1966).
21. Vinacke, Harold M, *A History of the Far East in Modern Times*, (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1967).
22. Wells, K.M, "The Rationale of Korean Economic Nationalism Under Japanese Colonial Rule, 1922-1932: The Case of Cho Man-sik's Products Promotion Society", *Modern Asian Studies* 29,4 (1985).
23. Fairbank, John K. *et al*, *East Asia Tradition and Transformation*, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1978)