

# Dispute over Territorial Ownership of Tokdo in the Late Chosŏn Period

*Hoon Lee\**

## I. Introduction

**T**he island of Ullŭngdo is located on the sea some 123 km from the provincial boundary of Uljin, Kyŏngsangpukto province. And Tokdo lies at a point 92 km east of Ullŭngdo. Tokdo is no less than 160 km from Japan's Oki Island.

Since the establishment of the Republic of Korea in 1948, Korea and Japan have disputed on several occasions over the ownership of Tokdo. Lately, the Japanese government is repeatedly claiming Tokdo as its inherent territory, historically and under international law.

On January 18, 1952, Korea promulgated the Presidential Declaration concerning its sovereignty over the contiguous sea, commonly called the Peace Line or Rhee Line. This became officially a turning point in triggering a diplomatic row between the two countries over the title to Tokdo. Later, the Korea-Japan Basic Treaty of 1965 did not formally take up the Tokdo issue, but Japan claimed

---

\* Senior Researcher, National History Compilation Committee, Korea.

informally and indirectly Japan's ownership of Tokdo through its negotiators.<sup>1</sup>

In the 1970s, as an interest in undersea resources mounted, Tokdo's ownership emerged as a diplomatic issue. In the 1990s, the question of Tokdo has once again flared up between the two countries, since Japan's interest in Tokdo is becoming keener in connection with boundaries for the exclusive economic zone (EEZ).

Both Korea and Japan have conducted research on Tokdo for quite a long time, and both countries have presented the findings of their research based on historic records and topographical surveys, each claiming Tokdo as its own territory. Korea basically takes a position that Tokdo cannot become an object of territorial dispute since it is clearly an inherent Korean territory, and therefore, Tokdo has not become a subject of serious intensive research. That is why Korea has not outdone Japan in research although there are a considerable number of historical materials on Tokdo in Korea. But, lately, interdisciplinary studies are being encouraged and conducted, from historical study to international law. Even the studies from philological, archeological, topographical, and ecological vantage points are being attempted now.<sup>2</sup>

On the other hand, Japan had set up a team of researchers at its Foreign Ministry and at the Liberal Democratic Party in the 1960s

- 
1. Kawakami Kenzo, *Takeshima no rekishi chirigaku teki kenkyu* (Historical and Geographical Study of Takeshima) (Tokyo: Kinko Shoin, 1966); Okuma Ryoichi, *Takeshima shiko* (Historical Study of Takeshima) (Tokyo: Hara Shobo 1968).
  2. Han'guk kundaesa charyo yon'gu hyophoe (Society for Study of Materials on Modern History of Korea) ed., *Study of Tokdo* (Seoul: 1985); Yang T'ae-jin, *Han'guk pyŏn'gyŏngsa yŏn'gu* (Study on the History of Korean Borderland) (Seoul: Popkyŏng Publishing Co. 1989); Lee Han-ki, *Han'guk ūi yŏng'o ch'widuke taehan kukchaebopchŏk yŏn'gu* (Study on Korea Territory: Acquisition of Territory under International Law) (Seoul: Seoul National University Press, 1969); Park Kwan-sook, *Tokdoŭi popchŏk chiwie kwanhan yŏn'gu* (Study on Legal Status of Tokdo) (Ph.D. dissertation) (Seoul: Yonsei University, 1968); Shin Yong-ha, "Chosŏn

and set them to work on Tokdo exclusively.<sup>3</sup> The results of the research are being used to argue that Tokdo did not belong to either country, by emphasizing the confusion of the names of Ullŭngdo and Tokdo, ambiguity of its location, and its uninhabitability. Besides, by stressing the Japanese sea maps showing Ullŭngdo and Tokdo made in the 17th century, Japan claims that Japan has effectively managed these islands. But, some research by the Japanese side has revealed that considerable parts of the historical records of the two countries were arbitrarily interpreted to back up the Japanese government's claim.<sup>4</sup> A large number of the Japanese research findings are not necessarily reliable.

Without reflecting on its past history, the Japanese government distorts historical facts and claims its ownership of Tokdo on a basis which is shaky under international law. This is giving rise to a growing concern about the development of Korea-Japan relations which should be based on mutual trust on the eve of building an Asian economic community in the 21st century.

In order to dispell such apprehension, it is necessary to examine the problem of Tokdo during the late Chosŏn period and how the knowledge of Tokdo is being disputed by drawing on the existing research results and by complementing them with materials from the Japanese side, as well as the background for the Japanese perception of territoriality.

---

*wangjoŭi tokdo yŏngyuwa ilbon jaegukchuiŭi tokdo ch'imryak* (Chosŏn Dynasty's Possession of Tokdo & Aggression of Tokdo by Japanese Imperialism), *Han'guk tongnip undongsa yon'gu* (Study on the History of Korea Independence Movement) Vol. 3, (Seoul: Han'guk tongnip undongsa yŏn'guhoe.) (Center for the Research of the History of Korean Independence Movement), 1987.

3. Kawakami *op. cit.*; Okuma, *op. cit.*

4. Kajimura Hideki "Takeshima/Tokdo mondaito nihonkokka (Takeshima/Tokdo Issue & Japan)", *Chosen Kenkyu* (Study of Korea), No. 182, Sept. 1979; *Chosen-shito nihonjin* (History of Korea & Japanese) (Tokyo: Akashi Shoten, 1992); Hori Kazuo, "1905 nen nihonno takeshima ryodo hennyu (Japan's Incorporation of Tokdo into Its Territory in 1905)", *Chosenshi kenkyu ronbunshu* (Collection of Articles on Korean History), No. 24, 1987.

## II. Knowledge of Ullŭngdo and Tokdo in Documentary Records

There are many points of dispute over Tokdo between Korea and Japan. First, one could claim the ownership by inquiring into the distance of Tokdo from a country. Also, a geological approach as to whether Tokdo is on the same Paektu volcanic range as Ullŭngdo could also become a point of dispute.<sup>5</sup> The approach to the issue from international law could also be made. However, what is important is which country first came to know the existence of the island called Tokdo and has managed it. Because of a confusion of the names of Tokdo and different interpretation of the same historical materials, the question now boils down to whether or not Tokdo is an islet appendant to Ullŭngdo.

As for the names of Ullŭngdo which became an issue, Korean historical records show that it was variably called Usan'guk, Ullŭngsŏng, Mullŭngdo, Ullŭngdo, Sambongdo, while Japan called it Isotakeshima or Takeshima. As for the name of Tokdo, it is first shown in a document in 1904<sup>6</sup> when the Japanese Navy sent a warship to Ullŭngdo to survey Tokdo to build an observation tower there during the Russo-Japanese War. Before that, it was called Chasando, Usando, Sambongdo, etc. in Korea while Japan called it Matsushima. Ullŭngdo was also called Usando. So, the Japanese side claims that Usando and Ullŭngdo were the two names for Ullŭngdo in the historical records of Korea and argues that Ullŭngdo is the only island belonging to Uljin prefecture.<sup>7</sup>

5: Kajimura Hideki, *ibid.*

6. The name "Tokdo" first appears in the Japanese naval report, *the Logbook of Warship Niikata's Operation*. An entry dated September 25, 1904 states: "Koreans call Liancourt Rocks Tokdo, and Japanese fishermen use the shortened form of Liangoto." In Korea, the name was first used in an official report by Ullŭngdo County magistrate Sim Hung-t'aek's report to the Bureau of External Affairs of the Uijŏngbu.

Korea had enforced a vacant island policy since King T'aejong until the end of the Chosŏn dynasty for Ullŭngdo and its surrounding islets. As the interest in Ullŭngdo and Tokdo waned, even the Korean government was often confused about the names of the two islands and their locations. However, at the time of implementing the vacant island policy, the Korean government positively acknowledged the existence of Tokdo, in addition to Ullŭngdo, the sources and historical materials acknowledging and treating Tokdo as the islets belonging to Ullŭngdo have been found in number.

First of all, the earliest record on Tokdo off the Korean Peninsula is found in *Silla pongi* (History of Silla Kings) and *Yoljon* (Biographies), both in the *Samguk sagi* (History of the Three Kingdoms), the former on the part on King Chijung (512 A.D.) and the latter on Isabu. These books state: "In the 13th year of King Chijung, in the summer of June, Usan'guk was subjugated. Usan'guk is an island in the middle of the sea due east of Myŏngju, and it is called Ullŭngdo."

It is not clear, however, from these records whether Usando mentioned here means only Ullŭngdo or includes Tokdo. Tokdo was called Matsushima during Japan's Edo era and Takeshima nowadays.

However, the fact that people lived on Usan'guk could be traced archeologically from the end of the 5th century to the beginning of the 6th century. If one assumes that people had lived on Usan'guk for nearly 900 years until the Chosŏn dynasty took the policy of the vacant island, it is quite reasonable to believe that the

---

7. Ullŭngdo and Tokdo were called by various names in Chosŏn, Japan and Western countries. Particularly, in the case of Japan, as the Tokugawa Shogunate government banned voyage to Ullŭngdo, interest in Ullŭngdo waned, but a growing interest in the development of Ullŭngdo was shown again by the Japanese merchants going to Vladivostok, Russia in the last period of the Shogunate government and early period of the Meiji government. In the process, the names of the two islands became confused.

inhabitants of those days were aware of Tokdo's existence, although there are no records about it.

The existence of Tokdo appeared in the documentary records of the Chosŏn period, and it is certain that the Chosŏn government knew about Tokdo as an island separate from Ullŭngdo early in the 15th century at the latest. In 1407 (7th year of King T'aejong), the lord of Tsushima So Sadashige asked the Chosŏn government to allow a mass emigration to Ullŭngdo.<sup>8</sup> This made the Chosŏn dynasty to pay attention to Ullŭngdo, and the dynasty acknowledged the existence of a small island (Tokdo) near Ullŭngdo.<sup>9</sup> In 1425 (7th year of King Sejong), when Kim In-u was dispatched to evacuate people from Ullŭngdo, he was given the title Commissioner for "Pacification (Anmusa) of Usan-Mullŭng," which proves that the vacant island policy was meant for both Ullŭngdo and Tokdo.

The *Chiriji* (Gazetteer) in the *Sejong Sillok* (Annals of King Sejong) records in the section on Uljin prefecture:

The two islands of Usan and Mullŭng are located in the middle of the sea due east of Uljin, and the distance between the two islands is not so far that they are visible from each other on a clear day.

This proves that the Chosŏn dynasty certainly had knowledge of the two islands of Usando (Tokdo) and Mullŭngdo (Ullŭngdo) belonging to Uljin. Chang Han-sang who explored Ullŭngdo in 1694 (20th year of King Sukchong) reports: "There was an island in the middle of the sea when I looked eastward, and it is situated far in the direction of southeast, and is less than one third of Ullŭngdo and the distance is barely 300 *ri* [92 Km]." This proves that Tokdo is located within a visible distance.<sup>10</sup>

The *Sinjung tongguk yŏji sŭngnam* (Augmented Survey of the

8. *Annals of King T'aejong*, 7th year, March.

9. *Ibid.*, 16th year, September.

10. Shin Kwang-bak, *Ullŭngdo sajok* (Historical Remains of Ullŭngdo).

Geography of Korea) compiled in 1531 during the reign of King Chungjong, states in the section on Uljin, Kangwŏndo (Volume 45):

Usan-do and Ullŭngdo are also called Mullŭng and Ullŭng. The two islands are situated in the middle of the sea due east of Uljin, three peaks rise into the skies, and the southern peak is low. One theory has it that Usan and Ullŭng were originally one island.

This record shows that Usando (Tokdo) and Ullŭngdo belonged administratively to Uljin county of Kangwŏndo Province in the territory of Korea, and that Usando (Tokdo) is definitely attached to Ullŭngdo. This is more realistically illustrated as the two islands are drawn in the complete map of the country of eight provinces in the *Augmented Survey of the Geography of Korea* although their locations are incorrect.

Above all, the book mentions the fact that Ulsan fisherman An Yong-bok went to the Japanese prefectures of Hokishu and Inbashu to make sure that the two islands of Ullŭng and Usan (Tokdo) were Korean territory and that the Japanese side handed him letters acknowledging Chosŏn's territorial ownership of the two islands.

Besides, the relationship of Tokdo and Ullŭngdo is confirmed in the writings of the Sirhak (practical learning) scholars. Chŏng Yak-yong writes in his book, *Yŏyudang chŏnjip* (Complete works of Yŏyudang) by quoting *Tongguk munhŏn pigo* (Reference Compilation of Documents on Korea) that Japan called Ullŭngdo Ito-takeshima and Usan, Matsushima, and makes it clear that the two islands belonged to Uljin. Yi Ik writes in the *Sŏngho sasŏl* (Collected Works of Sŏngho) that Ullŭngdo products included lamp-light oil extracted from sea lions inhabiting Tokdo, thus acknowledging that the adjacent island belonged to Ullŭngdo. The *Man'gi yoram* (Handbook of State Affairs) published in 1809, very clearly records the Ullŭngdo-Tokdo relationship by saying that "according

to *Yojiji* (Gazetteer), both Ullŭngdo and Usando are the lands of Usan'guk, and Usando is called Matsushima by Japanese."

Putting these descriptions together, one can find that Usan'guk consisted of the two islands of Ullŭngdo and Usando (Tokdo or Matsushima) and that Usando was attached to Ullŭngdo; thus Korea's knowledge of the existence of Tokdo has historically a very old origin.<sup>11</sup> These facts can be confirmed by the records of the Japanese side. The *Onshu shicho goki* (Records on Observations in Oki Province) is the earliest record on the existence of Tokdo in Japan. This book was written by Saito Hosen of Izumoshu after inspecting Oki island in 1667 under orders from his feudal lord. It says that Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) and Matsushima (Tokdo) are uninhabited and viewing Koryo (Korea) from there is like looking at Oki from Onshu. He makes it clear in the book that Ullŭngdo and Tokdo are Korea's territory and that Japan's north-west boundary is Oki.

As seen in the records, Korea's knowledge of the existence of Tokdo is at least two centuries earlier than that of Japan's and even in this book, it is made clear that Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) and Matsushima (Tokdo) are separate and are the territory of Korea. But, by citing the notes on the Uljin in the *Augmented Survey of the*

---

11. The references on Ullŭngdo and Tokdo include the following: "Chedo (Various Islands)" in *Yŏllyŏsil kisel* (Narratives of Yŏllyŏsil) by Yi Kŭng-ik (1736-1806) (Seoul: Chosŏn kwangmun hoe, 1914), special ed. Vol. 17; *Chaptongsani* (Miscellany), *Haero* (Seaways), *Sunam sŏnsaeng munjp* (Collection of Master Sunam's Writings) by An Chŏng-bok (1712-1791) Vol. 7; "*Haejung taedo* (Large Islands)," *Sanghŏn's Essays*; *Ullŭngdo saan* (A Survey of Ullŭngdo) by Tasan Chŏng Yak-yong. (1762-1836); *Ch'un'gwanji* (Case Studies of Rites) (Seoul: Office of Legislation, 1976), originally edited by Yi Maeng-hyu of the Ministry of Rites in 1744; Kim Chi-nam, ed., *T'ongmun'gwanji* (Annals of the Bureau of the Translators of Foreign Languages) (Seoul: Minch'ang Publishing Co., 1989), originally published in 1720; Ministry of Rites (Chosŏn), ed., *Pyonye chipyo* (Case Studies of Negotiations with Japan) (Seoul: Kuksa p'yonch'an wiwŏnhoe (National History Compilation Committee, NHCC hereafter, 1970), covering the period from 15th King Sŏnjo (1567-1608) to the 23rd King Sunjo (1800-1834) of the dynasty of Chosŏn.



*Geography Korea* which says "one theory has it that Usan and Ullŭng were originally the same island," some Japanese scholars argue that Ullŭngdo and Usan are different only in names but in reality the same and one island, and deny that Tokdo is attached to Ullŭngdo. Backed up by some topographical surveys and complicated mathematical formula, they argue that Tokdo is not within the distance of visibility from Ullŭngdo.<sup>12</sup> However, this claim is criticized even in Japan as a distorted interpretation of the historical data. First, to pay attention to and emphasize a footnote rather than the text itself is to make a mistake in treating the materials. In this vein, the Japanese claim to Tokdo by separating it from Ullŭngdo is criticized as an example of having damaged the reliability of Korea's historical materials.

Therefore, the sentence that "one theory has it that Usan and Ullŭng were originally the same island" in the *Augmented Survey of the Geography of Korea* should not be considered as denoting the two different names of the same island, but two entirely different islands, with Usan (Tokdo) attached to Ullŭng.

### III. Chosŏn's Management of Ullŭngdo and Tokdo

In the Chosŏn period, many of the inhabitants on the east coast went to Ullŭngdo to dodge military service and corvée labor and engaged in farming and fishing there. The Chosŏn dynasty enforced a policy of vacant island out of fear that an inhabited Ullŭngdo might tempt the Japanese marauders who had been rampant then.

In 1416 (16th year of King T'aejong), King T'aejong sent a native of Samch'ŏk named Kim In-u to Ullŭngdo as Ammusa (Commissioner for Pacification) to bring the people back inland.<sup>13</sup>

12. Kawakami, *op. cit.*, Okuma, *op. cit.*

13. *Annals of King T'aejong*, 16th year, September.

When Kim was on Ullŭngdo, he found a total of 86 people in 15 dwellings there. Of them only three returned, but habitation on Ullŭngdo was banned in principle.<sup>14</sup> The vacant island policy does not mean dereliction of Ullŭngdo, but Ullŭngdo and other islands off the southwest coast were managed as vacant islands by a necessary external policy. The policy was inherited by Chosŏn dynasty's successive kings after King T'aejong. When Kim In-u was sent again to Ullŭngdo in 1425 (7th year of King Sejong), his title was "Commissioner for Usan-Mullŭng," thus including Tokdo and Ullŭngdo in the target areas of the policy.<sup>15</sup> Despite the policy the people continued to live on Ullŭngdo. When the problem of Japanese pirate raids had settled down to a certain degree in 1457 (third year of King Sejo), there was even talk of establishing an ŭp (county) in Ullŭngdo and Usan (Tokdo).<sup>16</sup> It was actually impossible for the Chosŏn dynasty to found a new county, but as there were fears of the Japanese occupying the island, if it were left vacant, the government sent officials there regularly for inspection tours. From that time on, explorations and surveys on Ullŭngdo and Tokdo were conducted until the end of the Chosŏn period even on an irregular basis, and that can be confirmed by the *Annals of the Dynasty of Chosŏn*.

However, due to the implementation of the vacant island policy, the government's interest in Ullŭngdo and Tokdo waned and after the Hideyoshi invasion, the government was too busy with the post-war rehabilitation to attend to Ullŭngdo and Tokdo. In connection with the vacant island policy, an important event occurred in 1612 (4th year of King Kwanghaegun), when the lord of Tsushima So Yoshitoshi sent three Japanese ships with his letter to Tongnae magistrate Yun Su-gyŏm with the intention of surveying the topography of Isotakeshima.<sup>17</sup> There exists no record of the letter,

14. *Ibid.*, 17th year, February.

15. *Annals of King Sejong*, 7th year, August.

16. *Annals of King Sejo*, 3rd year, April.

but Isotakeshima appears to refer to Ullŭngdo as the Japanese are said to have argued that the island was Japan's boundary, situated in the middle of Kyŏngsangdo and Kangwŏndo. The Chosŏn court then delivered an official letter in the name of Tongnae magistrate to Tsushima in July 1614, emphasizing that Isotakeshima was Ullŭngdo as was already known in the Korean book, *Augmented Survey of the Geography of Korea*. In addition, the letter pointed out that the island was no place for other people to occupy even if it was evacuated then, as the island had been sending staple products to the royal court as tributes ever since the days of Silla and Koryo, and the government was bringing back the deserters inland. The letter added that since Tsushima was the sole channel for negotiations between Chosŏn and Japan, all the ships coming to Chosŏn from other places would be treated as pirates, irrespective of whether they were castaways or not and requested that the matter be brought to the attention of the Shogunate government.<sup>18</sup> This shows that Chosŏn held a firm belief that Ullŭngdo was its territory and that it formally requested Japan through a diplomatic note to ban any passage to Ullŭngdo by Japanese ships or nationals.<sup>19</sup>

After that, there is no record available allowing Korean people to move to Ullŭngdo to resettle, and it seems the vacant island policy had been in force until the question of territorial ownership of Ullŭngdo emerged again during the reign of King Sukchong in

17. Hayashi Akira, *Tsuko ichiran* (A Survey of Navigation), section on Chosŏn 113 (Takeshima) (Tokyo: Nihon kokusho kankokai [Japan Archives Publishing Society] 1971), pp. 21-33; *Sinjung tongguk yŏji sŭngnam* (Augmented Survey of the Geography of Korea: ASGK); gazetteer in the *Chŭngbo munhŏn pigo* (Reference Compilation of Documents on Korea: RCDK), Vol. 45 (Uljin prefecture) (Seoul: Minjok munhwa ch'ujin wiwŏnhoe [National Culture Promotion Association, 1971]; *Yŏllyŏsil kisul*, *op. cit.*; *Pyonye chipyo*, *op. cit.*, Vol. 17 (Ullŭngdo).
18. ASGK, Vol. 45 (Uljin prefecture); RCDK, *op. cit.*; *Pyonye chipyo*, *op. cit.*; *Zenrin tsusho: Manreki nenchu tsuko hennen* (Good Neighborly Communication: Annals of Japan-Korea Relations during the Manreki Period (1573-1619), A Survey of Navigation, *ibid.*
19. *The Diary of King Kwanghaegun*, 6th year, September.

1693. However, Chosŏn's vacant island policy led Japan to dispute the Korean claim to the islands as it perceived Ullŭngdo and Tokdo as uninhabited islands.

#### **IV. Territorial Dispute over Ullŭngdo (Takeshima) and Tokdo (Matsushima) in 1693**

Despite the vacant island policy, Koreans secretly sailed to Ullŭngdo and Tokdo for logging and fishing, but they did not settle down. The old records show some examples of Koreans going to Ullŭngdo without government knowledge to earn a livelihood. Particularly, the fishermen of Kyŏngsangdo frequented there, and even those of Chŏllado seemed to have gone there for fishing while the boats were made with the lumber, logged there. When ginseng was found on Ullŭngdo in the late Chosŏn period, the people of Kyŏngju went there to gather them, according to some records. The existence of Ullŭngdo and Tokdo became known to Japan much later in the 17th century.

Ullŭngdo seems to have been known to the Japanese as an uninhabited island abundant with various resources including bamboo when they accidentally went adrift to the island while fishing. Japan called Ullŭngdo Takeshima (Bamboo Island) or Isotakeshima, and even after Chosŏn formally banned passage to Ullŭngdo (Takeshima) by the Japanese, some Japanese made passage to the island. The Japanese side argues that the voyages to Ullŭngdo (Takeshima) by the Japanese were not conducted on a regular basis but were not interrupted for 80 years after 1618. Japan also maintains that sailings to Tokdo (Matsushima) increased after 1661, too, and used this fact as a proof that Japan effectively managed the two uninhabited islands while Chosŏn was implementing its vacant island policy.<sup>20</sup> This claim leaves some room for examination. At any rate, there were possibilities of clashes taking place among the

Koreans and Japanese logging and fishing. A typical example was the one between a fisherman An Yong-bok from Ulsan and his crew and the Japanese from Hokishu in 1693. This did not end as a simple clash but developed into a friction over territorial and fishing rights and provided momentum for Chosŏn to reawaken its interest in Ullŭngdo and Tokdo to which it had been indifferent.

Details of the incident are as follows: In 1693, An Yong-bok went out to the sea with 40 fishermen and drifted into Ullŭngdo to find there the Japanese merchants (the Otanis and Murakawas) from Yonagomura in Hokishu (Tottori prefecture today). A clash occurred between them in the course of which An Yong-bok and Pak Ŏ-dun, who spoke some Japanese, were taken hostage by the Japanese. An Yong-bok protested to the Shogunate government through the magistrate of Hokishu that Ullŭngdo (Takeshima) was Chosŏn's territory, and the magistrate had to ask the Shogunate government for instruction on An's case. The Shogunate issued an instruction to bring An and Pak to Nagasaki, where Tsushima authorities took them over and repatriated them to Chosŏn, accompanied by two Tsushima emissaries, Tachibana Saneshige and Tadayo Saemon, in December 1693.<sup>21</sup>

These emissaries came not just to return the ordinary drifters, but brought with them an official letter addressed to the Vice Minister of Rites.

The letter proved to contain important information that claimed Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) as Japan's. It said that Koreans frequently came to Japan's Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) to engage in fishing and logging and that the two men being turned over at the time were taken hostage by the magistrate of Hokishu from among 40 Koreans found off Takeshima. The letter went on to say that they were sent to Edo and that they were being repatriated. Then, the letter asked the Chosŏn government to issue an ordinance to the

---

20. Kawakami, *op. cit.*; Okuma, *op. cit.*

21. *Annals of King Sukchong*, 20th year, February.

out-of-the way fishing harbors in Korea to keep Koreans from going to Takeshima for fishing.<sup>22</sup> The official letter brought by the Tsushima envoys in behalf of the Shogunate government made assertions as if Takeshima existed on the East Sea as an island different from Ullŭngdo and Korean fishing activities at Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) would be considered illegal. Thus, it eventually claimed Ullŭngdo as belonging to Japan which had the fishing rights there. After receiving this letter, the Chosŏn government discussed possible counteractions. But, having experienced a ravaging war with Japan, Korea was concerned about a possible clash with Japan and decided to write a reply to Japan stating that Ullŭngdo was a Korean territory, but fishing by Koreans would be banned off Takeshima. The reply Minister Kwŏn Kae sent to the lord of Tsushima reads in part:

Our country has been strict on voyages abroad and forbidden our fishermen from going out to the ocean. Even voyages to our territory of Ullŭngdo are not permitted as it is too far. How would they be allowed to go outside of our boundary?

We are grateful for your gesture of good neighborliness in taking the trouble of returning the boat which had ventured into your territory of Takeshima.

The fishermen are making a living by fishing and could suffer the hardship of drifting by storms. But their act of crossing over the sea and penetrating deeper will be duly punished by law. Punishment will be meted out to these criminals by law now.<sup>23</sup>

Tsushima raised a suspicion as to why Chosŏn referred to the island as "our territory of Ullŭngdo" and feared that the Shogunate

22. *Annals of King Sukchong*, 20th year, February. *Pyonye chipyo* vol. 17 Ullŭngdo; Ministry of Rites (Chosŏn), ed., *P'yoin yŏngnae tŭngnok* (Report on Repatriation of Korean Castaways from Japan) (Seoul: Kyujanggak Library, Seoul Nat. Univ., 1993), pp. 70-82.

23. *Annals of King Sukchong*, 20th year, February. *P'yonye chipyo*, *op. cit.*; *A Survey of Navigation*, *op. cit.*

government would heavily punish the lord of Tsushima if these words were not deleted from the Korean letter. The lord of Tsushima asked Chosŏn to state only Takeshima and cross out the words in question.<sup>24</sup> Tachibana Saneshige who came to repatriate An Yong-bok in 1693 was again sent to Chosŏn with an order to negotiate on the revision of the letter.

At first, Tachibana hesitated to go to Chosŏn because he knew the "Sorŏn" faction was in power and Nam Ku-man advocated a hard-line policy on Japan and recommended King Sukchong not to make a concession on Ullŭngdo to Japan. Meanwhile, the Chosŏn government reached the conclusion that the Japanese demand to delete the words "our territory of Ullŭngdo" was aimed at eventual occupation of the island and recommended King Sukchong to punish the Japanese taking a voyage to Ullŭngdo.<sup>25</sup> Besides, a proposal to set up a garrison on Ullŭngdo was discussed for fear that the regions of Kangnŭng and Samch'ŏk would suffer if Japan occupied Ullŭngdo.<sup>26</sup> Chang Han-sang was made associate commander of Samch'ŏk and sent to Ullŭngdo to prepare for a garrison setup.<sup>27</sup> At the center of the discussions were Nam Ku-man and Yun Chi-wan who belonged to the "Sorŏn" faction and took a hardline policy on Japan rather than a policy of appeasement.

The negotiations for revision of the Chosŏn's reply had not been as smooth as Tachibana had predicted. Chosŏn decided to revoke the first reply and prepared the second one in the name of Yi Yŏ, Vice Minister of Rites. The gist of the letter follows:

Ullŭng is located in the middle of the sea east of Uljin, and the seaway is inconvenient due to the danger of heavy seas. Therefore, the inhabitants have been withdrawn and the island is now vacant, but officials are often dispatched there for search. The mountains and

---

24. *Ibid.*

25. *Annals of King Sukjong*, 20th year August; *Pyonye chipyo*, *op. cit.*

26. *Annals of King Sukchong*, 20th year July.

27. *Ibid.*, August.

rivers are meandering, and the topography is irregular, becoming wide and narrow. The records about the relics of habitation and local staple products are all written down in the *Yōji sūngnam*, and they are also put down in the chronicles of successive generations. When fishermen of our country went to that island, they met unexpectedly your countrymen who had trespassed on our boundary arbitrarily and they clashed with one another. Two Koreans were seized perversely and taken to Edo, but fortunately thanks to the kind consideration of Your Honor they have been repatriated, for which we are grateful. It is off the shore and on Ullūngdo in our country where fishing and logging were done. As bamboo is grown there, the island is also called Takeshima (Bamboo Island), and the names are different, but they refer to the same island. The fact that it is the same island with two different names is recorded in the books of our country, and the people of your province are fully aware of it. Isn't the morality of sincerity and trust breached when you have not taken up the misconduct of trespassing on our boundary and, arresting Chosŏn people, while claiming Takeshima as your territory in the letter and trying to have Chosŏn ban fishing boats? It is hoped that this matter be reported to the Shogunate government and that your people on the coastal areas be warned not to cause any further incident by sailing to Ullūngdo.<sup>28</sup>

In other words, the second reply is much tougher compared to the first one as it points out that Ullūngdo is an island located in the middle of the sea east of Uljin in Kangwŏndo, and Ullūngdo and Takeshima are only different in name but in reality are the same island, thus making it clear that Ullūngdo belongs to Chosŏn and demanding the Japanese be banned from coming to Ullūngdo and fishing there.<sup>29</sup>

The lord of Tsushima, So Yoshitsugu, however, rejected Chosŏn's reply for fear of reprimand by the Shogunate government

---

28. *Ibid.*,

29. *Ibid.*,



Protocol officer Yu Chip-il and the interpreter who had come down from Hansŏng (Seoul) to Tongnae to meet the Japanese envoy had to return as they were unable to fulfil the order of the court to hand the reply to the envoy and entertain him.<sup>30</sup> As Tachibana had expected, on the expurgation of the words from the first letter the negotiations had not been resolved until the next year in June 1695, due to the hardline policy of Chosŏn. So, Tsushima decided to send a renowned theoretician in Kyushu, Suyama Akira (Suyama Shouemon), together with Tachibana, to negotiate the revision of the note. Suyama submitted a note to the Tongnae magistrate asking why Chosŏn was refusing to revise the letter and requested the note be forwarded to the court in May 1695. However, Chosŏn continued rebutting it by citing the old books which showed that Ullŭngdo had belonged to Chosŏn since the vacant island policy was implemented 82 years before in 1614.<sup>31</sup>

The emissaries from Tsushima objected to the reply by the Chosŏn side and threatened a war against Chosŏn. They also planned to stage a mass demonstration in front of the Pusan garrison commander or Tongnae magistrate.<sup>32</sup> But, the Chosŏn side did

---

30. *Pyonye chipyo*, *op. cit.*

31. *Annals of King Sukchong*, 21st year, June.

32. The port of Choryang at Pusan'ŏ, Tongnae was the only place allowed for Japanese to engage in exchange and trade between Chosŏn and Japan. For this purpose, Tongnae-bu played a role of the Korea's contact point with Japan, and Tsushima that of Japan with Korea. Tsushima sent the *kanshu* (館守) and lower ranking officials to waegwan (Japan House) in Pusan to conduct negotiations, but the magistrate of Tongnae-bu and the head of waegwan (*kanshu*) did not negotiate directly. Tongnae-bu usually sent its interpreters to waegwan to receive letters from the Japanese side, to be delivered to the Chosŏn government. In most cases, many days were needed for negotiations and it was difficult for the Tsushima side to have its wishes put into action promptly. That was why they often resorted to an emergency means called "ranshutsu" to push through their business. "Ranshutsu" was an act of mass demonstration by the Japanese who broke out of waegwan without permission and marched to the Pusan garrison or Tongnae-bu to demand a meeting with the magistrate, and this was a method of negotiation the Chosŏn side disliked most. *Pyonye chipyo* devotes one complete volume (vol. 13) to the cases

not give in and confronted them saying that the matter would be negotiated directly with the Shogunate government when the Korean embassy was dispatched to Japan. As the dispute over Ullŭngdo could not find a settlement, So Yoshizane who was the guardian of the lord of Tsushima So Yoshimichi, shifted from the hard-line stance and reported to the Roju (Senior Councilor) Abe, Lord of Bungo, of the Shogunate government that the negotiations on the case of Takeshima were experiencing difficulties and asked for instructions on the future handling of the case in October 1695. The Shogunate government started its own probe and in January 1696 conducted a question-and-answer session with lord So of Tsushima, who came to pay a courtesy call on the Shogun, in the presence of the the magistrate of Hokishu on the problem of Takeshima (Ullŭngdo).<sup>33</sup> As a result, the Shogunate government finally sent to Hokishu and Tsushima an official letter in the name of the Roju in January 1696. The official letter contained the following instructions:

#### Historical Data 1

Takeshima is said to belong to Inbashu, but the Japanese people had not ever lived there. At the time of Itokukun, Tokugawa Iemitsu the third Shogun, the merchants of Yonagomura wanted to go there for fishing, and permission was given. Geographically, the island is located at 160 *ri* (390 miles) from Inbashu, whereas it is only at 40 (98 miles) from Chosŏn. Therefore, it is undoubtedly Chosŏn's territory. The country could settle the matter by military power, but it is not our policy to impair the good-neighborly relations over a useless, small island. From the beginning, that island was never taken from Chosŏn by force, and it does not make sense [for Chosŏn] to turn it over to us. The only thing to do is to prohibit permanently the

---

of "ranshutsu."

33. Shin Yong-ha, "Tokdo chugwŏn: sahwŏl kŏllin munjaeida" (Sovereignty over Tokdo: a Life-and Death Issue), *Sindonga* vol. 439, 1996, p. 596.

Japanese people from going there for fishing. Therefore, this should be communicated to Chosŏn.<sup>34</sup>

From this we know that the problem of Chosŏn's territorial ownership of Ullŭngdo and its fishing rights were confirmed in the official letter of the Shogunate in 1696. Chosŏn planned to send an official translator to Tsushima on a courtesy call in October 1696, while Tsushima intended to make known the Shogunate's decision on Chosŏn's ownership of Takeshima (Ullŭngdo).

However, an unexpected incident occurred in the summer of 1696. As the dispute on Ullŭngdo was not settled down promptly due to Tsushima's refusal to accept the letter, An Yong-bok decided to personally resolve the problem of the Japanese trespassing and fishing at Ullŭngdo. A group of 11 Koreans led by An Yong-bok went to Inbashi (present Tottori prefecture) and Hokishu (Tottori prefecture) via Ullŭngdo and Tokdo (Matsushima), and appealed directly to the Shogunate government that Ullŭngdo (Takeshima) and Tokdo (Matsushima) were Chosŏn's territory.

This took place when An Yong-bok gathered his fishermen and went to Ullŭngdo in the spring of 1696 and found some Japanese fishing boats moored at the island.

An Yong-bok decried the Japanese: "How could foreigners intrude into Ullŭngdo that is Chosŏn's inherent land?" Then the Japanese replied: "We live in Matsushima originally, but strayed into here while fishing, so we will return to our place." An Yong-bok again reproved them that "Matsushima is Chasando (Usando, Tokdo) and it is also Chosŏn's land."

According to a historical record, when An went to Usando (Tokdo) the following day, the Japanese had installed a cauldron and were cooking fish. An Yong-bok destroyed it with sticks and blamed the Japanese, who took the boat to return to their country.<sup>35</sup>

---

34. *A Survey of Navigation*, *op. cit.*

35. *Annals of King Sukchong*, Sukchong 22nd year, September.

Then An Yong-bok and his party went directly to Inbashu via Oki and protested against the Japanese voyage to Ullŭng and Usan. They falsely told Inbashu authorities that they were tax inspectors for Ullŭng-Usan. They forged a government note of protest and asked Inbashu authorities to transmit it to the Shogunate government so that illegal Japanese crossing to Ullŭngdo could be banned. A Chosŏn record states that Inbashu authorities pledged to punish those trespassing on Ullŭngdo and Tokdo and any usurpation by the lord of Tsushima over the question, if and when the Chosŏn government brought such a case or cases to the attention of Japan in an official note via an official translator. However, under Japan's Shogunate government structure, Inbashu and Hokishu were in no position to make unilaterally such a pledge without consultation with the government. Therefore, Inbashu inquired of the Shogunate on how to deal with An Yong-bok's protest, and the Shogunate informed the lord of Tsushima of An Yong-bok's second visit to Japan and instructed the lord to probe the matter. Tsushima harbored doubts about the intention of the Chosŏn government which failed to keep negotiations with Japan from being conducted through a channel other than Tsushima even if An Yong-bok was not an envoy of the Chosŏn government.

Chosŏn had recognized Tsushima as the sole channel of contact with Japan since the conclusion of the 1443 agreement during the reign of King Sejong. That was reconfirmed by the 1609 agreement signed after the Hideyoshi invasion. Tsushima was gaining many economic benefits from Chosŏn as the intermediary in diplomatic intercourse between Chosŏn and Japan. In this position, Tsushima also could monopolize profits from trade with Chosŏn. Tsushima became sensitive to An Yong-bok's second entry into Japan, since the Chosŏn's direct contact with the Shogunate government was tantamount to depriving Tsushima of its vested rights.

At that time, some officials in the Chosŏn government had a suspicion of Tsushima. They did not believe that Tsushima's per-

sistent demand for the revision of the letter was based on instructions from the Shogunate government.

They believed that Tsushima was making the Shogunate government blur its judgment, by equivocating over Ullŭngdo and Takeshima as two separate islands, and that it was a manifestation of its excessive loyalty towards the Shogunate government.

In fact, there is a sentence in the official note to the Ministry of Rites by the Tsushima emissary in the course of repatriating An Yong-bok, which reads: "Your fishermen engaged in fishing off our country's Takeshima."<sup>36</sup> Of course, this note was prepared under the instruction of the Shogunate government.

In the official document, however, there is a passage which raises suspicion that the lord of Tsushima treated Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) as Japan's although he knew that Takeshima was Korean territory.

A report on the investigation of An Yong-bok by the Tongnae magistrate shows that An received from the Hokishu magistrate a letter saying that "Ullŭng is not Japanese territory." When An and his party went to Nagasaki to clear the procedures for repatriation to Chosŏn, the letter was taken away by the Nagasaki magistrate who was close to the lord of Tsushima. At that time, the lord called Ullŭng "Takeshima" under a fake order from the Kanpaku (Imperial Regent) and often sent emissaries to Korea to argue this point. But in reality, it was not the Kanpaku's intention. Tsushima coveted Ullŭngdo which was abundant in fish and bamboo, and it feared that An Yong-bok might expose this to the Shogunate. Therefore, he was detained over 90 days before repatriation according to the record.<sup>37</sup> While An Yong-bok was clearing the formalities for repatriation, Tsushima prepared a document indicating that "our country's Takeshima" is different from Chosŏn's Takeshima (Ullŭngdo), although the Japanese already knew that Takeshima belonged to

---

36. *Ibid.*, 20th year, February.

37. *Ibid.*, August.

Chosŏn. In 1407 (7th year of King T'aejong), the lord of Tsushima So Sadashige proposed a mass immigration to Mullŭngdo (Ullŭngdo),<sup>38</sup> but was rejected by Chosŏn which wanted no dispute between the two countries over "the border crossing."

The lord of Tsushima should have known that Chosŏn banned voyages to Ullŭngdo. At the time of the An Yong-bok incident in 1693, Tsushima asked to delete the phrase "our territory of Ullŭngdo" for fear of reprimand from the Shogunate government. Actually, it did not make any inquiry to the Shogunate government on the matter.<sup>39</sup> In other words, if Chosŏn had accepted Tsushima's demand and deleted the words in question from the letter, Tsushima would have covered up the fact that Takeshima and Chosŏn's Ullŭngdo were the same island. It is also believed that the lord of Tsushima tried to have the Shogunate government acknowledge Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) as an uninhabited island different from Chosŏn's Ullŭngdo, and to ride on the coattails of Shogunate government's military power<sup>40</sup> and to convince the Shogunate<sup>41</sup> of his loyalty. In this way, he might have tried to obtain whatever gains he could from the Shogunate government.

This problem was eventually settled by the official letter from the Japanese government in 1696, which says in part that "from the beginning, that island was never taken from Chosŏn by force, and it does not make sense to say that it will be returned to Japan." It confirmed that Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) and Matsushima (Tokdo) were Chosŏn's inherent territory and that Japan had absolutely no intention of making a dispute over the islands.

Tsushima did not want the question of Ullŭngdo to become further complicated or to lose its lucrative position as intermediary between Korea and Japan. To that end, Tsushima negotiated with

---

38. *Annals of King T'aejong*, 7th year, March.

39. *A Survey of Navigation*, *op. cit.*

40. *Annals of King Sukchong*, 21st year, June.

41. *Ibid.*, 20th year, August.

the Shogunate not only to persuade An Yong-bok to withdraw his letter delivered through Inbashu, but also to repatriate the Koreans by treating them as castaways.

Consequently, the territorial dispute over Ullŭngdo and Tokdo raised by An Yong-bok and his party was withdrawn, and they were repatriated to Chosŏn as drifters.<sup>42</sup> When Pyŏn Tong-ji and Song P'an-sa were sent to Tsushima after the settlement, the lord informed them of the Shogunate decision on the Ullŭngdo affair, but lodged a protest against An Yong-bok's contact with Inbashu and demanded Chosŏn not to deal with any local authorities of Japan but Tsushima.<sup>43</sup>

Although the Japanese government's decision was already made in 1696, Chosŏn learned about it belatedly from the report of the mission by the two envoys who returned from Tsushima in 1697 and also from the communication of the Tongnae magistrate.<sup>44</sup>

Therefore, the official note from Chosŏn on the Ullŭngdo affair was sent to the kanshu (head) of the Japan House finally in April 1698, in the name of Councillor Yi Sŏn-bu of the Ministry of Rites.

"It is obvious from the maps that Ullŭngdo is a Korean territory. If you note that Ullŭngdo and Takeshima are different names for the same island, it is clear that the island is a Korean territory. It is fortunate to learn that you are going to issue a decree prohibiting your people permanently from going to Ullŭngdo for fishing. Chosŏn also plans to send officials there to prevent any trouble which the comings and goings of our two peoples might cause. No doubt the incident of the Chosŏn castaways last year (An Yong-bok incident) was caused by a typhoon, and they were duly punished."<sup>45</sup>

42. *Ibid.*, 22nd year, August.; *P'yoin yŏngnae tŭngnok* vol. 6; *Pyonye chipyo*, *op. cit.*

43. *A Survey of Navigation*, *op. cit.*

44. *Pyonye chipyo*, *op. cit.*

To this official note, Tsushima and the Shogunate government did not raise any further questions and the problem was settled under the agreement of the two countries.

After that, Chosŏn dispatched officials once every three years to Ullŭngdo and adjacent islands for inspection and search. In this way, Chosŏn managed Ullŭngdo and Tokdo regularly, except for the period of famine or other unavoidable circumstances.

But here, there is a question we should not overlook. Why did Japan decide to confirm Chosŏn's title to Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) in 1696, three years after it demanded the government to ban fishing off and voyages to the island by Koreans and claimed Ullŭngdo as Japan's Takeshima in 1693? Did "Takeshima" mentioned in the official letter by the Roju of the Shogunate government mean only Ullŭngdo or recognize Tokdo as an island attached to Ullŭngdo? On this point, there is a need to examine Hokishu's and Shogunate's knowledge of Ullŭngdo and Tokdo as well as the negotiating style of Tsushima on the question of Ullŭngdo.

First, Hokishu did not regard Ullŭngdo and Tokdo as Japanese territory, as was confirmed in the process of the Japanese investigation of the An Yong-bok case:

We heard that a dispute has arisen between Chosŏn and Japan over the island we went to last year. We have never gone to a Japanese island, but we went to Chosŏn's Ullŭngdo. The Japanese came and arrested us and took us to Hoki. People in Hokishu said "it is a laughable thing to seize Koreans who went to their own country and bring them here." We heard that the two Japanese who arrested us were punished while we were staying at Hoki. After that their treatment of us improved markedly and we were taken to Nagasaki by sedan chairs. At Hoki, a memorandum was written and given to us, stating that this island is the Korean territory, but we did not accept it as it was written by a low-ranking official.<sup>46</sup>

---

45. *Annals of King Sukchong*, 23rd year, February. *A Survey of Navigation*, *op. cit.*



When Tachibana Saneshige, the emissary from Tsushima, came to Korea again to ask for the revision of the reply, Chosŏn official translators Pak Tong-ji and Pak Ch'ŏm-ji quoted the above statement by An Yong-bok to refute him.

At the time of the Shogunate government's inquiry, Hokishu authorities knew that Takeshima meant Chosŏn's Ullŭngdo. This is revealed clearly by Hokishu punishment of the Japanese who had arrested and brought the Koreans from Ullŭngdo, and that derision was made by the people in Hoki for arresting and bringing Koreans who went to their own country.

Next, how did the Shogunate government react when in regard to the fishing and territorial rights of Ullŭngdo, Hokishu requested instructions from the government on the issue? The Shogunate government first summoned the Tsushima representative in Edo in May 1693, to inform him of the ban on Korean fishing off Takeshima (Ullŭngdo). When this incident became an issue between Chosŏn and Japan, the Japanese government appears to have taken an interest in the island of Takeshima (Ullŭngdo), and started its own inquiry into the matter. In May 1693, the Japanese government asked Hokishu about Takeshima's (Ullŭngdo) location, its seaways and fisheries, and ownership by Korea.

Hokishu's reply is as follows:

1. From Yonago in Hokikuni, Takeshima is located about 390 miles on the sea. Every year, boats leave Yonago for Izumo, and then sail to Takeshima via Okinokuni. No ships go to Takeshima directly.
2. No one lives on Takeshima as it is an island so isolated, nor is it controlled by Hoki.
3. We understand there is no official letter from the Roju concerning

---

46. *Takeshimaki* (Takeshima Story) Vol. II. Anonymous, place and date unknown, this ancient Japanese book in classic Chinese is kept in the Library of Korea NHCC. The first volume of this 2-vol. book is unavailable.

voyage to Takeshima. But this information is provided because of an inquiry from the Shogunate government. We do not have a copy of the official letter either.<sup>47</sup>

It appears that the Shogunate government was interested in knowing Takeshima's (Ullŭngdo) location and its voyage route, and as for the territorial rights to Ullŭngdo, Hokishu was unable to reply. According to the reply, Hokishu sent to the Accountant-General Matsudahira, Lord of Mino, the merchants of Hokishu (Murakawa Oya Kuuemon) gathered abalones at Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) and presented them to the Shogunate government. But the report said Takeshima was not under Hokishu's control. The Shogunate government took an isolationist policy and monopolized the exchange and trade with foreign countries at that time. Therefore, Ichibei, the contact points with foreign countries were limited to a few designated places, and the voyages by ordinary people abroad were forbidden. Under such circumstances, for people to make a long voyage, a Roju's written permit was required. This fact leads some Japanese to think that Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) belonged to Japan. Certain Japanese scholars go so far as to claim that Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) was an island belonging to Hokishu since the Hokishu merchants were granted permission to gather abalone there.<sup>48</sup>

It is true that the Japanese travelled to Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) with the permission from the Shogunate government. But, since an official permit was issued to its nationals going abroad, it is nothing but the recognition of Takeshima as a foreign territory.<sup>49</sup>

The above data No. 3 shows no official letter was required for a voyage to Takeshima (Ullŭngdo), which could be misunderstood

---

47. A copy of the Memorandum Dispatched to the Shogunate by Lord Ikeda of Tot-tori, Imba-koku, *Ikeda Family Records* dated 16th of the intercalary Month of April, 1724 in the Tottori prefecture Library.

48. Kawakami, *op. cit.*; Okuma, *op. cit.*

as allowing voyage to a distant island within Japan or which could be taken advantage of in Japan's claim to the island. However, the requirement for the permission was acknowledged when the merchants of Hokishu were allowed to make voyages to Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) in 1618. Therefore, we assume that the first permit issued the merchants of Hokishu in 1618 had a time limit, and as the Shogunate became indifferent to this requirement, Hokishu merchants may have gone there secretly for their personal gain. This may have been the situation involving Japanese voyages to Takeshima.

The Hokishu authorities which seized Koreans as hostage said that their merchants were fishing off Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) but the island did not belong to Hokishu. Thus, Hokishu had no knowledge of Ullŭngdo belonging to Hokishu and the Shogunate government acknowledged this fact.

This was more clearly demonstrated in the questions and answers between the Shogunate government and Inbashu in 1695 over Takeshima (Ullŭngdo). The Roju Abe Bungono-kami asked the following questions:

1. Since when did Takeshima become attached to the two prefectures of Inbashu and Hokishu?
2. How big is Takeshima?
3. Since when have the people started going there for fishing; how many vessels have gone there for what kinds of fish?
4. Two Koreans were captured and brought here three or four years ago for fishing there. Had they come there often before that?
5. How many vessels and how many people went to Takeshima last year?
6. Are there other islands belonging to the two prefectures of yours?<sup>49</sup>

The memorandum submitted to the Shogunate government by

---

49. Kajimura, *op. cit.*

Inbashu states that:

1. Takeshima does not belong to Inbashu or Hokishu.
2. The island is about 9 *ri* [22 miles] around, and there are no inhabitants.
6. There are no other islands belonging to the two prefectures in addition to Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) and Matsushima (Tokdo).<sup>51</sup>

Both Hokishu and Inbashu did not recognize Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) as Japanese territory, nor did the Shogunate government so. We also know from this that Matsushima was involved in the territorial dispute, too.

The above session was conducted immediately before the Roju Abe, Bungono-kami sanctioned the official note on the problem of Ullŭngdo in 1696 and is believed to have influenced the decision of the Shogunate government. The official note (Historical Data No. 1) states that "from the beginning the island was not taken from Chosŏn by force, and it does not make sense to say that it will be returned to Chosŏn," and it acknowledges Takeshima as Chosŏn's inherent territory from ancient times. This is precisely on this grounds that the Shogunate government reversed its very decision in three years.

Now, in the official letter of the Shogunate government there is a reference to "prohibiting voyage to and fishing at Takeshima." What area does Takeshima include in this reference? Does it refer to Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) only, or include Tokdo (Matsushima)? That Takeshima included Matsushima could be confirmed by the Japanese data. According to Kajimura Hideki, there was no reason for the Shogunate government to covet Matsushima (Tokdo), particularly because Matsushima had little value for fishing or logging, and that it was regarded simply as a milestone for voyage to

50. *Ikeda Family Records, op. cit.*

51. *Ibid.*, Answers 3, 4 and 5 are omitted as they are considered not so important for examination here.

Takeshima (Ullŭngdo).

Therefore, no historical data shows that the Shogunate government consciously distinguished Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) from Matsushima (Tokdo) and that Matsushima (Tokdo) was understood to be an island attached to Takeshima (Ullŭngdo). This may have been the generally accepted idea of that time.<sup>52</sup>

This is confirmed by the record of Tsushima which directly led the negotiations over the territorial rights of Takeshima (Ullŭngdo). When the voyage to Ullŭngdo by the inhabitants of Iwamishu (present Shimane prefecture) became controversial, the Shogunate government inquired of Tsushima about the location of Ullŭngdo and its adjacent islands as well as its territorial ownership.

#### Historical Data 2

##### Question)

Do Takeshima and a small island of Matsushima about 40 *ri* [98 miles] away both comprise Ullŭngdo, or is Takeshima Ullŭngdo, but Matsushima outside of Chosŏn?

##### Answer)

There is a record of the Genroku period that Matsushima is located near Takêshima, and the Japanese went there to fish. We understand that it is the island, together with Takeshima, where Japanese are forbidden to fish ①, but it is difficult to answer that the injunction was so definitely made ②.<sup>53</sup>

In other words, to the query by the Shogunate government as to whether Matsushima (Tokdo) was attached to Takeshima

---

52. Kajimura, *op. cit.*

53. *Tsushima soka kamonsho* (So Family of Tsushima Records) No. 4751 kept in the library of NHCC.

(Ullŭngdo) or not, Tsushima replied that Matsushima (Tokdo) was included in Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) when the Japanese government issued an injunction on voyage to Takeshima. Tsushima directly negotiated on the question of Ullŭngdo (Takeshima) at the end of the 17th century and made a desperate effort to tide over the crisis of possibly losing its vested interests in the Korea-Japan channel. So, Tsushima grasped the real situation better than anyone else and is believed to have known accurately whether Takeshima meant only Ullŭngdo or included Tokdo. Therefore, Tsushima's reply that Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) included Matsushima (Tokdo) is judged as accurate information.<sup>54</sup>

Accordingly, it is clear that when the Shogunate government made the decision at the end of the 17th century, it acknowledged Matsushima (Tokdo) as appendant to Takeshima (Ullŭngdo). This defies the Japanese view that the same island was interchangeably called Ullŭngdo (Takeshima) and Usando. Ullŭngdo does include Usando (Tokdo, Matsushima).

## V. Conclusion

The decision of the Shogunate government towards the end of the 17th century clearly confirmed that Chosŏn possessed the territorial and fishing rights of Ullŭngdo and Tokdo, but voyage to Ullŭngdo by the coastal inhabitants of the two countries was not completely discontinued.

As we have seen above, Iwamishu inhabitants' voyage to Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) and Matsushima (Tokdo) in 1722 caused trouble, and in 1836 when Ahizuya Hachiuemon of Iwamishu was

---

54. According to "Japan's Incorporation of Takeshima into its Territory in 1905," Tokdo was acknowledged as an island attached to Ullŭngdo, and recorded in Japan as 'Matsushima inside Takeshima,' 'Matsushima near Takeshima' or 'Small islets near Takeshima.' see Hori Kazuo, *op. cit.*

found to have engaged in smuggling with its center at Takeshima (Ullŭngdo), the *hanshu* (feudal lord) was punished by the Shogunate government.

Whenever voyages to Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) caused trouble, the Shogunate government made an inquiry to Tsushima on the ownership of Takeshima and circumstances under which a voyage was made. The replies by Tsushima were strangely very ambiguous on Ullŭngdo and Tokdo. For example, the questions and answers (Historical Data 2) exchanged between the Shogunate and the lord of Tsushima at the time of the voyage to Ullŭngdo by the inhabitants of Iwamishu clearly acknowledged that the Shogunate government's ban on voyage to Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) included Matsushima (Tokdo). On the other hand, however, one can detect his intention to separate Matsushima (Tokdo) from Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) from data 2 - ②. The attempt in the 18th century to separate Matsushima (Tokdo) from Takeshima and finally from the Chosŏn territory is presumed not to be the intention of the Shogunate government, which came to know it later from the replies from Tsushima.

By the mid-19th century, the Japanese began to write as if Takeshima (Ullŭngdo and Tokdo) were originally Japanese territory but ceded to Chosŏn. The response Tsushima submitted to an inquiry made by the Shogunate government when the smuggling at Ullŭngdo became an issue in 1837 maintained that since Japan "ceded" Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) to Chosŏn in 1696, the voyage to that island was prohibited.<sup>55</sup> This statement could raise a misunderstanding that Takeshima was originally a Japanese island but was ceded to Chosŏn and might have distorted the Shogunate government's knowledge of Ullŭngdo and Tokdo. This perception finally

---

55. "The above-mentioned island is a place where the people of Yonago, Hokishu went to engage in fishing, but since it was ceded to Chosŏn at the period of Genroku towards the end of the 17th century, the voyage there was prohibited." *So Family of Tsushima Records, op. cit.*

degenerated into the idea that the cession of Takeshima (Ullungdo and Tokdo) to Chosŏn was a mistaken decision by the Shogunate government.<sup>56</sup>

Leafing through the Japanese records of the mid-17th century such as *Tsuko ichiran* (A Summary of Navigation), *Tsushin zenran* (A Complete Survey of Communication), *Zoku tsushin zenran* (Supplement to a Complete Survey of Communication), *Chosen gaiko jimusho* (A Guide to Diplomacy with Korea), and the Meiji government Foreign Ministry records, we see they all maintain that the Shogunate decision of The cession of Takeshima (Ullungdo and Tokdo) was a mistake.

The mid-19th century when the first three of these publications were compiled was a time when Commodore Perry of the U.S. steamed into the Japanese sea aboard the "black ships" and Russian ships were also coming to Japan and demanding Japan to open its ports. These books strongly reflected the critical situation of the time as they were compiled to meet the need to look back to the pre-modern diplomacy and to cope with the rising external crisis of the Shogunate government.

One can read the intention of the Shogunate government for territorial expansion from the statement that the cessation of

---

56. A *Survey of Navigation* reads in page 24: "After that it was proposed that Takeshima be ceded to Chosŏn and the matter was resolved as proposed. This eventually proved to be a loss because of the erroneous investigation conducted by the lord of Tsushima."

*Zoku tsushin zenran* (Supplement to A Complete Survey of Communication) ed. by Tsushin zenran hensan iinkai (Complete Survey of Communication Compilation Committee) (Tokyo: 1987) states in p. 987: "The above is the island where people of Yonago in Hoki went over for fishing, but passage there was prohibited after it was ceded to Chosŏn in the Genroku period."

*Chosen gaiko jimusho* I (A Guide to Conducting Diplomacy with Korea I), ed. by Han'guk ilbonmunjae yon'guhoe (Korea Association for Research on Japan), originally drafted by Japan Foreign Ministry, states in pp. 551-552: "Thereafter it was suggested that Takeshima should be given to Chosŏn and the matter was resolved as suggested. It was reported to the government that because of an erroneous investigation by Tsushima, [Japan] suffered a loss."



Takeshima (Ullŭngdo) to Chosŏn was a mistaken judgment. Such perception is not unrelated to the intention of the Meiji government to expand its territory by emphasizing that Ullŭngdo and Tokdo were uninhabited when the East Sea became a battleground against Russia. Furthermore, this is related to the Japanese Foreign Ministry's external expansionist policy. It is considered necessary for the Japanese government to shift its diplomatic policy in order to dispel the mistrust of Japan by Korea and many other Asian countries.