

## **Civilizing Koreans: The 1910 Debate over Korean Education**

**Mark Caprio**

**Rikkyo University**

## **Civilizing Koreans: The 1910 Debate over Korean Education**

The education system that the Japanese administration adopted in Korea following the enactment of the first Education Act in 1911 clearly demonstrated the general aims of the administration: while preaching assimilation it aimed to maintain the hierarchical relationship between Korean and Japanese in the colony. The administration offered Korean children a curriculum that was shorter in duration and inferior in content to that which it provided Japanese children residing on the Korean peninsula. This curriculum did not, however, reflect the spirit of the debate that took place over the first few months following annexation regarding how best to bring the Korean people to civilization through education. This paper will evaluate the views put forth in this debate against the education system that the government-general eventually selected for the schools it created.

Many of the views put forth in newspapers and education journals from August 1910 reflected the discriminative system that emerged? Koreans should be taught separate from their Japanese counterparts using a different curriculum. Others, however, argued against segregation, against content difference, and even against the idea of a Japanese-based curriculum. For the goals of the occupation to realize success, some Japanese insisted, Koreans and Japanese children must not only study together, they must also learn each other's language and customs. When considering the views put forth in this debate, the following questions emerge: How feasible were the more liberal ideas voiced by education scholars? Why was the government-general reluctant to incorporate them into the curriculum? What affect might these ideas have had on the Korean-Japanese administration had the government-general chosen to do so?

### **Assimilation Policy**

Even before the Japanese government finalized the decision to annex the Korean peninsula it had already resolved to enforce an assimilation policy on the new subjects of the Japanese Empire. The debate over administrative policy had taken place fifteen years previous, at the time that Japan incorporated Taiwan as a colony. Indeed, Japanese history demonstrates that assimilation had been used to administer peoples living at the archipelago's peripheral regions as early as the late eighteenth century when the Tokugawa, fearing a Russian invasion of the northern territories (present-day Hokkaido and the Kurile Islands), attempted to assimilate the indigenous peoples of the region. In the case of Korea, unlike that of Taiwan, the question of whether to integrate the Korean people received limited attention. The similarities they imagined the two peoples sharing limited their administrative policy choices to one? assimilation.

Japanese administrations consistently relied on education to be the vehicle to integrate the subjugated peoples into Japanese society. In 1790 the Tokugawa government began teaching the Japanese language and mannerisms to the Ezo. Later, following the Meiji Restoration, the new government established a school system to

facilitate their integration into the dominant society. Similar experiments in educating newly amalgamated peoples took place in the Ryukyu Islands and Taiwan following the territories' incorporation into an expanding Japanese state over the latter half of the nineteenth century. Not unique to the Japanese government, other colonizing forces employed education in similar situations. Indeed, the homeland compulsory education system established by the Japanese from 1871 can be explained as a move to "colonize" the peoples of the former Tokugawa *han* by enrolling them in a compulsory education system.

Comparisons between the education of traditional Japanese peoples and those incorporated following the Meiji Restoration reveals the emergence of a two-tiered system: peoples such as the Ainu, the Ryukyuan, the Taiwanese, and the Korean were provided with an education that was both segregated from, and inferior to, that of the Japanese. In addition to being taught in separate facilities, these peoples found that their colonizers' limited expectations of their capabilities also limited the number of years they were allowed to attend school (four as opposed to six for Japanese children). These two factors negatively effected these peoples' chances of advancing to higher education, a disadvantage that had repercussions for the kinds of employment they found themselves eligible for upon their graduation from the education system. The fact that their lessons were taught in a language foreign to them only magnified the challenges these students faced when having to compete with their Japanese counterpart.

### **The 1910 Debate over Korean Education**

The education system imposed upon the Korean people from 1911 shared the characteristics described above in that it segregated Korean children from the expatriate Japanese children residing in the colony, elementary school was limited to four years, and the language of instruction was primarily Japanese. Thus, much of the students' day in school was spent studying the Japanese language which took time away from the more important lessons in other content areas required of those wishing to advance to junior high school or even a technical school. The system that emerged, however, does not reflect the content of an active debate that took place in the education journals of the archipelago from the time of annexation, a debate that reflected a variety of images drawn by Japanese of Korean people, as well as the relationship the participants hoped the Korean education system would deliver.

The colonial administration established the hierarchical relationship between the Korean and Japanese peoples, and the need to institute a different education system, even before annexation. A report issued by the residency-general stated the inappropriateness of including the Koreans in Japan' s educational system argued the following.

Koreans are on a different level than the Japanese and thus it is difficult to put them under the same system right away. After the conditions, customs, and mannerisms of the Japanese are learned; after the welfare of the people is promoted through the improvement of their level of culture; and after this knowledge is

developed, gradually the Korean people can be assimilated with the Japanese.

The system that the government-general enacted upon assuming control of the peninsula reflected this belief. It would not be until after the March First Movement that the Japanese administration changed its admissions policy from one that segregated peoples according to nationality to one that segregated them by language ability. The debate over education policy included arguments supporting both segregation and integration, as well as for an end to assimilation as a policy altogether. It thus presents one of the more interesting discussions on Japanese administrative policy in general, and Korean-Japanese relations in particular, held at this time.

The debates concentrated attention on a number of issues ranging from philosophical questions regarding the nature of the curriculum and the purpose of this education, to more practical questions such as the language in which it was to be conducted. A minority of writers wrote critically of the attitude that the Japanese harbored toward their new subjects, an attitude reflected in the inferior curriculum that the Japanese government-general offered the Korean people.

Regarding the nature of the curriculum, one of the more frequently asked questions considered whether the Korean student was to be taught practical knowledge or receive training in moral behavior. Would, for example, industrial education (*jitsumu kyoiku*) or Confucian ideology form the basis of the curriculum? *Kyoikukai* (Education world) argued the practical over the moral. The Korean people, it noted, were already trained in Confucian education principles. Instead, they should be given a special "preparation education" (*junbi kyoiku*) that concentrated attention in areas such as agriculture, industry, and manufacturing to enable them to make a useful contribution to the empire. The Korean people would attain happiness, the article reasoned, through their becoming an autonomous and self-managing people, the primary aim of the preparation education it advanced.

Stressing practical education did not mean that Confucian education was to be ignored. A second segment of these preparation education was to concentrate on moral training. It was also to emphasize instruction in the Japanese language, as well. The primary goal of the education system? successful unification of the two peoples? required the Korean student receiving training in these two areas. For the time being, the author concluded, the Japanese authorities would have to endure the Korean's bilingual existence (Japanese at school and Korean in the home) until they were prepared to adopt the colonizer's language as their native language. This process would take upwards from twenty to one hundred years of Japanese rule.

The *Maeil sinbo* [Daily news], a government-general friendly Korean language newspaper, agreed with this thinking in its calling for a curriculum designed around practical industrial skills such as farming, industry, and manufacturing. It was through this education, the newspaper reasoned, that the Korean student could best develop and prosper. It contrasted this curriculum with one that was "intellectual," one that offered the students lessons in history and other such areas. While this education was valuable in nurturing a "unified spirit" (*ildan songsin*), practical education served as the foundation of this spirit and answered the immediate needs of the Korean people. The *Maeil sinbo*'s Japanese language sister newspaper, the *Keijo nippo*, complemented this view in arguing that

Confucianism was more appropriate for a traditional state. To train the Korean people simply to obey was to create “mental slaves.” Instead, the Japanese must prepare the Koreans for economic development, public finance, independence, and military service to allow them to walk alongside the Japanese in global activity.

Japanese Diet member Mitsuji Chuzo also devoted attention to this question of whether the Korean school curriculum was to focus on moral or practical education. Also writing in the journal *Kyoikukai*, the statesman argued that “special education” was necessary to allow the Korean people to overcome what he calculated to be a forty-year handicap in competing against Japanese students. This deficit, he reasoned, resulted from their education having been limited to the Korean *sodang*, a system that he likened to the Japanese *terakoya* schools of Tokugawa Japan. Unlike others, Mitsuji did not attribute the cause of this education deficiency to a defect in Korean character, but simply to historical consequence: the Japanese people came to be introduced to “enlightenment education” before the Korean people. His remedy for narrowing this gap differed from other arguments presented above. Rather than a practical curriculum, the Korean child would better advance through moral training. Koreans, he reasoned, must be trained as world citizens rather than as Japanese subjects. Moral education would train the Korean student in “obligation, honest moral character, and public spirit,” a more fruitful endeavor than instructing them in loyalty to the Japanese state and subjugation to the Japanese emperor.

Mitsuji was not alone in calling the Japanese on their arrogance in assuming that education had the sole purpose of absorbing the Korean people as Japanese subjects. Other writers, as well, echoed this view. Horio Mine, in an article printed in *Kyoiku jiron* (Contemporary education opinion), suggested that the Japanese implement a curriculum that offered the Korean people incentives through a national education (*kokumin kyoikuteki doki*). He argued that the Korean people must be led to form their own nation with a foundation of common interests and equal prosperity based on “parity” and “equal sentiments” with the Japanese people. Above all, the Korean must gain an understanding of their position as fellow countrymen and countrywomen. In this way, he explained, the Japanese people came to stand shoulder-to-shoulder with the world powers; it is the reason why national education was essential for the Korean people. Without acquiring a feeling of national polity, the author warned, the road to assimilation of our new members of the nation will be lost. Koreans, Horio posed, should be given an education that trained them for a position of equality with, rather than subordination to, the Japanese people.

Horio continued by delineating the greatest barrier blocking the advancement of this education? the superficial understanding that Japanese had of their administrative mission. He criticized his fellow countrymen for advancing an assimilation policy without actually considering its content, noting a disturbing contradiction between what was being said and the negative idea they held of the Korean as their inferior. It was this attitude that needed correction. The Japanese people, he contended, had no intention of either recognizing or respecting the Korean people’s “potential character.” If the Japanese did not bridge this superior-inferior gap of the conqueror over the conquered, much like the Indian under British rule, or the black and the Native American under United States rule, the Korean had little chance of advancing as a people.

Shiratori Kurakichi, also writing for *Kyoiku jiron*, also criticized the Japanese attitude toward the Korean while questioning his government's choice of assimilation as an administrative policy. Considering the Korean as their inferior, he began, was not an attitude conducive to fostering a productive teacher–student relationship. If the Japanese were to realize success in winning the sentiments of the Korean people, the colonizers would have to adopt an attitude of “caressing inducement” (*aibu shido*), a sentiment that would inspire the Korean people to accept Japanese morals and culture.

Even if the Japanese were to accept a more congenial attitude toward the Korean people, he continued, it did not follow that assimilation was the best policy under which to administrate the colony. Unlike Okinawa, Shiratori reasoned, Korea had been a “nation” with its own customs and mannerisms up until annexation. For this reason assimilation would prove to be rather difficult. He also questioned the Japanese ability to assimilate a foreign people, an action that was unprecedented in their history. Japan, Shiratori concluded, was a nation of imitators; we are not a creative people. Thus we are incapable of assimilating others.

The education of women, and particularly the purpose behind educating them, was an issue that garnered attention throughout the period of Japanese colonial rule. Many criticized the Korean seclusion of its women as a primary reason for the state's stagnation. Educating the women, argued many, served as the initial step in educating the nation. The *Maeil sinbo* addressed this issue soon after annexation. The women's role, the newspaper wrote, was as coordinator of what the Japanese often referred to as “home education” (*katei kyoiku*), the learning that took place before the child began attending school. This education was pivotal to an individual's future. “Whether a person will turn in life from a good to an evil road, or from an evil to a good road, depended on whether he or she had been taught. If they were taught correct things (*chongsa*) they would become a correct person (*chong'in*).” This education, the newspaper editorialized, began in the home. If the mother is educated she can pass on correct knowledge to her children. It continued:

It is not an overstatement to say that women's education is tied to the rises and falls of the state. If women do not have morals then boys cannot be strictly directed. [Without this foundation] it will be too late after to make him excel in his education.

The education that women were to receive for this urgent task, however, was to be limited to moral education. The author of this editorial did not consider knowledge-based education and physical training to be of vital importance to the women's role in society.

Another important question raised in this debate regarded the language of instruction: should Korean children be taught in the Japanese or Korean language? Most contributors believed it best that Japanese be used to educate the Korean. The *Seoul Press*, the English-language affiliate of the *Maeil sinbo* and the *Keijo nippo*, offered one commentary on this issue. The newspaper argued that initially the government–general should offer textbooks written in Korean before, “in due time,” replacing them with those written in Japanese as the Korean people grew comfortable in the language. This editorial employed the often used stereotype of the people to justify this plan: Koreans were better linguists than Japanese; they learned languages faster and easier. The Japanese people, being poor at acquiring foreign languages, were more suitable as

subjugators, whereas the Korean people's talents at imitation made their role as the subjected all the more appropriate.

This newspaper further argued that the Korean students' progress in the Japanese language would be expedited by placing them in integrated classrooms with other Japanese students. Because of their natural talent for learning foreign languages, it reasoned, Korean children would have few problems adjusting to the Japanese education system. An integrated education system would first provide the Korean student with an environment of equality under which to conduct their studies. It would also give the Japanese student more incentive to learn the Korean language. The content of the curriculum, the newspaper advised, should remain Japanese-centered: history and geography lessons would concentrate attention on Japanese matters with Korean history being introduced only through its historical connections with Japan.

The debate over education during this initial period of Japanese administration provided the government-general with a greater variety of options than the debates on other aspects of colonial administration which tended to limit their discussion to the naturalness of the Japanese attempt to assimilate Koreans. In a word, those writing on Korean education matters tended to view the Korean and their potential for development in more positive terms, and thus wrote with greater expectations of the role education would play in the advancement of them as a people independent of the Japanese. Scholars here directed the criticism in their writing toward Japanese policy as well as toward the arrogant attitude Japanese nationals aimed at the Korean people. Rather than the limited aspiration of training the Korean student for his or her place in the Japanese Empire, some argued the need to educate the people for the higher ambition of their participation in global affairs.

### **Government-General Education Policy in Korea**

The first Education Ordinance Act that appeared following annexation commenced from November 1, 1911; it remained government-general education policy until March 31, 1922. In practical terms this legislation demonstrated none of the creative ideas put forth during the debate during the year of planning that followed the August 1910 incorporation of the Korean peninsula into the Japanese Empire. From April 1920, when the Korean people were finally allowed a press through which to voice their criticisms of the Japanese administration, this system and the curriculum it harbored frequently became the content of their dissatisfaction.

The education system established by Governor General Terauchi Masatake's offices resembled that which the Japanese government had instituted for other colonized peoples, including the Ainu, Okinawan, and Taiwanese, after their incorporation into the Japanese Empire: one unequal and segregated. It provided the Korean people with a truncated version of the Japanese system: the Korean child started this education later (at age eight) and graduated earlier (after four years) when compared with their Japanese counterparts. The content of the curriculum stressed moral education in the elementary stage, but practical education once the foundation of the student had been established. It thus emphasized the molding of a loyal subject over the nurturing of a prolific citizen, a final product who knew the value of a hard day's work before being trained for a career. Terauchi emphasized this in declaring that the "object of education is to promote the

intellect of the young people and embrace their moral character so that they may become able to govern themselves and their homes.” He continued by stressing the latter:

[H]itherto many men of [Korea] have been led by the erroneous method of education pursued to dislike work and indulge in useless and empty talk. In the future, attention should be paid to the removal of this evil as well as to instilling in the minds of the young men the detestation of idleness and the love of real work, thrift, and diligence.

The 1911 Education Ordinance reiterated this ambition as

Educat[ing] Koreans on the basis of the Imperial Rescript on Education so that they may become good and loyal subjects of the Empire fostering in them such characteristics and giving them such knowledge and ability as will enable them to lead a respectable life and rise in society.

As in other peripheral colonized system students enrolled in the elementary school were required to spend the majority of their time studying language: sixteen of the twenty-six hours were set aside for this purpose. Of this time, Japanese (*kokugo* or national language) occupied ten hours and a combined Korean/Classical Chinese class the remaining six hours of the week. In addition, the students' school day was filled with one hour of ethics (*shushin*), three hours of singing and physical education, and six hours of mathematics. From the third year students received two hours of science classes, an addition that required them to add one hour to their school week and subtracting one hour from their Korean/Classical Chinese class.

The ten hours that the students received in Japanese language is misleading. The only textbooks after the first year that were not written in Japanese were those used in the Korean/Classical classes. Teachers, in principle, were supposed to teach their classes while using the Japanese language. Thus, theoretically the majority of the students' contact hours in the classroom served as time devoted to Japanese instruction, either directly or indirectly. The low numbers of Japanese-speaking Koreans suggests one of two realities: either the students were in practice being taught through the Korean language or they were not learning much in their Japanese language-based instruction. As the government-general supplied teachers of the first few years of elementary education with bilingual instruction manuals, one might conclude that much of this education was being conducted in the Korean language.

The fact that the students' weekly schedule allowed for but one hour of ethics per week is also misleading. A glance at the content of other classes reveals lessons in this area being presented across the curriculum. Language textbooks stressed thriftiness by portraying the Empress Dowager as a lady who did not aspire luxury, an individual who raised her own silkworms to demonstrate to the commoner ways of promoting Japan's national treasure. Stories of Japanese-Korean harmony promoted the spirit of assimilation and inter-cultural communication. Kinan dutifully learned Taro's language; the Korean boy's positive attitude toward his Japanese friend inspired the boys' parents, as well. Through the stories that appeared in both the Korean and Japanese language textbooks students learned about Japanese myths and tales, Shintoism, the Japanese flag, and

other necessary icons of Japanese culture. In contrast, very few symbols of Korean culture appeared in these textbooks. As Patricia Tsurumi notes, teachers in Korea, like their Taiwan counterparts, were urged to include “ ‘ Japanese spirit’ with everything they taught.”

The emphasis on language study and moral education in the elementary schools dovetailed with the Japanese master plan for colonial rule in Korea over the first decade of its rule. The Japanese administration often emphasized the necessity of Koreans acquiring an ability to use the Japanese language as a sign of success in their assimilation policy. To the contrary, this education did not properly outfit its constituents with that needed to participate in the political institutions of the colony. The government-general chose to ignore enlightening suggestions put forth by a number of educators calling for the Korean to be educated to be able to play a more active role in a global society. To fill this role the student was required to begin his education in the system set aside for the Japanese either on the peninsula or in the archipelago.

### **Conclusion: Korean Criticism and Japanese Reforms**

On April 1, 1920 the first issue of the *Tong’ a ilbo* found its way to the streets offering the Korean people their first public and legal voice to participate in the debate over the running of their homeland. The newspaper immediately attacked the government-general’ s education system. One of its first editorials targeted the colonizers’ insistence that Japanese be the language of instruction. The newspaper argued at this time that Korean children having to engage in their studies through a foreign language “blocked Korean national development.” Education, it continued, was most important for the modernization of a people and the ages between five and twelve were most vital for a child’ s development. Thus, it concluded, learning during this stage must be conducted in the language that is most natural for the student.

Education continued to be a focal point of the *Tong’ a ilbo* throughout the newspaper’ s existence. In February 1922 the newspaper criticized the recently promulgated education act for its contribution to the obliteration of the Korean language, an atrocity that was seen in most other colonial situations. In December of the following year the newspaper editorialized on the “double burden” that the education system placed upon the shoulders of the Korean child who had to study not only English and classical Chinese as foreign languages, but also classical and modern Japanese, as well. The newspaper made it a point at the beginning of every new school year to remind the Japanese authorities of the limited opportunities that they provided the Korean children to pursue an education within the colonial system by announcing the number of students denied admission for lack of space.

Women’ s education, and the attitude in which Korean women participated in this institution, was also targeted for criticism. This criticism contested the content, rather than the purpose, of the government-general’ s education system. It was essential that the Korean women be educated, just as long as girls were educated to become Korean women and to raise her children as Koreans. While at times the newspaper argued that women took the rather liberal view of Korean girls being sent to school to learn how to live autonomous lives and to shed her image of a “devote slave” and an “obedient doll,” on other occasions it put forth the idea that education was necessary to provide the home education her children needed before going off to elementary school.

Much of this criticism carried the dual purpose of criticizing both women's education and the Japanese education system in the colony. Here "woman" could easily be substituted for "Korean," a message coding that became more important during the latter half of the 1920s after the Japanese administration tightened its censorship criteria. At times, though, the *Tong' a ilbo* directly confronted the education system. On one occasion the newspaper urged the Japanese to educate the women in the services that she was expected to be able to fulfill as a Korean (rather than a Japanese) woman. She should, for example, be taught to serve tea on a Korean *ondol* floor rather than on a Japanese *tatami* floor. She must be trained, in other words, to be of use for Korean society rather than to Japanese society.

The government-general began to discuss reform even before the March First Movement broke out in 1919; it was not able to announce its education reform package until three years later, in 1922. During this interval Japanese scholars and political figures engaged in a second debate over this institution. Prime Minister Hara Kei began this discussion by arguing that the failure of Japanese rule in Korea to date stemmed from the two people's separate existences. He criticized the policy that copied British and other colonial polices by creating two distinct systems of education, one for the colonized and one for the colonizers. One cannot expect to change a people, he stressed, while considering them fools. Differences in the two systems make it difficult to receive the Korean people as loyal citizens.

Integration became the primary issue debated during the years following the independence demonstrations. House of Peers member Sawayanagi Seitaro argued that excuses of its "inconvenience" or that it was "troublesome" to educate Koreans alongside Japanese children were insufficient reasons for maintaining two segregated systems. Kamada Eikichi, president of Keio Gijuku University, explained that for the two peoples to come together they would have to realize that they both share the same blood, sweat, and tears. To obtain this feeling they must first be educated together. This required, he believed, an integration of two languages and cultures, rather than a total absorption of the Korean people by the Japanese. In 1924 a conference was even convened for the purpose of promoting "the co-education of Japanese and Korean" education.

Reforms enacted during this period, however, emphasized "separate but equal" rather than the ending of the segregated systems. Governor General Saito Makoto called for the building of more schools to enroll a greater number of Korean children and the importation of the Japanese education system to the Korean peninsula. The reforms increased the years required to graduate from elementary school from four to six. Also, as mentioned above, provisions were made for Koreans with sufficient Japanese ability to gain entrance into the schools set aside primarily for expatriate Japanese students. More significant reforms would take place in the late 1930s when the government-general integrated both systems under the generic *kokumin kyoiku* (people's education) system and promised that this education would soon be made compulsory for Korean children.

These reforms proved to be too little too late. While the government-general sat a greater number of Korean children in its schools, it provided them with less per capita funding than their Japanese counterpart; school classrooms were also more crowded in the predominantly Koreans schools than in the Japanese schools. It increased the years necessary for Korean children to graduate from elementary school to six, at a time, however, when the Japanese government had increased the number of years for

Japanese students to eight. Even when it tried to erase distinction between schools it failed: schools soon came to be categorized by their tuition (with Japanese students occupying the more expensive schools) rather than by their title. Also, unless the administration took positive steps to integrate schools it would not erase the reputations that the schools carried from the past. People did not need a formal distinction to determine which schools were better than others. Compulsory education, slated to begin after ten years, never came to pass as Japan lost the war within a few years after this announcement.

Japan's inability or unwillingness to follow its rhetoric of assimilation with action to enhance the integration of the two peoples can be explained by a number of factors. I would first like to emphasize that this apparent contradiction was not unique to Japan's colonial practices. The French preached and practiced a similar policy in Algeria and West Africa. Likewise the Germans followed a similar pattern in its Alsace and Lorraine territories that it acquired from the French in 1871. Indeed, this is a characteristic of most colonial activities that I have termed peripheral, those resulting from a core state incorporating neighboring territories just beyond their borders. All pledged assimilation as their colonial policy yet allowed few of the colonized peoples the "privilege" of sitting with them as fellow citizens of this core state. More often than not the colonizers provided the peoples it subjugated at this level with a vastly inferior example of the education it offered its people at home, as well as those who migrated to the colony.

This point highlights the hierarchical nature of assimilation as a colonial policy. It was rarely intended to integrate the peoples under its jurisdiction as citizens equal to the peoples of the homeland; rather they were to be considered subjects of a lesser social value. Providing them with an education system that was inferior guaranteed that the vast majority of these people would remain at a level inferior to their counterpart in the colonial homeland. Indeed, it was invariably the subjected people who were responsible for proving their social worth by adopting the language, religion, customs, and mannerisms of the colonizing people. In spite of discussion by some far-reaching Japanese regarding the integration of the Japanese and Korean cultures, this utopian goal apparently was never considered at the practical level. Japanese-ness received recognition as a "civilized" entity by a foreign people adopting it as their own, not by "corrupting" it through creating a hybrid Japanese-Korean culture.

This brings us to our final point: the idea that segregation was needed to protect the Japanese people and culture from the infusion of "inferior" influences. Whereas an "advanced" culture could export its brand of civilization to an "inferior" one, it would not consider consciously importing aspects of the "inferior" into its own. Complete integration of the education systems to the extent that a near-equal number of Japanese and Korean children shared the same classroom threatened the fragile state of Japanese culture, one that in 1910 arguably was still in a state of incubation. Too much contact with the Korean, some feared, could work against their goals: the Koreanization of Japanese residents rather than the Japanization of the Korean. The Japanese deemed the better defense mechanism against this threat to be segregation, rather than integration, of the two peoples. This policy is most evident in the school system that the Japanese administration created and maintained throughout its thirty-six year rule over the peninsula.

