KOREAN AND AMERICAN MEMORY OF THE FIVE YEARS CRISIS, 1866-1871

by

James P. Podgorski

A Thesis

Submitted to the Faculty of Purdue University

In Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of History

West Lafayette, Indiana

May 2020

THE PURDUE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE SCHOOL
STATEMENT OF COMMITTEE APPROVAL

Dr. Sally Hastings, Chair
Department of History

Dr. David Atkinson
Department of History

Dr. A. Whitney Walton
Department of History

Approved by:
Dr. David Atkinson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This project examines the events from 1866 to 1871 in Korea between the United States and Joseon, with a specific focus on the 1866 *General Sherman* Incident and the United States Expedition to Korea in 1871. The project also examines the present memory of those events in the United States and North and South Korea. This project shows that contemporary American reactions to the events in Korea from 1866 to 1871 were numerous and ambivalent in what the American role should be in Korea. In the present, American memory of 1866 to 1871 has largely been monopolized by the American military, with the greater American collective memory largely forgetting this period.

In the Koreas, collective memory of the five-year crisis (1866 to 1871) is divided along ideological lines. In North Korea, the victories that Korea achieved against the United States are used as stories to reinforce the North Korean line on the United States, as well as reinforcing the legitimacy of the Kim family. In South Korea, the narrative focuses on the corruption of Joseon and the Daewongun and the triumph of a "modernizing" Korean state against anti-western hardliners, and is more diverse in how the narrative is told, ranging from newspapers to K-Dramas, leading to a more complicated collective memory in the South.

This Thesis shows that understanding the impact that the first state-to-state encounters had on the American-Korean relationship not only at the time but also in the present, is key to analyzing the complicated history of the Korean-American relationship writ large.

INTRODUCTION

Between 1866 and 1871, a series of international incidents occurred between Joseon Korea and the United Sates. Both of these nations underwent tumultuous political and culture changes during those five years. In Korea, a new sovereign was proclaimed in 1863 at the age of 11, Yi Myeong-bok, known better by his royal name, Gojong. Too young to rule alone, his father, prince-regent Yi Ha-eung, better known as the Daewongun, ruled in his stead from 1864 to 1873, making some of the most crucial foreign policy decisions for Korea in the nineteenth century. He oversaw war with France and the United States and the persecution of Christians across the peninsula, in reaction to the apocalyptic Taiping Rebellion which had destabilized the Qing Empire, the supposed "big brother" of Joseon Korea.[1]

While Korea was under the tenure of the isolationist Daewongun, the United States was suffering from a different kind of change. In 1865 the American Civil War ended, with the majority of the slave-holding Southern states forced into a process of reintegration known as Reconstruction, which "ended" in 1877, a success for holding the union together but an absolutely abysmal failure for civil rights.[2] From 1866 to 1877 the United States had constant tension between its Northern and Southern states, but the Federal government continued to pursue expansionist foreign policies, a trail of decision-making that lead to the American Expedition to Korea in June of 1871. The United States also went through a presidential assassination, the first impeachment of a president, white terror in the Southern states against free Black Americans, and the election of Ulysses S. Grant while the Daewongun pushed back French aggressions in 1866,

[1] General information is best found in Young Ching Choe, *The Rule of the Daewongun, 1864-1873: Restoration in Yi Korea* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972), 91-127.
[2] The American Civil War historiography on Reconstruction is literally too long to count, though the revisionist school generally agrees that Reconstruction generally failed. A classic in the field, see Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988).

and the near constant harassment by western private enterprises, such as those led by the German merchant Ernst Oppert, between 1866 and 1868.[3]

The specific events are discussed in detail in Chapter 1, but a rough chronology of the interactions between these two states during this period are as follows. In 1866 the American schooner *Surprise* was shipwrecked off the coast of Korea; the crew was returned safely to China, where "treaty ports" were open to American vessels. Also in 1866 the American *General Sherman* was destroyed off the shores of Pyongyang for its aggressive attempts to open Korea to trade; this is the event that triggered the United States into responding with force some years later. The French invaded Korea at the end of 1866 in response to the executions of French Catholic missionaries, but the invasion failed to yield any results from the Joseon state. In 1867 the American *Wachusett* sailed to Korea to ascertain what had happened to the *Sherman*, but no concrete information was found. In 1868 Ernst Oppert, a German merchant and an American and Frenchman attempted to steal the remains of the father of the Daewongun as a form of collateral to open the country to trade, but this failed. At the same time, the American *Shenandoah* successfully ascertained the fate of the *Sherman*, but no apology was given by the Koreans. This led to the American government sending a small fleet to try once again to open Korea to trade and receive a formal redress for the destruction of the *Sherman* in 1871. This led to an extensive battle, resulting in a military victory for the Americans, but no redress or treaty with Korea was gained.[4] How these events shaped the memory of the United States and the Koreas into the present forms the core research question of this project.

[3] These of course being, the assassination of Abraham Lincoln, Impeachment of Andrew Johnson, and the first iteration of the Ku Klux Klan and other white terrorist organizations, which the U.S. government did not crackdown on until roughly 1868-1869.

[4] This chronology is found mostly correct in Horace N. Allen, *A Chronological Index: Some of the Chief Events in the Foreign Intercourse of Korea* (Seoul: Methodist Publishing House, 1901).

In such drastic changes, memory can be twisted and lost quite easily, with parallel remembrances coexisting into the present. Caroline Janney has outlined these types of changes in her work on Civil War Reconstruction, *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconstruction*, and her approach to memory serves as the basis for this project's approach. While a Civil War historian, Janney's work on the memory of Reconstruction and the formation of the "Lost Cause" narrative translates well to the differing memories within the United States and North and South Korea during these tumultuous years.[5] Her methodology informs the shape of this thesis, though the execution is certainly different both in location and scope, as Janney deals with American Reconstruction and the formation of alternate history in the "lost cause" narrative which in her studies do not branch out into the mid to late twentieth century. This project examines the memory of the events of from 1866 to 1871 between the United States and Korea into the present, looking at their memorialization in the late twentieth and early twenty-first century.

This project argues that the events of 1866 through 1871 between the United States and Korea were well-known by the American public as they occurred, but have been nearly forgotten in American memory save for a few dedicated and obscure portions of the American military. The story is vastly different in the Koreas, as the "five-year crisis," as it has been termed, is used in both North and South Korea for political, educational, and entertainment purposes into the present. Over the course of three chapters, this project shows that American and Korean memories are highly selective. American memory of the Korean expedition of 1871, for example, is concerned primarily with the military exploits of the United States Marine Corps or its ramifications for understanding American foreign policy. Korean memory varies by state, with

[5] See Caroline Janney, *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconstruction* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013). See also her earlier work Caroline Janney, *Burying the Dead, not the Past: Ladies Memorial Associations and the Lost Cause* (Chapel Hill: North Carolina Press, 2008).

South Korea in some cases using the five-year crisis to illustrate the impotency of the Daewongun's rule, while in the North the *General Sherman* incident is used to legitimize the Kim family's supposed centuries-old struggle against American imperialism. In essence, the Korean Peninsula remembers the five-year crisis quite vividly and to support the national biographies of both the North and South, while the United States has of yet to come to terms with its imperial past in its own national narrative, relegating the five-year crisis into obscure corners in its overall collective memory.

Structure of the Thesis

This project is divided into three chapters. In the first chapter, titled "American Views of Events in Korea, 1866-1871," I provide a detailed narrative of several major events. My narrative relies upon secondary works and the official reports given to the Secretary of the Navy in 1871. In the second subsection, I analyze the American press in a geographical survey of the country, analyzing articles published between 1866 and 1871, through a selection of states and the Kingdom of Hawaii, to show that information about Korea and its relationship to western powers and the United States was widely, and increasingly available to the American public.

In chapter two, titled "*Sinmiyangyo* and 1866 in Korean Memory," I examine South Korean newspapers, museums, and visual media from roughly 1966 to the present day. I also examine North Korean state media and briefly discuss North Korean physical monuments, all within the previous decade (2010s). I show that *how* the five-year crisis is remembered varies drastically between North and South Korea, and within South Korea itself, in service to or critical of the national biographies of North and South Korea. The main takeaway, however, is that the Koreas have consistently "remembered" the five-year crisis and American involvement in the *Sinmiyangyo*, whether as an integral part to telling the story of Korea during its "Opening" period, or as the first victory against foreign imperialism by the Korean people.

In the final chapter, titled "American Memory of the *General Sherman* and the Korea Expedition," I examine what little there is in the United States to remember the five-year crisis, showing that American military museums, popular history websites, and national security and foreign policy magazines remember mostly the 1871 Korea expedition, leaving out the *General Sherman*. I also show that the work of Thomas Duvernay, an American professor of Basic Studies at Yeungnam University, has almost single-handedly bridged the transnational memory of the *Sinmiyanygo* between the United States and South Korea. He advocated for the return of looted artifacts and the preservation of the battlefield on Ganghwa island. I conclude that the United States has mostly forgotten the transnational importance of the five-year crisis, but that the work of a dedicated few such as Duvernay continues to connect the United States with its first Korean War.

In the conclusion, I reiterate the findings of each chapter, and posit new inquiries for research. As this is a generally new approach to examine the five-year crisis, there is significant work to be done to expand the historiography on the subject using memory studies as a methodological basis, with this project acting as a foundation for that research.

Historiography

The events of 1866 through 1871 are well-known amongst historians. William Elliot Griffis, famous for the first English-language historical work on Korea, *Corea, The Hermit Nation*, outlines these events as he knew them.[6] Several other historians, such as Horace N. Allen, Homer Hulbert and Charles Paullin, helped establish the first historiography of early American-Korean

[6] William Elliot Griffis, *Corea, The Hermit Nation* (London: W.H. Allen & Co., 1911). Original edition published in 1882.

interactions.[7] These early works were focused primarily on recovering this information, as accurately as possible, and not necessarily with making a historical argument.

What makes up the majority of the current historiography are military and diplomatic histories that place the events of 1866 to (normally) 1882 in conversation with burgeoning American foreign policy. The first of these is the broader work by Tyler Dennett, *Americans in Eastern Asia: a Critical Study of the Policy of the United States with Reference to China, Japan and Korea in the 19th Century*.[8] Dennett covers a broad period of relations between the United States and East Asia, and offers some argument as to the failings and successes of those relations. A thesis by then-future congressman for Montana Mike Mansfield takes the diplomatic methodology and applies it to the full-length of American relations with an independent Korea (1866-1910) in his project "American Diplomatic Relations with Korea (1866-1910).[9] From the 1930s, there is a significant gap in histories relating to the five year crisis, until Andrew C. Nahm published an article in 1968 titled "Our Little War with the Heathen," a phrase found in Griffis' writing as well as American newspapers from the period. Nahm examines, along with Albert Castel, the American Expedition of 1871, through a diplomatic and military policy lens. They argue that the war occurred due to mutual miscommunication and mutual arrogance between the United States and Korea.[10] Nahm expanded on his examination of Korean-American diplomatic relations in his work *The United States and Korea, American-Korean Relations*, which as one

[7] See Horace N. Allen, *A Chronological Index: Some of the Chief Events in the Foreign Intercourse of Korea* (Seoul: Methodist Publishing House, 1901). Homer B. Hulbert, *The Passing of Korea* (New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1909). Charles Oscar Paullin, "The Opening of Korea by Commodore Shufeldt," *Political Science Quarterly* 25, no. 3 (1910)., and Charles Oscar Paullin, *Diplomatic Negotiations of American Naval Officers: 1778-1883* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1912).

[8] Tyler Dennett, *Americans in Eastern Asia: a Critical Study of the Policy of the United States with Reference to China, Japan and Korea in the 19th Century* (Macmillan, 1922).

[9] Mike Mansfield, "American Diplomatic Relations with Korea (1866-1910)" (MA Thesis, University of Montana, 1934), 1-87.

[10] Andrew Nahm and Albert Castel, "Our Little War with the Heathen," *American Heritage* 19, no. 3 (1968), 18.

would expect details a century of diplomatic interactions between the United States and both the state of Korea and its government-in-exile during the Japanese colonial period.[11]

A significant work that provides background information on the rule of the Daewongun is Young Ching Choe's 1972 *The Rule of the Daewongun, 1864-1873*, which is a well-researched, succinct and easily approachable work on the Daewongun's policies and Joseon Korea's actions in response to foreign invasion.[12] It is still the only English-language diplomatic and political history from the specific perspective of the Joseon state during the five-year crisis, some five decades later. Between Choe and the present, there was a significant dearth in coverage of any sort of the five-year crisis, save for a thesis by Douglas E. George which provides an extremely detailed military and political account of the "Low-Rodgers Expedition," the term he uses for the Korea expedition of 1871. He shows how foundational the expedition proved to be for American foreign policy in relation to Korea.[13] Several books were written that deal with the end of Korea's opening period, which normally begin in 1882 if dealing with the United States or 1876 if starting with Japan.[14] A host of new additions to the historiography appeared in the 2000s and 2010s, though the dominance of diplomatic and military lens continued to be the most prevalent.

The first work that coined the term "five-year crisis" was Yong-koo Kim's *The Five Years' Crisis, 1866-1871: Korea and the Maelstrom of Western Imperialism*. His work concerns mentalities and perspectives of civilizations in East Asia and in the West, and how those

[11] Andrew C. Nahm, *The United States and Korea, American-Korean Relations 1866-1976* (Center for Korean Studies, Western Michigan University, 1979).
[12] Young Ching Choe, *The Rule of the Daewongun, 1864-1873: Restoration in Yi Korea* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972).
[13] Douglas Edward George, "The Low-Rodgers Expedition: a Study in the Foundations of U.S. policy in Korea" (MA Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, June 1988).
[14] Good examples include C.I. Eugene Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism, 1876-1910* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967)., and Peter Duus, *The Abacus and the Sword, The Japanese Penetration of Korea* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995).

perspectives clashed during this period.[15] The famous (or infamous) Max Boot published his *The Savage Wars of Peace* in 2002. The work "rediscovered" some of the "small" conflicts in American history, and gives them significance in the transformation of American foreign policy over the duration of American history. Boot has one chapter which details the American expedition to Korea in 1871, but it is within the context of the formation of the American expansionism, not within the larger story of the five-year crisis.[16] In 2003 a fascinating article written by Gordon Chang examines the perception of race and civilization between the United States and Korea during the 1871 expedition. "Whose 'Barbarism?' Whose 'Treachery'?" is an excellent guide to how racial thinking permeated American language on the incident, and contributed to the mutual arrogance between the United States and Korea during the five year crisis.[17] Kim Myong-ho (김명호), in an excellent Korean-language book published in 2003, analyzed the role of Bak Gyu-su in the *General Sherman* incident from the perspective of the Joseon government.[18]

Joe woong Kang examines the lead up to the 1882 treaty between the United States and Korea and the formation of a Korean international identity in *The Korean Struggle for International Identity in the Foreground of the Shufeldt Negotiation*.[19] It is the only work of its kind that features the five-year crisis as a central pivoting point in the formation of a Korean national and international identity, and argues for the "nation-state-ness" of Korea much earlier

---

[15] Yong-koo Kim, *The Five Years' Crisis, 1866-1871: Korea in the Maelstrom of Western Imperialism* (Incheon: Circle Publishing, 2001).
[16] Max Boot, *The Savage Wars of Peace: Small Wars and the Rise of American Power* (Basic Books, 2002).
[17] Gordon H. Chang, "Whose "Barbarism"? Whose "Treachery"? Race and Civilization in the Unknown United States-Korea War of 1871," *Journal of American History* 89, no. 4 (2003): 1331-1365.
[18] Kim Myong-ho 김명호, "Gaeneoreol Seomeonho Sageon gwa Bak Gyo-su" 제너럴셔먼호 사건과 박규수 [Bak Gyo-su and the General Sherman Incident], *Daedong Munhwa Yeongu 대동문화연구* 42, (2003): 309.
[19] Joe woong Kang, *The Korean Struggle for International Identity in the Foreground of the Shufeldt Negotiation: 1866-1882* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2005).

than previous authors have claimed. In 2006 another academic-lite history in the vein of Max Boot was released by Robert Kagan, *Dangerous Nation*. Kagan's argument is a revision of the beginnings of American expansionism, placing the date of "American Empire" at the nation's founding, rather than at the beginning of the twentieth century. The United States' role in East Asia in the nineteenth century features prominently in the book, with the Korea expedition receiving substantial examination, but only from a diplomatic and military lens.[20]

Additional works were added to the historiography in the 2010s, with Ian Murray's "Seward's True Folly," which examines the lead up to the Korea expedition and the role William Seward had in ensuring that it occurred. A slight spin on the diplomatic history approach, Murray uses biography to illustrate the mistakes that led to the Battle of Ganghwa, while still keeping within the diplomatic historiography of Korean-American interaction.[21] In 2018 Kim Nam-hyun published an article in Korean chronicling how Korea was represented in the New York press from 1810 to 1871.[22] Kim's approach in this excellent work greatly informed this project in how to use American newspapers to understand how the press was writing about Korea. While Kim examines the nineteenth century up to 1871, and only uses papers from the New York Press (primarily the *New York Herald*), this project surveys the entire country during only the five-year crisis. Finally, Kyung Moon Hwang devoted an "essay" in his work *Past Forward: Essays in Korean History* to the *General Sherman* incident in the context of current North Korean-American relations.[23] An extremely short and general essay, it is better described as a reflection on the use and obfuscation

[20] Robert Kagan, *Dangerous Nation* (Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group, 2006).
[21] Ian Murray. "Seward's True Folly: American Diplomacy and Strategy During 'Our Little War with the Heathens,' Korea, 1871," *Penn History Review* 18, no.2 (Spring 2011): 43-68.
[22] Kim Nam-hyun 김남윤, and Hong Jong-kyu 홍종규, "19 Saegi (1810-1871) Miguk Nyuyok Eonroneul Tonghae bon Joseonwae Imiji 19 세기(1810~1871) 미국 뉴욕 언론을 통해 본 조선의 이미지 [Images of Joseon in the 19th Century (1810-1871) through New York Media in the U.S.], *Gangwon Sahak 강원사학* 31 (2018): 137.
[23] Kyung Moon Hwang, *Past Forward: Essays in Korean History* (London: Anthem Press, 2019).

of the *General Sherman* Incident. Hwang argues that the *General Sherman* incident was a catalyst in a longstanding tradition of Korean isolationism and wariness to foreigners that is seen most clearly in North Korea today, though given the brevity of the essay, Hwang does not elaborate further.

These works make up the bulk of the current historiography relating specifically to the five-year crisis. While other works have mentioned the events from 1866 to 1871 in passing, or were concerned specifically with the French expedition of 1866, this project is primarily focused on Korean-American interaction during these five years. There are significant differences between this project and the current historiography, the most major being the focus on memory studies informed through the works of Caroline Janney. This project is also devoted to how these events are viewed the present, which is not a concern of *any* previous work in the historiography. Only Kim Nam-hyun has specifically worked with American newspapers during this period as a significant portion of his source base, something his article has in common with this project. As argued in Chapter 3, scholarly discussion of this period has been eclipsed by both non-historians and amateur historians in the United States, which I believe has stymied the growth of the historiography that this project will help to remedy.

CHAPTER 1: AMERICAN VIEWS OF EVENTS IN KOREA, 1866-1871

Introduction: The events of 1866-1871

This chapter mainly deals with how the American press viewed events in Korea from 1866 to 1871, but it is important to understand what these events are, and what actually happened during them, especially the *General Sherman* incident, as there are multiple, contradictory stories as to how the *Sherman* came to be destroyed. First, a brief overview of what events this study examines and a rough chronology of those events are needed to better situate the reader as to what *exactly* was happening in Joseon Korea.

The first event, mentioned only briefly, is the shipwreck of the American merchant vessel the *Surprise*, which occurred on 24 June, 1866. The Americans and Chinese on board the ship were washed ashore and treated well by the Korean authorities, and quickly transported to China on orders from the Daewongun, or the Prince Regent of Korea and father of the young King Gojong.[24] By 7 July, three survivors from the execution of French missionaries from February of 1866 had arrived back in China to report the news to the French delegation there. This prompted Admiral Pierre-Gustave Roze to prepare to invade Joseon for a redress of grievances.[25] At the end of July, the first particularly significant event in this study occurred, the *General Sherman* Incident.

Between 29 July and 9 August, the American Merchant-Marine registered centerboard trading schooner *General Sherman* left present-day Tianjin, China towards the Korean peninsula

[24] William Elliot Griffis, *Corea, The Hermit Nation* (London: W.H. Allen & Co., 1911), 391. *Corea, The Hermit Nation* is STILL cited in secondary literature as a source book for the *General Sherman* Incident, into the 2000s. This is mostly because Griffis did excellent historical work on piecing together the various different stories of the events, including the Korean perspective.

[25] Horace N. Allen, *A Chronological Index: Some of the Chief Events in the Foreign Intercourse of Korea* (Seoul: Methodist Publishing House, 1901), 6. A great work by Allen, it is essentially a listed chronology of *every* event that had occurred in Korea involving foreign powers. Still an extremely valuable piece of secondary literature in its own right.

and disappeared. Griffis noted that the firm that financed this voyage, the British Tianjin-based Meadows & Co., loaded the *Sherman* with "cotton cloth, glass, tin-plate, etc.,[…] in the hope of thus opening the country to commerce."[26] However, not everything was as it seemed with the *Sherman*. It is not improbable that the *Sherman* was also looking for loot. Armed with cannon and the rumors of royal tombs in Pyongyang being made of solid gold, the crew of the *Sherman* likely had intentions that went beyond that of a simple trading mission.[27] When the *Sherman* reached the Korean coast, the interpreter on board, Rev. Robert Jermain Thomas, convinced a Chinese sailor by the name of Yu Wen Tai, to guide the ship up the Taedong River, and towards Pyongyang. The Koreans were wary of the *Sherman*, as it was well-armed. Because of on-going problems with Chinese pirates, a ship with a mostly Chinese crew led by a Chinese sailor headed towards Pyongyang was a cause for alarm.[28]

The Joseon Dynasty Annals, or in this case the *Gojong Sillok*, provide some clue as to what happened when the *Sherman* approached Pyongyang. Both the annals and George reference Robert Thomas as a central figure, as the *Gojong Sillok* shows him as being the instigator of the carnage that followed, while George portrays Thomas as an agitator by his questions about the wealth of the surrounding countryside.[29] Either way, in late August the *Sherman* ran aground in low tide just outside of Pyongyang, and became stuck in the river bed of the Taedong river. Curious Korean commoners attempted to approach the *Sherman*, undoubtedly to offer assistance

[26] Griffis, *The Hermit Nation*, 391-92.
[27] Ibid., 392. The *China* affair of 1868 also had the purpose of digging up royal tombs, though that crew nearly succeeded in doing it.
[28] Douglas Edward George, "The Low-Rodgers Expedition: a study in the foundations of U.S. policy in Korea" (MA Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, June 1988), 22-23.
[29] "Pyeongan Gamsa-ga Pyeongyang Baekseongdeuri Seoyangbaereul Bulsareugo Yeongguk Saram Choenanheoneul Jugyeotdago Bogohada" 평안 감사가 평양 백성들이 서양배를 불사르고 영국 사람 최난헌을 죽였다고 보고하다 [An Inspector General of Peace Reports that the People of Pyongyang Burned Western Boats and Killed British Choi Nan-heon], *Gojong Sillok* 3, Gojong year 3 July 27, no. 1, (1866). George, "U.S. policy in Korea," 26-28.

or inquire as to why the *Sherman* was there, but the crew of the *Sherman* fired upon the boats and the shoreline, unsure as to the intentions of the Koreans. Soon afterwards the crew of the *Sherman* decided to kidnap an inquiring official, Yi Hyon-ik, who was on orders from the governor of Pyongan Province Bak Gyu-su to investigate why the *Sherman* had fired upon the shoreline and the boats.[30] Stranded in the Taedong River, with certain ill-intent according to the Joseon records, the crew of the *General Sherman*, which included its American owner W.B. Preston and its American Captain Page, had clearly grown increasingly desperate. According to Choe, it was on 2 September that Bak Gyu-su gave the order to burn the ship with fireboats, as a series of skirmishes had broken out between the *Sherman* and the Pyongyang militia, ending with the *Sherman* burned to its iron frame and the entire crew killed in the fire, drowned or executed upon capture.[31]

Soon after the destruction of the *Sherman* on 23 September the French Admiral Roze arrived with ships at Ganghwa Island with the full intent to sail up the Han River to Seoul to secure redress for the murdered Catholic priests. Receiving no redress from the Joseon Court, Roze returned to present-day Yantai (known then as Chefoo), China to restock and returned to Korea on 13 October with around one thousand personnel to secure Ganghwa Island.[32] This is commonly known as the French expedition to Korea of 1866 or in Korean the *Byeonginyangyo*. Both of these terms will be used throughout this study depending on Chapter. The expedition ended in defeat, and Roze returned to Chefoo by 28 October, with no restitution for the persecuted Catholics.

On 23 January of 1867, Admiral Henry Bell of the United States East India Squadron commanded Robert Shufeldt, Captain of the U.S.S. *Wachusett*, to send a letter to King Gojong to

[30] Young Ching Choe, *The Rule of the Daewongun, 1864-1873: Restoration in Yi Korea* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972), 110-111.
[31] Ibid., 111-112.
[32] Allen, *A Chronological Index*, 6-7. Chefoo was a treaty port in what is today Yantai, China.

ascertain the fate of the *General Sherman*, as some rumors that an American trading vessel had been destroyed had reached China with the defeated French forces.[33] Unfortunately for Shufeldt, who had intended to go to Seoul, he mistakenly anchored off the coast of the Taedong estuary, far to the north. His letter did not reach the Joseon court and the Daewongun until after Shufeldt had left the coast of Korea with no response. He was only able to ascertain that the crew of the *General Sherman* had been killed, but not why. He was also led to believe that some of the crew had survived and were being held captive.[34]

By April of 1868, another important "incident" occurred. A German merchant by the name of Ernst Oppert, along with French missionary and survivor of the executions from 1866 Stanislas Feron, and the American F.H.B. Jenkins sailed to Korea on a "private" expedition with the ships *China* and *Greta*, with the purpose of stealing the remains of a Yi Dynasty royal family member in order to ransom the remains back in exchange for opening the country for trade.[35] This is commonly called the *China* incident or *China* affair. Unfortunately for Oppert and his crew, the had decided to dig up the remains of the *Namyeongun*, the father of the *de facto* head of the Joseon court, the Daewongun. Incensed, the Daewongun demanded that Oppert return the remains of his father, seeing the act as unthinkably heinous. Eventually Oppert, Feron and Jenkins escaped Korea, but lost some of their crew in the process, and with no remains of Yi royalty.[36] This incident left a horrible taste in the mouths of most Koreans, not just Yi family members. Trust of westerners

[33] Charles Oscar Paullin, "The Opening of Korea by Commodore Shufeldt," *Political Science Quarterly* 25, no. 3 (1910): 471-472. The East Indian Squadron was a small American pacific fleet that operated from 1835-1868. It was replaced by the larger Asiatic Squadron in 1868.
[34] Charles Oscar Paullin, *Diplomatic Negotiations of American Naval Officers: 1778-1883* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1912), 285-286.
[35] Choe, 112-114.
[36] Choe, 113-114.

and foreigners writ large immediately declined due to this treacherous action, with the Joseon state even ending the goodwill policy to shipwrecked sailors soon after the event.[37]

While Ernst Oppert was attempting to commit crimes against humanity, the United States East India Squadron was reorganized into the Asiatic Squadron at the beginning of 1868. Under the leadership of Admiral Stephen C. Rowan, who was promoted to head the squadron in April of 1868, one its first actions was to once again return to Korea. Rowan instructed Captain John Febiger to take the U.S.S *Shenandoah* to investigate the fate of the *General Sherman*. The *Shenandoah* arrived at the mouth of the Taedong River on 11 April 1868, and contacted local officials for information pertaining to the *Sherman*.[38] On 1 May, Febiger received a letter detailing what had happened to the *Sherman* from Yi Ki-cho, head of the Samwha district, Pyongan Province, written by Bak Gyu-su. It was an identical copy to the letter sent to the Qing Board of Rites after Shufeldt had failed to acquire the letter the previous year.[39] Impressed with the cordiality of the letter, which included a reassurance from Bak that a "well-provoked" unauthorized mob had destroyed the *Sherman* (nearly true, he had ordered its destruction, but they were well-provoked), Febiger left Korea on 16 May, 1868, after Yi Ki-cho had also informed Febiger that there were no survivors of the *Sherman*, putting an end to those rumors.[40]

In the two years after Oppert's latest attempted crime and the *Shenandoah* mission, the United States went through the impeachment of President Andrew Johnson and the presidential election of 1868, both of which put significant strain on the federal political bureaucracy. Further action involving Korea had been tabled, though the men with influence in the State Department,

[37] Ibid. 114.
[38] Joe woong Kang, *The Korean Struggle for International Identity in the foreground of the Shufeldt Negotiation: 1866-1882* (Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2005), 9-10.
[39] Ibid., 10.
[40] Kang, 10.

such as William Seward, Hamilton Fish, and Fredrick Low all had the impression that the Joseon state deserved further chastisement from the United States.[41] Low had received assurances from the Qing government that it had no "claims or exercises no control in any way over Corea, nor do the Coreans regard the Chinese having any right to control [their government]."[42] Under the Grant Administration, Low had been empowered to send an expedition to Korea in the event that the Joseon court failed to respond the United States concerning a redress for the *General Sherman* and an opening of the country to foreign trade. Since the Daewongun did not respond, on the grounds that this would constitute a foreign interaction which had been severely restricted by Korea after the *China* incident, Low and five ships of the Asiatic squadron under the command of Rear-Admiral John Rodgers departed from Japan for Korea on 16 May, 1871.[43] This is known as the United States Expedition to Korea of 1871, with the later battle with Koreans at Ganghwa island known in Korean as the *Sinmiyangyo* or "western Disturbance in the *Sinmi* Year."

On 23 May, 1871 the ships of the Korea expedition arrived off the coast of Ganghwa island. Local Korean officials inquired into the purpose of five heavily armed ships and over one thousand American personnel, but as only "local officials" responded "Mr. Low determined not to see the envoys [those officials], and they were informed that only officials of the first rank, who were empowered to conduct negotiations could be received; and to such alone could a full announcement of the objects of our coming be made."[44] While awaiting a reply from the Koreans, Rodgers ordered all five ships (which consisted of the flagship *Colorado*, the *Monocacy*, *Alaska*,

[41] Ibid.,18-19. William H. Seward was the Secretary of State from 1861-1869, Hamilton Fish was Secretary of State from 1869-1877, and Fredrick F. Low was the U.S. minister to China from 1869-1873.
[42] Ibid., 19-20.
[43] Choe, 125. "Expedition to Corea," *Reports of the Secretary of the Navy and of the Postmaster General* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1871), 275.
[44] "Expedition to Corea," 276.

Benicia, and the converted tugboat the *Palos*) to conduct a survey of the Salee river.[45] Likely under the impression that an American fleet was traveling up the Salee river towards Seoul, exactly in the same fashion that the French had done five years earlier, several Korean shore batteries opened fire on the American sloop on 1-2 June.[46] This skirmish was the only exchange of fire between the American ships and the Ganghwa batteries, as no marines were landed for an assault. Instead, Rodgers and Low, who were on the *Colorado* during the duration of these events, waited for an explanation and an apology from the Joseon government for firing upon them.

The expedition waited ten days for a reply from the Korean government, but the Daewongun had decided by 6 June to indict the American fleet for its hostile approach and violation of Korean sovereignty, though he did send the expedition some goods as gesture of good will for their "long voyage."[47] Low and Rodgers had already decided to take the Ganghwa forts before the arrival of these goods, and sent a final letter on 9 June demanding an apology, but did not wait long enough for a response before launching an attack on 10 June.[48] The Battle of Ganghwa was fought between 10-11 June 1871, with the result being the deaths of 250 or so Korean troops, the taking of five Korean forts, and the deaths of three American soldiers. Of the Americans, Lieutenant Hugh McKee, Seth Allen and Dennis Hemahan were killed.[49] Of the Korean dead, General Eo Jae-yeon, commander of Ganghwa militias, was killed along with his lieutenants, and some 20 Koreans were captured. The Americans acquired fifty standards as well as the General's flag, known as the *Sujagi*, along with a number of guns.[50] The next day, Admiral Rodgers ordered the fleet to completely withdraw from Ganghwa, citing the significant

[45] The "Salee River" is the body of water which separates Ganghwa from mainland Korea. Today, Incheon stands on the west bank of the "river" while generally rural area resides on the east bank, or Ganghwa's western shore.
[46] "Expedition to Corea," 276-78.
[47] Choe, 129-130.
[48] Choe, 130-131.
[49] "Expedition to Corea," 283.
[50] Ibid., 283-284.

reinforcements moving to the forts from the mainland. The expedition returned to Chefoo, China on 5 July, 1871.[51] Thus ended the American expedition to Korea, which achieved a military victory, but was a complete diplomatic and political failure for Fredrick Low and Hamilton Fish, who had decided against further action, most likely due to a lack of manpower to continue the war.

Over a decade passed before the United States interacted with Korea in a meaningful way again. It appeared that the failure of the 1871 expedition to open Korea to trade had soured American ambitions in East Asia for some time, as "excitement" about Korea was not renewed until the signing of the Shufeldt treaty in 1882. If anything, the "five-year crisis" which is a useful shorthand to describe the years between 1866 and 1871, was a significant re-examination of Korean sovereignty and international identity.[52] Two political victories over western forces and the reassertion of Korean independence in the face of a "changing" Japan and China, cemented the Daewongun's rule for several more years, and gave increased legitimacy to anti-western spiritual and political movements within Korea.[53]

In the United States, the American public was exposed for the first time to near-constant news involving Korea in the American press. Korea was once relegated to the back pages of American newspapers, if not simply called "China," but during the five-year crisis "Corea" was mention consistently and increasingly towards the front-page, if not on the front page next to American political crises. With the events this study covers mapped out, the remainder of the chapter examines the American press, state by state, on what the public had access to in relation to the events of 1866 to 1871 between Korea and the western world.

---

[51] Ibid., 284.

[52] Kang examines this idea in his work *The Korean Struggle for International Identity in the Foreground of the Shufeldt Negotiation*. The "five year's crisis" is not my original term. The honor of that goes to Yong-koo Kim, *The Five Years' Crisis, 1866-1871: Korea in the Maelstrom of Western Imperialism* (Incheon: Circle Publishing, 2001).

[53] The *Donghak*, or "Eastern Learning" movement turned into a full-fledged rebellion in the 1890s, and was the primary catalyst of the First Sino-Japanese War (1894 to 1895).

American Newspapers-Around the United States 1866-1871

Newspaper coverage of the events that had transpired between the United States and Korea between 1866 and 1871 was generally widespread across the United States. Even in the aftermath of the American Civil War, American newspapers were interested in covering international events, particularly those involving not only Americans but also the French, partly due to French interventions in "Cochin China," Korea, and Mexico between 1861 and 1868.[54] Of particular importance was any news involving Christian missionaries, as they were considered by the press as symbols of "western" civilization in what was seen as a "heathen" yet to be Christianized world. The opinions voiced in American newspapers over what should be done about the alleged injustices occurring against westerners by Koreans was mixed, with some calling on the Johnson administration to invade and potentially colonize Korea, while others were critiquing the French for intervening on behalf of the executed Catholic missionaries. Concerning the American invasion of Korea in 1871, opinions were even more divided. While in 1866 many newspapers simply reported that the U.S.S. *General Sherman* had disappeared or that France had invaded Korea on behalf of the executed missionaries, in 1871 the Korean expedition was seen as an important punitive step for the *General Sherman*, but also as a waste of Federal resources and potential American lives, given how recent the bloodiest war in United States history had concluded.

What follows are the words of newspapers from across the United States concerning American and French involvement in Korea during this period from 1866 to 1871. These articles

[54] Also known as French Indochina, or more specifically present-day Vietnam in this case. This was primarily a colonial, "scientific" expedition and not a direct military intervention or punitive expedition. While the United States Government under William Seward had maintained a neutral position to the French intervention in Mexico, American newspapers frequently took the side of the Anti-Maximillian faction; opinions on the French were more mixed over their interventions in East Asia. For more on American opinions on the Mexican intervention, see Gary Moreno, "Rage Against the Monarchy: American Reaction to French Intervention in Mexico," *Journal of the West* 47, no. 3 (2008): 48-55.

are sometimes quite short, only concerned with the basic events, while others are full-fledged op-eds on the issue of intervention on a peninsula some six thousand miles away. By 1871, many had reached front-page status. While it is uncertain as to specifically *why* the American press was so concerned with such distant international incidents, what is clear is that every corner of the country had something to report about them and no consensus on *what* the United States should do.

Part I: 1866-1867

The New York press, as the largest voice in American media both in the middle of the nineteenth century and in the present day, had some of the first news of the rumblings occurring on the Korean Peninsula. On 25 October 1866, *The New York Times* reported that "The Chinese Government has declined all responsibility for the outrages on the French Missionaries in Corea, and has expressed the intention of remaining neutral if steps are taken to obtain redress."[55] This is one of the first times the "paper of record" reported on "Corea" in 1866, and is also one of the first instances of the execution of the Catholic missionaries being reported.

In Philadelphia, a single sentence dispatch on 27 October of 1866 read: "The American schooner General Sherman, it is believed, had sailed for Corea, though cleared for Prest [likely custom duty]."[56] Not yet had it been reported to the Philadelphia press that any fate had befallen the *Sherman,* but it was known that the *General Sherman* had sailed for Korea. For a merchant marine vessel to be reported in a major newspaper, with no other details, is peculiar. There was nothing particularly special about the *Sherman,* save for its end, that would have lent it enough credibility to be reported on in this manner, considering that the *Surprise* had shipwrecked with an American crew the same month as the *Sherman* disappeared. This is also one of the earliest reports

[55] This is an archaic spelling of Korea. "China," *The New York Times*, October 25, 1866, 1.
[56] "By Telegraph, for the American & Gazette," *The North American and United States Gazette*, October 27, 1866.

on the *General Sherman*, but the *North American and United States Gazette* had little to elaborate on beyond a simple telegraph at that point.

In the nation's capital, American interests in Korea were of course of interest in the D.C. press. The *National Intelligencer*, one of the oldest in-circulation papers in D.C., reported on Korea in November of 1866. An incredibly short dispatch was listed on 6 November, which noted that a "Telegraph from Tsin [Tianjin], China, says the French have declared war against Corea."[57] The *Intelligencer* had little to say in terms of opinion, or for that matter why the French had gone to war with Korea. By the next day, the *Intelligencer* thought it appropriate to report on the *General Sherman*, noting that an "American vessel, the General Sherman, got ashore at Corea, and forty persons on board were murdered by the natives."[58] Once again, the *Intelligencer* offered only a published dispatch by telegraph, but with more details as to the fate of the *Sherman*'s crew. A lack of original editorials, or longer articles from published letters, from the *Intelligencer* is extremely telling considering the national decline of the *National Intelligencer* as the leading newspaper of D.C. during the lead up to the American Civil War and to its end in 1870. That even a declining newspaper like the *Intelligencer*, which had attempted to keep up with the rapid speed of the news through telegraphic dispatches, reported on Korea at all is notable.[59]

Also on 7 November the *North American* published news concerning the *Sherman*. It was not an original report, as it stated that the "American vessel General Sherman got ashore on the coast of Corea. Forty persons on board were murdered by the natives."[60] This is an identical

[57] "European Intelligence," *National Intelligencer*, November 6, 1866.
[58] "European Intelligence," *National Intelligencer*, November 7, 1866.
[59] For more information on the rise and decline of the *National Intelligencer*, see the works of William Ames. For the most succinct background, see William Ames, "The National Intelligencer: Washington's Leading Political Newspaper," *Records of the Columbia Historical Society, Washington, D.C.* 66/68 (1966): 71-83. The *National Intelligencer* had by the end of the Civil War been overtaken in circulation by other D.C. papers, such as *The National Republican* and the *Evening Star*.
[60] "By Telegraph for the American & Gazette. From Europe by the Atlantic Cable," *The North American and United States Gazette*, November 7, 1866.

dispatch to that which was reported in other American newspapers, something that the New York press had reported in October. The paper claimed that the "telegraph" was for the "American and Gazette," though given that it is identical to the telegrams provided to the *Intelligencer* it is likely it was widely available to the American press writ large. This is further confirmed by the Boston-based *Boston Daily Advertiser* also publishing an identical short dispatch.[61] What is important about these dispatches is their rapid dissemination within a single day, thanks to the technological powers of the telegraph and railroad. Given that speed, it is not surprising that the number of dead from the *Sherman* had been simultaneously overestimated and implied to be only a portion of its crew.

Some of the earliest reporting on Korea in the post-war Southern states came from a German-language newspaper in Nashville, Tennessee. On 13 November of 1866, the *Tennessee Staatzeitung* reported on the French expedition, noting that "several days ago, the Telegraph reported that France and Korea were at war. Since there little is known about this country in world history, the following geographic notes may be interesting [my translation.]"[62] The *Staatzeitung* continued, not with an explanation of *why* France was at war with Korea, but with a relatively intricate description of Korea:

> Korea is a peninsula on the North-east coast of Asia, running south into the sea, with Japan on the east side and the yellow sea on the west. The country has not been exactly measured; […] The country is not very fertile, but there are some excellent port locations, some of which are suitable for fleet stations. The tip of the island [likely Jeju Island] is an excellent location for an invasion of China or Japan, as it is only 80 miles from the Hoang-Ho [Yellow River, my translation].[63]

---

[61] "Boston," *Boston Daily Advertiser*, November 7, 1866.
[62] "Vermischtes." *Tennessee Staatszeitung*, November 13, 1866, original text*: "Vor einigen Tagen des Telegraphen die Nachricht, daß Frankreich und Corea Krieg erflärt habe. Da von diesem lande bisher in der Weltgeschichte noch sehr menig die Rede mar, so dürsten bielleicht solgende geographische Notizen nicht uninteressant sein:".*
[63] "Vermischtes." *Tennessee Staatszeitung*, November 13, 1866, original text*: "Corea is eine halbinsel an der nordöstilchen Rüste Asiens und erstrecht sich in südlicher Richtung in das Meer, das aus der oftseite das Japanesische und aus der Westfeite das gelbe Meer heißt Das land wurder nie genau bermessen;*[…] *Das land ist nicht sehr sruchtbar, hat aber einige ausgezeichnete hafen, bon denen sich einige borzüglich zu Flottenstationen*

Instead of a more general description of Korea, or mention of the French missionary deaths, the *Staatzeitung* emphasized the physical features that would be advantageous to a foreign power in further conflicts with Qing China and Japan. As for the "80 miles to the Yellow River," it is unknown how that came about, considering the closest river in China to the tip of Korea, or Jeju Island would be the Yangtze. Already the focus is not on what is happening in Korea, but how Korea could be exploited in further military ventures in East Asia, even in a German-language Southern newspaper.

Philadelphia was not the only location in Pennsylvania where news of Korea was published. In Clearfield, an original story was published combining news of the *General Sherman* and the French expedition, titled "Massacre of Americans." The article began: "In North-Eastern Asia is a country called Corea, of which little is known. It is nominally tributary to China, and is inhabited by a semi-barbarous people, extremely jealous of foreigners, with whom they hold but very limited intercourse."[64] Essentially an accurate statement from the perspective of an American in an exceptionally small town, the *Journal* continued with the "French, it is stated have declared war against Corea, doubtless for outrages committed on subjects of France, and it looks now as if these people would also get into serious trouble with the United States, for a Cable dispatch received a few days since, announces that forty Americans had been murdered by the Coreans."[65] The *Journal* concluded the article: "We take it for granted that the Commander of the United States squadron in the East will promptly seek satisfaction for this horrible outrage, the perpetrators of which should certainly have inflicted upon them the most condign punishment."[66] Already there

eignen würden. Die äußerste spitze der Insel bietet einen ausgezeichneten Süßpunst für einen Ungriff auf China oder Japan, da dieselbe nur etwa 80 meilen bon der Mündung des Hoang-Ho entsernt ist."
[64] "Massacre of Americans," *Raftsman's Journal*, November 14, 1866.
[65] "Massacre of Americans," *Raftsman's Journal*, November 14, 1866.
[66] Ibid.

is a call for action in an American newspaper, or rather a given that action would be taken in response to the destruction of the *Sherman*.

By the end of November, the *New-York Daily Tribune* reported, via the *London and China Telegraph*, that "*The Telegraph* in announcing the declaration of war against Corea, says the news confirms a previous statement that the French Admiral [Pierre-Gustave Roze] would set entirely on his own responsibility and without the special instructions of his government. He has thus probably precipitated a second Cochin China conflict,[67] for which the Emperor [Napoleon III] will not thank him." The article continues by reporting, via the *Telegraph* that they "ha[d] also received news of the American schooner Gen. Sherman having run ashore, October 5, on a voyage for Corea, with a large crew. The telegram says 40 persons have been murdered by the Coreans."[68] The *Tribune* combined short dispatches from October that had appeared in other papers around the country with a slight elaboration on what the status of the French expedition had been.

In unreconstructed Columbia, South Carolina, an article appeared at the end of November on the news of the French expedition that was still the most important news coming from Korea, not the *General Sherman*. The French newspaper the *Moniteur* reported that "in regard to the trouble with Corea, that in consequence of a palace re-actionary [sic] intrigue [likely a reference to the Daewongun], several missionaries in Corea have been put to death."[69] *The Daily Phoenix* had one of the most accurate explanations in an American newspaper for why the French missionaries had been killed. "Palace reactionary intrigue" is an accurate and succinct explanation for a nineteenth-century American audience. The article is more intriguing still, as the *Phoenix*

[67] Likely a reference to the Mekong expedition that had begun roughly in June, or a mistake on the geographic location of Korea.
[68] "COREA-War by France against Corea," *New-York Daily Tribune*, November 22, 1866.
[69] "Foreign News," *The Daily Phoenix*, November 27, 1866. The *Heungseon Daewongun* or "Great Prince Regent, Great Archduke, Prince of the Great Court," was the Father of King *Gojong* and acting regent of Joseon from 1864-1873.

continued that the "French Government is but imperfectly acquainted with the facts, and had sent Admiral Rosee [Roze] to cruise off the coast of Mevis [probably one of the *Ongjin* Islands or Ganghwa itself]. A recent telegram *via* China, said that the Admiral had declared war against Corea."[70] Here the onus is on Admiral Roze for the French expedition, which is essentially the truth. The French did not have all the information, and it was Roze that decided to attack Korea, not the French government at home. Although Roze was reprimanded, the French Empire did not rescind what had happened.[71] The *Phoenix* had accurately and succinctly reported on the French expedition, more so than in Union states and even the New York press in that regard. This is striking given that Columbia was likely still rebuilding from the end of the U.S. Civil War.

Unreconstructed Charleston also had a mention of Korea in 1866. This description was perhaps an even better explanation for *why* French missionaries had been murdered that year, as the *Charleston Daily News* reported that the "Prince Regent of that country [Korea], who is a tributary of China, sends, every two years, ambassadors to Pekin [Beijing]. He received from them a false intimation, the purport of which was that the Chinese had commenced a general massacre of Europeans."[72] Due to a miscommunication with China, the Daewongun had ordered the deaths of Europeans in general in Joseon, which so happened to be Christian missionaries from France, so the article purports. This version of the events that led to the French expedition is potentially the most sympathetic to the Joseon court. The *Daily News* is also the first paper in this study to actually publish an account from an escaped missionary, a Mr. "M. Ridel," which recounted his evasion of Korean authorities on his way to escaping the country. That account is generally

[70] Ibid.
[71] See Young Ching Choe, *The Rule of the Daewongun, 1864-1873: Restoration in Yi Korea* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972), 91-108.
[72] "The Missionary Massacre in Corea," *The Charleston Daily News,* December 6, 1866.

sympathetic to Korean commoners, who were painted as ready and willing converts to Christianity, with the trouble being in the Joseon authorities themselves.[73]

The *Daily News* actually put some names to the escaped *and* killed missionaries, reporting that "[h]e [the Daewongun] immediately caused to be seized and beheaded the Apostolic Vicar Daveluy, his coadjutor, and the missionaries Baulieu, Pourthie, Petinicolas, and a great number of native Christians."[74] As to the missionaries that had escaped death, M. Ridel had escaped the country, while "[t]wo other missionaries, M. Feron and Calais, were still wandering the mountains of the Corea."[75] The *Daily News* had added a new, human dimension to the crisis in Korea, while simultaneously placing the blame on a "rogue faction" of the Joseon court, and not on the Government writ-large, or the Korean people as a whole. Both the *Daily Phoenix* and the *Daily News* were not overtly partisan, and in fact it is likely they had more Southern Democrats working for them than Republicans. Considering the partisan angle and that the state was unreconstructed, and was generally seen as the origin of the Confederacy and the expansion of slavery, one would think that the South Carolina press had the most to lose in nuancing events occurring within a non-white, "colonizable" polity.

The *New York Herald* tied the defeat of the French Fleet at Ganghwa Island in November of 1866 to the behavior of Napoleon III. Relying on what is most likely British news sources out of Hong Kong, the *Herald* reported that the French fleet had "been defeated at Chunghaw and was compelled to retire to Shanghae.[76] Napoleon is unfortunate both in his diplomatic and his military undertakings. After fomenting the late war in Germany he was scared out of his intention to use

[73] Ibid.
[74] Ibid.
[75] Ibid.
[76] This is likely an odd spelling for *Ganghwa* Island. Archaic spelling for Shanghai.

that conflict for the advantage of France."[77] The article continues by placing Otto von Bismarck as responsible for keeping Napoleon out of the war with Austria, positing that "[t]he failure of his [Napoleon's] imperial schemes in Mexico and the compulsory withdrawal of his troops…and the defeat of the French fleet in the distant Japanese sea[78] may somewhat impede the realization of another grand Napoleonic idea." The *Herald* went even further in indicting Napoleon's imperialism, suggesting that "it is not improbable that there was a design at the bottom of it—to get a foothold on the kingdom of Corea…with a view to checking the advance of Russia in the direction of the large trade of the Japan and other islands in those waters."[79] The *Herald* called these imperial ventures by France an "accumulation of embarrassments," which would imply both the impotence of Napoleon's leadership, but also the defeat of a western power by an Eastern "backward" nation as unacceptable. France's defeat may have embarrassed Napoleon III, but it freed up the New York press to focus on what had happened to the *General Sherman*.

While New York moved on from the French expedition with the latest news available, in other parts of the country this was not the case. In Evansville, Indiana, the *General Sherman* was not yet a priority in the *Evansville Journal*, as news concerning the French punitive expedition was a more involved affair. The *Journal* reported that advices "from Hong Kong bring rumors that the French expedition against Corea, sent for the purpose of avenging the murder of French missionaries and other outrages, has been beaten off from [Ganghwa] with severe loss. The French fleet, it is said, returned to Shanghai."[80] Short and devoid of any real opinion, the *Journal* at the very least did care to publish the news of the French defeat. It is not implausible that even in

[77] "Defeat of the French Navy at Corea," *New York Herald*, December 26, 1866. Placing blame on Napoleon III for the "fomenting" of the Austro-Prussian War is a surprising analysis coming from the *New York Herald*.
[78] This being the Yellow Sea.
[79] "Defeat of the French Navy at Corea," *New York Herald*, December 26, 1866.
[80] "Latest News." *The Evansville Journal*, December 27, 1866.

Evansville, France's aggressive actions would have been on the minds of Americans. While likely more related to the actions of the French in Mexico, any news of the condition of Napoleon III's imperial ambitions was certainly a welcome one.

Chicago was arguably the runner-up in most important press centers in the United States in the immediate aftermath of the Civil War. The *Chicago Tribune* was one the city's largest paper in circulation. That Korea made the front page of the *Tribune* on the last day of 1866 is thus no small order.[81] Excerpted from a "Toulon letter", an article titled "The Massacre of the French Missionaries in Corea" reported on the French expedition to Korea, providing specific detail as to why Rear-Admiral Roze was in Korean waters, as well as giving justification to his offensive actions at Ganghwa island, more so than any previous paper reporting on the French expedition.[82] The actions of the French government are described as essentially reserved: '"The French Government, entirely disapproving of any attempt of an expedition against the kingdom of Corea, directed Rear-Admiral Roze to undertake nothing till further orders, as the massacre of the French missionaries required an exemplary chastisement which would be better deferred to a more opportune moment.'"[83] The *Tribune* noted that a reservation in an escalation in conflict existed only because the "vengeance" for the deaths of the missionaries would not be great enough. This rhetoric mirrors several editorials in the Midwest and East Coast on their reasoning for ending the Korea expedition of 1871, as the war would be a failure *only* due to a lack of overwhelming military force.

The article takes a contradictory turn in its reasoning for why Admiral Roze engaged the Koreans, as the *Tribune* noted:

[81] For specific circulation figures of the *Chicago Tribune* during the 1866-1871 period, see Philip Kinsley, *The Chicago Tribune, Its First Hundred Years*, Vol. 2, *1865-1880* (New York: A.A. Knopf, 1945).
[82] "COREA-The Massacre of French Missionaries in Corea." *Chicago Tribune*, December 31, 1866.
[83] Ibid.

> 'Ascending the stream [Saleé or Han River] very slowly, they [Roze's squadron] reached, at four leagues from the mouth, a large village, where a strong body of armed men were occupied in constructing weirs. After some fruitless attempts at a conference, the Admiral, seeing that his presence caused no cessation of the work, *destroyed the stockade, by cannon shot, and fired grape into the hostile* corps d'armee, *which took to flight in every direction* [my emphasis].'[84]

This certainly points to Admiral Roze attacking Korean commoners on shore unprovoked, and it implies that Roze had fired on the Koreans as he was insulted that they had not ceased their dam construction due to his presence. This unequivocally painted Roze in a negative light, as someone willing to go against the orders of the French government over his own arrogance and perceived lack of respect at reception. Interestingly, the *Tribune* justified Roze's actions, which were contradicted a sentence before, concluding that the '"admiral, who only intended to make a hydrographical *reconnaissance* to facilitate ulterior operations, has left these inhospitable shores to join his main squadron in the China seas.'"[85] There is no evidence from the article that would imply that a "hydrographical *reconnaissance*" was the mission of Roze, considering the escalation to violence. There is also no mention of a failed expedition, or that the goals of the expedition were to address the deaths of the French missionaries, which contradicts news of the French expedition from other papers. Notice also that there is no information on the *General Sherman*, which would point to the French expedition being more newsworthy to the *Tribune* than an American-centered story.

In Davenport, Iowa, a short report was also published on the last day of 1866. It stated that the "repulse of the French fleet in the Corea is confirmed. The Cochin Chinese shore batteries are said to be formidable."[86] It is not clear if there is a mistake in this dispatch regarding the French

[84] Ibid. Weir, if understood to mean a low dam to control water flow. Context clues within the article could also point to "weir" being a synonym for a stockade for defense, if the word were abstracted enough. I would lean on dam construction, however.
[85] "COREA-The Massacre of French Missionaries in Corea." *Chicago Tribune*, December 31, 1866.
[86] "News by the Atlantic Cable," *Daily Davenport Democrat*, December 31, 1866.

expedition, or if the *Daily Davenport Democrat* had combined the French Korean expedition with the French Mekong Expedition. It is more likely that it *is* a mistake, as a such a small paper may have confused the location of Korea considering that the paper also reported that "the French fleet in the Corea has been defeated in an engagement at Kin Yan Cochin [unknown, most likely an abstraction of a location in Southeast Asia]. The China fleet has returned to Shanghai. The amount of loss is not stated."[87] What is more certain is that there is no mention of the *General Sherman*, months after it had been reported in various forms in other newspapers in the United States. French weakness, even in this very short statement, is still a priority.

In January of 1867 news coverage had shifted to the *Sherman* and its fate over the French blunder in the preceding months. The *Boston Daily Advertiser* reported again on Korea. In their article, both the fate of the *General Sherman* is confirmed, as well as reference to the U.S.S. *Surprise*, a different American merchant marine vessel that was shipwrecked in June, a month before the *Sherman*.[88] The article reiterates the testimony of the "[t]wo surviving Catholic priests, who escaped from the Corean mountains after the massacre of their companions, arrived at Chefoo [Yantai], October 6, and confirm the news of the murder of the crew of the American schooner General Sherman. […] The American schooner Surprise was lost June 24 off the Corean coast, but the crew after considerable suffering landed at Corea, where they were well taken care of."[89] While the *Boston Daily Advertiser* did not directly question why the crew of the *General Sherman* were murdered, by putting the treatment of the *Surprise* crew within the same article, it is implied to be a mystery, at the very least.

[87] Ibid.
[88] The *Surprise* is mentioned in several sources, though the most succinct might be the dated Charles Oscar Paullin, "The Opening of Korea by Commodore Shufeldt," *Political Science Quarterly* 25, no. 3 (1910): 471.
[89] "From Japan and China," *Boston Daily* Advertiser, January 7, 1867.

The New York Times finally reported the fate of the *General Sherman* on 7 January 1867, relaying that "[t]he two surviving Catholic priests who escaped from the Corean Mountains after the massacre of their companions arrived at Chefoo [Yantai] Oct. 6. [1866] and confirmed the news of the murder of the crew of the American schooner *General Sherman*."[90] Earlier in this edition of the *Times*, a short op-ed calls on the American government to address the destruction of the *General Sherman* in decidedly more fiery language. The writer states that:

> the natives not only burned the vessel and appropriated everything that was portable on board, but murdered the whole crew in the most brutal manner. As these pirates of Corea have for a long time been guilty of a series of similar cruelties against the seafaring people of all nations, our Government *ought at once to take steps so effectually to punish them* [my emphasis], that a good sound chastisement shall compel them hereafter to abstain from a repetition of such crimes. The savages want a thrashing. It should be a right hearty one.[91]

This is one of the first instances of a New York paper calling for a war with Korea, or at the very least a "punitive expedition" much like the one carried out by the French. This call for an attack upon Korea would not be answered until 1871, but op-eds such as this assuredly spurred the federal government into investigating the destruction of the *General Sherman*.

Returning to the French, a generally confused reporting on the defeat of the French in Korea came from *The Sun*. The short report indicated that "the French fleet in the Corea is about to leave those waters for the Winter, without being able to obtain adequate redress from Cochin China. It is stated that French troops have burned the palace and Government houses at Kanghow [sic]."[92] It is unclear if *The Sun* thought that Korea was in Southeast Asia, or if Korea was thought to be the same kingdom as "Cochin China", but what is implied in this report is not defeat for France,

[90] "China," *The New York Times*, January 7, 1867, 5.
[91] "Work for Our Navy," *The New York Times*, January 7, 1867, 4.
[92] "French Leaving the Corea," *The Sun*, January 9, 1867. Kanghow is more than likely Ganghwa Island.

but a successful "punitive expedition" with the destruction of Korean royal properties on Ganghwa Island, in contrast to the *Herald* article from December.

In the vein of *The Sun*, reframed news of French actions in Korea was also published on 9 January in the *Evansville Journal*. The *Journal* reported that the "French fleet in the Mexican waters has been ordered to remain there, and to collect the Custom House duties."[93] The French had yet to leave Mexico since their invasion in 1861, but the *Journal* includes this news of conflict de-escalation with the results of the French expedition, noting that once again advices "from Corea, just received, state that the French have burnt the Palace and the Government Houses at Kangahero [Ganghwa]. All attempts at negotiation have failed."[94] In this instance, the *Journal* painted the results of the French expedition on a more equal footing. The language had changed from "severe loss" to "burnt the Palace" in terms of which party in the conflict came out more damaged.

In Keokuk, Iowa an article reported that the "failure of the French at Corea is confirmed. The expedition was a total failure. The natives are greatly elated, and European prestige is considerably damaged."[95] Again, no mention of the *Sherman* appeared in the Iowa press within the timeframe of other U.S. states, a fact that is surprising considering the relative sizes of Keokuk and Davenport in relation, to say, Evansville. The fact of French failure abroad was still more newsworthy in many parts of the country then an actual interest in affairs revolving around Korea, which is suggested by the blending of "Cochin China" and Korea as a single entity.

An editorial appeared in the *Chicago Tribune* in February of 1867, fully interested in the fate of the *General Sherman*. Titled "A Trouble in Corea," the *Tribune* offered an alternative reason for the *General Sherman* embarking to Korea, noting that while "preparations were making

[93] "Europe." *The Evansville Journal*, January 9, 1867.
[94] Ibid.
[95] "By Telegraph," *Daily Gate City*, January 12, 1867.

for the [French] expedition, certain enterprising merchants concluded to improve the opportunity to turn an honest penny by a contraband trade with Corea."[96] Here the *Tribune* is not describing the *General Sherman* but instead an "English vessel [that] was fitted out by an English firm. [sic] and made a successful trip, having disposed of her cargo of arms and ammunition, and returned safely to port."[97] This unnamed English vessel appears only in this article, and is purportedly *different* than the *General Sherman*, even though the description and purpose of this English vessel bears a striking similarity to the *Sherman*.[98] The *Tribune* used this supposed "English Vessel" as a comparison to the similarly tasked *General Sherman*, as the Tribune reported that on

> the 9th of August last [1866], an American schooner, named the *General Sherman*, left Chefoo [Yantai] on a similar expedition [to this English vessel theory], in command of American Captain [Page], and with an American crew, although on this occasion in the service of an English firm. […] There is no doubt but the schooner was engaged in an unlawful expedition, and her seizure and confiscation by the Corean Government would have been very proper.[99]

The *Tribune* admitted that the *General Sherman* was likely involved in some sort of illegal activity, as the likely fictional "English vessel" had been engaged in gun-running that the *Sherman* was also accused of doing. The *Tribune* had sided with the actions of the Joseon state against the *Sherman*, but had found the way in which the *Sherman* was destroyed, in this instance that the crew was burned alive, a crew the *Tribune* believed to be mostly Americans, to be reprehensible.[100]

The *Tribune* called on the Federal government to act due to the supposed nature of the deaths of the *Sherman*'s crew, not that the crew were innocent. The *Tribune* noted that "Mr. Johnson [Andrew Johnson] has now an opportunity to display a 'vigorous foreign policy.' Corea

[96] "A Trouble in Corea," *Chicago Tribune*, February 24, 1867.
[97] Ibid.
[98] It is likely that the *Chicago Tribune* had misreported this story on a successful English smuggling run to Korea during the French expedition, as there is no forthcoming evidence to its existence in the available historiography on this period.
[99] "A Trouble in Corea," *Chicago Tribune*, February 24, 1867.
[100] Ibid.

has an army of over six hundred thousand men, and a fleet of two hundred vessels; but a few broadsides from one of our war vessels would soon scatter the whole of them."[101] Even when knowledge of the *Sherman* engaging in unethical, or overtly illegal activity was taken as fact, the *Chicago Tribune* still called on the United States government to retaliate against the Joseon state, calling for military action and an international incident to defend a largely international crew, acting independently of the United States.

By March, *The Sun* reported on the first actions by the United States government to investigate the *General Sherman*, noting that "[t]he U.S. steamer Wachusett left for the Corea on the 21st of January, to inquire into the circumstances attending the wreck of the American schooner General Sherman."[102] The article continues with a an international dimension to the situation on the Korean peninsula, reporting that "[t]he English, French, and American Ministers have agreed to go to the Corea in the spring…and insist upon the execution of all treaties."[103] This is a striking report, as it would imply that the western powers interested in Korea were planning a coordinated effort to open the country up to trade, an act that is unsubstantiated outside of the press.

On the same day, the *Herald* elaborated on the news of the *Wachusett* indicating that "Captain Schufeldt, her [U.S.S *Wachusett*'s] commander, states that all the crew of the ship General Sherman had been murdered by the pirates."[104] While a minor figure in 1867, Robert Wilson Shufeldt played an integral role in the opening of Korea, and was present at every engagement between the United States and Korea from 1867 to 1882, when the treaty bearing his name that opened the country to the United States was signed. The *Herald* also continued using the word "pirates" to describe the Koreans that destroyed the *General Sherman*, in the same vein

[101] "A Trouble in Corea," *Chicago Tribune*, February 24, 1867.
[102] "China and Japan," *The Sun*, March 21, 1867.
[103] Ibid.
[104] "Special Telegram to the Herald," *New York Herald*, March 21, 1867.

as the *Times* op-ed, which conflicts with the idea of "punishing" the Joseon kingdom, instead seeking to punish what are essentially outlaws in an international incident.

Also on the same day, The *Boston Daily Advertiser* reported on the *Wachusett* mission in March, noting that "[t]he United States steamer Wachusett arrived here [Shanghai] from Corea on the 6th inst. [*instante mense*] Capt. Schufeldt states that the crew of the Gen. Sherman were all murdered. Capt. Schufeldt's despatches to the Governor of Corea had been received by the latter, but no answer had been returned."[105] The *Advertiser* had relayed essentially the standard telegraph from Shanghai that also appeared in New York papers, but had included the attempt by Schufeldt to contact the Joseon state. News from Korea was short for the *Advertiser*, which is surprising considering the importance of the *Wachusett* for the state of Massachusetts, but it was forthcoming at the least.[106]

The *Evansville Journal* had also returned to American issues on 21 March, reporting on the same "despatch" that the Massachusetts press had. A telegraph from San Francisco noted to the *Journal* that the "United States steamer Wauchusetts [*Wachusett*] arrived here [Shanghai] from Corea on the 6th [February]. Capt. Schufeldt states that the crew of the General Sherman were all murdered. Capt. Schufeldt's dispatch to the Governor of Corea had been received by the latter, but no answer had been returned."[107] The focus had changed in the *Journal* to the "mystery" of the *General Sherman*. At that point Korea was not an unknown place to Evansville, as evidenced in previous articles, but the seriousness with which the United States government had begun to treat the *Sherman* situation represented a transition from a French problem to an American one.

[105] "From China and Japan," *Boston Daily Advertiser*, March 21, 1867.
[106] Mt. Wachusett is a peak in Worcester County, Massachusetts. The U.S.S. *Wachusett* acquired its name from this Massachusetts peak.
[107] "China & Japan," *The Evansville Journal*, March 21, 1867.

In Lowell, Massachusetts, another short telegram identical to the one printed in New York paper the *Sun* was published in 23 March of 1867. The *Lowell Daily Citizen* reported that a "telegram says that English, French and American ministers have agreed to go to Corea in the spring, accompanied by their respective fleets, and insist upon the execution of treaties."[108] It is unclear whether the *Daily Citizen* replicated the dispatch in the *Sun*, or if it had received the same report from China as the *Sun* had. It is more likely that a local paper in Lowell, Massachusetts would have copied those short reports from a much larger New York publication, although it is also possible that these newswires were available to the press writ large, and not protected by a single publication.

In October, another fiery op-ed lambasting the western powers over their inaction with Korea was published in the *Times*. Their correspondent in Asia lamented that "[t]he three greatest Governments in the world—England, France and the United States—seem to care nothing for their national honor, and the lives and safety of their citizens, so far as Corea is concerned." He continues with increasingly bombastic language, "All these things do not appear to disturb the repose and equanimity of those Powers, and Corea, a poor, half-civilized and insignificant country, unknown to the world almost, except that it exists on maps, treats with inhumanity the flags and the citizens of the West, with outrage and slaughter!"[109] Echoing the January op-ed, the *Times* had increased the anti-Korean rhetoric, writing the "quiet part loud" in the paper of record. As the *Times* called for action against Korea, not Korean "pirates", for its alleged crimes against westerners, in a similar vein to other American newspapers.

The end of the year produced something more original in the *Advertiser*. On the *Wachusett* expedition, the *Advertiser* stated that no

[108] "A Young man in Illinois." *Lowell Daily Citizen,* March 23, 1867.
[109] "Affairs in China," *The New York Times,* October 7, 1867.

> satisfactory results have been obtained in the regard to the murder of the officers and crew of the American schooner General Sherman, in one of the streams of Corea, and Rear-Admiral Bell [Henry Haywood Bell] apprehends that "until the government takes efficient action on this case, our countrymen lawfully navigating the seas adjacent to Corea will be in peril of life and liber of person from the barbarities of the people and the authorities of that country, who aim at the exclusion of strangers."[110]

Rear-Admiral Bell, and not the American press, is calling for an escalation with the Joseon state. The idea of Korea as a dangerous nation for shipwrecked sailors ran counter to the evidence of their previous treatment, such as with the case of the *Surprise*, but Bell implied that the *General Sherman* was the rule, and not an exceptional case. The responsibility was shifted to the Koreans, for being a closed nation, and not to the crew of the *General Sherman* for their attempt at "opening" Korea without the consent of the Joseon state.

These papers show that between 1866 and 1867, United States newspapers were generally of one mind in terms of what should be done to Korea in retaliation for the *General Sherman* and the failures of France to vindicate perceived injustices towards the "west." Opinions ranged from neutral reporting on the events, to calls to punish the "barbarities" of the Korean "pirates" that had killed the crew of the *General Sherman*. Not one paper during these two years called for no action against Korea, though the Southern press took a nuanced approach towards the French expedition. Ambivalence in the American press towards Korea was only beginning between 1866 and 1867, but this accelerated during the next few years, and reached its height when American troops were sent to the Korean peninsula in 1871.

Part II: 1868-1871

Some of the reporting in 1868 began in Cleveland, Ohio, where the *Daily Cleveland Herald* reported in "The Wrecked Ship Gen. Sherman" that "the United States steamer Shenandoah, seven

[110] "Report of the Secretary of the Navy." *Boston Daily Advertiser*, December 5, 1867

guns, [and] Captain Febiger [sic] in command, serving in the Asiatic squadron, had proceeded under orders to Corea to inquire into the fate of any of the survivors of the American barque General Sherman, who may be found on the territory of the Peninsula."[111] Essentially a relayed telegraph from the Associated Press, the *Cleveland Herald* had provided a minimum of information on the situation in Korea. The *Herald* opted to not lend an editorial, or even a more detailed story, to the *General Sherman*, Shufeldt's efforts with the *Wachusett*, or even to the *Shenandoah* in any greater detail, erasing the efforts of the *Wachusett* and perpetuating the idea that the fate of the *Sherman*'s crew was still an entire mystery in 1868.

In the Kingdom of Hawai'i, the foreign-owned and English-language newspaper *The Hawaiian Gazette* also reported on the crisis unfolding in Korea. It is likely that the westerners that occupied and worked within the Kingdom of Hawaii were concerned with international news relating to the United States, considering their international position in the middle of the Pacific Ocean. Titled "Corea," the short dispatch is concerned primarily with events from 1866 to 1868, relaying a "letter from China" on the particulars of American naval movement: '"The loss of the American schooner *General Sherman* on the coast of the Corea peninsula during the early part of 1867, and the report of the massacre of all the people on board, is a matter which has never been fully investigated. Now a report reaches us that some of the crew escaped the sword, but are still held in bondage.'"[112] Mirroring the general lack of clear information at the time, the *Gazette* combined several inaccuracies, from the wrong year of the incident to the survival of some of the crew. Once again, no mention of the *Wachusett* is given, but the *Gazette* continued with this excerpted letter: "So the U.S. steamer *Shenandoah*, under the command of Captain Ferbiger [John C. Ferbiger], sails in a few days to investigate the *General Sherman's* disaster, and also to survey

[111] "The Wrecked Ship Gen. Sherman," *The Daily Cleveland Herald,* May 11, 1868.
[112] "Corea," *The Hawaiian Gazette,* May 13, 1868.

the coast.'"[113] The *Gazette* did not report the *Shenandoah*'s mission in any sort of objective way, of course. The *Gazette* concluded with what should be done, according to this letter, that '"Admiral Rowan [Stephen Clegg Rowan], it is supposed, will bring orders to punish the barbarians. Such attempts all good men will hope to see crowned with success, and not thwarted like the French expedition which came to grief some months since[.]"'[114] By omitting the efforts of the *Wachusett,* the *Gazette* inadvertently reinforced a chain of events that led to the Korea expedition.

The situation on the Kingdom of Hawai'i, and the information that the *Gazette* led with in that article is also worth noting. That '"Corea is a country and coast of which we know but little, and at the same time a land which [the] report says is rich in precious metals, and a garden-spot of fertility."'[115] That the *Gazette* opened by essentially describing Korea as a land of untapped resources likely appealed to the English-speaking readers in Honolulu, many of which were sugar plantation and factory owners who themselves were exploiting the "untapped" potential of Hawai'i, many of which were Americans in a "garden-spot of fertility."[116] Already in what became America's first Pacific colony had American colonial-political interests turned further East, with an anticipation of further profit to be found in Korea.

Finally in July, a detailed account of what had happened to the *Sherman* was published in *The New York Times*. While the *Wachusett* had found that the *General Sherman*'s crew had been murdered, the fate of the ship and what events lead to their deaths had not been established. *The New York Times* released a detailed retelling of the *Shenandoah*'s findings in July of 1868. This report included a short description of the *Sherman*'s crew, the first published in the *Times*:

---

[113] Ibid.
[114] Ibid.
[115] Ibid.
[116] For more specific information on the development of a sugar economy in Hawai'i, see the singly economically focused C. Allan Jones and Robert V. Osgood, *From King Cane to the Last Sugar Mill : Agricultural Technology and the Making of Hawaii's Premier Crop* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2015).

> The main features of that ill-fated expedition are still *quite fresh in the public mind* [my emphasis]. They can be briefly summoned as follows: The *Sherman*, a small schooner of between one and two hundred tons burdeu [sic], was freighted with an assorted cargo, by a trading house in Tientsin [Tianjin], doing business under the style of MEADOWS & Co., and dispatched to Corea toward the close of 1866, under the command of Capt. PAGE. Accompanying PAGE went an American of the name of PRESTON, who to the novelty and interest of a pleasure trip seems to have added whatever of profit was to be derived from a traffic in firearms, which, owing to the difficulties then existing between the Corean and the French bore a high price…As nothing was heard from them, and it was known that the Corean authorities had expressed themselves hostile to any attempt by foreigners to settle on the coast, or even to open trade with the natives, it was generally believed that the vessel had been destroyed, and the party on board either killed or taken prisoners.[117]

This description contradicts previous claims by the New York press, claims that implied with *certainty* the fate of the *Sherman*. In reality, the reporting on the events that lead to the deaths of the *Sherman*'s crew were based on second- or third-hand information, and likely any available rumors. Despite this, the fate of the crew of the *General Sherman* was generally reported correctly, in that "the officers and crew of the *General Sherman* were beheaded, and not burned alive as had been previously reported. The schooner was said to be laying, an 'unbroken wreck' on the banks of the [*Taedong*] river, where the disaster took place[.]"[118] That the crew had not been burned alive, and the *Sherman* had also not been burned were slight corrections to the reporting from the previous two years. The *Times* article also included a brief description of what the crew of the *Shenandoah* thought of the Korean shores that they had visited, with the prophetic line from the article that "it is not improbable that it [Korea] will be re-visited by both Europeans and Americans[.]"[119] The article ends with a cliff-hanger, addressing the United States subtly insisting

[117] "China," *The New York Times,* July 13, 1868.
[118] Ibid.
[119] Ibid.

that it "remains to be seen what further developments the actions of the Government at Washington are *destined* [my emphasis] to bring about."[120]

In Kansas, *The Emporia News* reported on a multi-national land invasion of Korea that was underway that was a punitive expedition to its core. The *News* proclaimed that the "frigate Colorado and the Corvettes, Alaska and Benicia, ordered to the Asiatic squadron, have been equipped with an extra supply of howitzers, regulation rifles and pistols, for the special purpose of punishing the natives of Corea and Formosa [Taiwan] for their depredations on American shipping."[121] There is no question of the nature of the Korea expedition here. The *News* is explicit in the offensive nature of the Korea expedition, a tone distinctly different from papers in other parts of the United States, especially considering that the *News* does not mention a specific reason for the Asiatic squadron to punish the Joseon state, outside of "depredations on American shipping." The *News* continued by asserting a Great Power coalition against Korea, as "English, French, American, Dutch and Russian squadrons *will* [my emphasis] unite in an expedition [sic] which will land five or six thousand men, to attack the paincipal [sic] cities in Corea, and bring the authorities to terms."[122] Unique in its assertion of a multinational alliance totally bent on punishing Korea for vague reasons, the *News* actually exaggerated the political importance of the Korea expedition, as opposed to undervaluing the events in Korea or generally reporting on them. It should also be noted that this is the only piece of news written in 1870 in this study, and is thus the first news of the Asiatic Squadron heading to Korea, even though the circumstances

[120] Ibid.
[121] "The frigate Colorado." *The Emporia News*, April 8, 1870. On "Formosa," The Formosa expedition was undertaken in 1867 over the deaths of shipwrecked American sailors killed by native Taiwanese. Little historiography exists concerning the Formosa expedition, but the roughly hundred-year-old James Davidson, *The Island of Formosa, Past and Present. History, People, Resources, and Commercial Prospects. Tea, Camphor, Sugar, Gold, Coal, Sulphur, Economical Plants, and other Productions* (London and New York: Macmillan & co., 1903), 110-122., does record this incident, in the most professional method available among sources. The press also does, but this work is obviously more academic, even given its highly dated and problematic nature.
[122] "The frigate Colorado." *The Emporia News*, April 8, 1870.

surrounding that mission are grossly misreported. Events in Korea evidently were exciting enough to be published in an exaggerated fashion on the front page of the *Emporia News*, over a year before the Battle of Ganghwa.

In early 1871, before the events of the Korea expedition, an article titled "A Spec of War in the East," was published by the *New York Herald* and provided another explanation of the *General Sherman* incident, along with a description of the *China* incident of 1868.[123] The "North German Steamer" known as the *China* sailed to Korea with nefarious intentions, as the *Herald* article revealed through the American on board the *China*, F.H. B. Jenkins, who stated that "the real objects of the expedition— [were] to exhume the bones of a former king and to hold to force a large payment of money[,]" which "was looked upon as certain to grievously interfere with efforts to open relations with Corea."[124] As obvious as holding the remains of a Korean king for ransom would be to hurting international relations, the full case *against* Korea is the main subject of this article. As the American expedition was already underway, the decision to forcibly open up Korea had already been made by the publishing of this article.

What is interesting about this article is an inclusion of the "Corean account" of the *General Sherman* incident as relayed by the "Chinese Foreign Office" which, "was to the effect that the [Joseon] government had no hand in the disaster that befell the General Sherman and her crew. That it was a fixed rule in Corea that when unfortunate men were cast ashore that they were to be released and treated kindly, so that if there were any pitiable cases of such persons who had drifted ashore they would not be detained against their will."[125] This supposedly official account from the "Corean government" echoes previous op-eds that argued that "pirates" were responsible for

[123] "A Spec of War in the East," *New York Herald*, March 23, 1871.
[124] Ibid.
[125] Ibid.

the deaths of the *General Sherman*'s crew, as opposed to an official sanction by the Joseon state. This narrative did not convince the United States government to not pursue "punitive" action against Korea, though it did convince, or at least cast doubt on further action, with some members of the American press.

By June, when the Korea expedition really took off, the *Herald* had changed its position. Korea itself was now painted as a pirate nation. Korea is seen as both subservient to Qing rule as well as in rebellion to the will of the Qing Empire, with an article from 17 June 1871 stating that the "coalition of the French, English, Prussians and Americans, entered into [sic] for the punishment of the piratical Chinese [Koreans] of the Corea, makes a fine opening for a decisive settlement, by a similar coalition, with China, and for a reconstruction of the Chinese policy of international discourse and reciprocity with civilized nations."[126] Seeing the 1871 expedition as an opener to another war with China to the further benefit for western nations is the central point of this article, with the *Herald* itself stating that "[w]e [*New York Herald*] hope that General Grant will, from this affair in the Corea, *take the hint* [my emphasis], and proceed to the adoption of measures looking to an *armed coalition* [my emphasis] for a satisfactory treaty of peace with China."[127] Calls for an escalation of war in East Asia from a punitive expedition on Korea to one on China with a coalition of western powers is certainly a bold decision by the *Herald*, but their inclusion in such an encouraged conflict, or even the Korean expedition itself, was not a guarantee.

The *Boston Daily Advertiser* was given a "special despatch" from Washington on 19 June concerning the Korea expedition, but the results of which were yet unknown. The dispatch noted that the "despatch of Secretary Fish [Hamilton Fish, 26th Secretary of State] to Minister Low of April 20, 1870, authorized him to negotiate a treaty with the authorities of Corea for the protection

[126] "Very Interesting News from Washington," *New York Herald*, June 17, 1871. 6.
[127] Ibid.

of shipwrecked mariners, and, should the opportunity seem favorable for obtaining commercial advantages in Corea, he was to include provisions to that effect."[128] The *Advertiser* laid out the responsible parties to the expedition in full in this excerpt. Secretary Fish had given the order to Frederick Low the year prior to conduct the mission, and the *Advertiser* also mentioned a noticeable nuance in the goals of the expedition: the protection of American sailors in the Joseon state *first*, and the "opening" of the country *second* and only if convenient to Minister Low. The article continued, as "Admiral Rodgers received full instructions from the Navy department and placed his flagship [U.S.S. *Colorado*] at the disposal of Mr. Low, who was instructed to exercise *prudence and discretion* [my emphasis], to maintain firmly the right of the United States to have their seamen protected, and to *avoid a conflict by force* [my emphasis], unless it could not be avoided without dishonor."[129]

It is likely by the content of this *Advertiser* article, that the failure of the Korea expedition was multifaceted, as not only had the United States failed to conclude any treaties with Joseon, but Admiral Rodgers had also failed to avoid military conflict and to uphold "American honor." If those were the actual objectives of the expedition, they were certainly the official objectives of record, as corroborated by Grant's speech at the end of 1871. Thus, it was a failure of both those civilian and military objectives, not an isolated, civilian failure on Minister Low's part in concluding diplomacy. This article also shows that the American press had become more ambivalent in its opinion on the role of the Korea expedition, as the *Advertiser* by publishing this dispatch had taken the side of caution and potential avoidance of conflict, unlike some of the other American papers.

[128] "News by Telegraph," *Boston Daily Advertiser*, June 19, 1871, 1.
[129] Ibid., 1.

The *Herald* published two letters on 24 June 1871 that detailed the exclusion of the American press from the Korean expedition which, according to the author of one of these letters, "is the first time that the press has been arbitrarily excluded from joining an expedition of the kind you [Admiral John Rodgers] lead[.]"[130] Excluding the *Herald* from the expedition, and indeed *all* American journalists, was seen as a matter of military secrecy by Admiral Rodgers. The *Herald* correspondent highlights this, noting that Rodgers believed that "'it may be of the first importance to keep our action and further purposes from the Coreans.'"[131] A need for military secrecy concerning the expedition is not necessarily unusual, considering the evolution in military censorship of journalism born out of the American Civil War.[132] What is unusual is the complication found within the *Herald* article. The correspondent observed that "a photographist [sic] from Yokohama, a subject of the kingdom [sic] of Greece or Great Britain, one who has no claims whatever on the United States government or its officers, has received permission from yourself [Rodgers] to accompany the fleet."[133] To the ire of the *Herald*, the New York press relied on the Asiatic Squadron for news on the expedition, unable to accompany the fleet. This lack of military transparency on what was supposedly an investigative mission into trade relations with the Joseon state as well as compensation for the *General Sherman* may have signaled to the New York press that direct military confrontation was always the objective.

That suspicion was confirmed by the *New-York Daily Tribune* in an article titled "Bombshell Diplomacy." An article that both praised and called for the end of military actions by

[130] "Rear Admiral Rodgers and the Press," *New York Herald*, June 24, 1871.
[131] Ibid.
[132] For a short primer on American journalism during the U.S. Civil War, and its suppression and censorship, see Ford Risley, *Civil War Journalism* (Westport: ABC-CLIO, LLC, 2012).
[133] "Rear Admiral Rodgers and the Press," *New York Herald*, June 24, 1871.

the Asiatic squadron in Korea, "Bombshell Diplomacy" begins with retelling of the *General Sherman* incident, except with dated details that were known by 1871. The *General Sherman* was

> blown off her course and shipwrecked on the inhospitable shores of the peninsula of Corea. The crew managed to take to their boats and landed in a small cove, whence they penetrated a little way into the interior. The jealous Coreans…stopped not to ascertain the cause of this sudden apparition of foreign strangers, but fell upon them, wounding them sore, killed many, and left but a few alive to escape to tell the tale of this barbaric reception of shipwrecked sailors.[134]

Several inaccuracies from the fate of the *General Sherman* are apparent in this article, even from "outsider" information coming from previous New York reporting--principally, the idea that the crew unwillingly ended up in Korea, and that they were "found" in some sort of cove, and not confronted on the banks of the *Taedong* river. There is also the fact that the *entire* crew was killed, that the fate of the *General Sherman* required outside inquiry, and not a survivor's account.[135] "Bombshell Diplomacy" continues by providing an explanation for why a response from the United States seemed so delayed. The *Tribune* admits that "[w]e were in the agonies of Reconstruction; we could not stop to bother with making inquiries concerning the responsibility of the Corean Government—if such there be—for the barbarous butchery of a few sailors. *The demand was one of those things which would keep* [my emphasis], and so was pigeon-holed."[136] The *Tribune* attributed the five-year gap between the *General Sherman* and the Korean expedition entirely to Reconstruction, while it was the press that would keep the "unanswered" injustice of the *General Sherman* alive as "the demand" was apparently strong enough.

In a polemical fashion, the *Tribune* continued, closing the five-year gap in which the United States had apparently

> pacified our [United States] quarrels, cemented peaceful relations with the Western nations…[t]he blood of the martyred crew of the General Sherman cries to us from

[134] "Bombshell Diplomacy," *New-York Daily Tribune*, June 30, 1871.
[135] Several New York press articles addressed above corroborate what is considered the "true" account.
[136] "Bombshell Diplomacy," *New-York Daily Tribune*, June 30, 1871.

> the stones of the Corean coast, and Anglo-Saxon civilization, in pervasive and persuasive mood, stands eager to pour its revolvers and prayer-books, sewing-machines and bombshells, into the vast unknown land, peopled by a hardy, industrious and numerous race. A grand naval and diplomatic expedition, with great faith in the power of ideas…sails for Corea to ask explanation of the General Sherman affair and open the gates of the long-isolated kingdom—peaceably if we can, forcibly if we must.[137]

With such a potentially subtle compliment to the resistance of the Korean people to outside influence hidden within a "God-and-Guns" view of diplomatic interventions, it may not be that surprising that this article also called for an end to the expedition. The *Tribune* inquired:

> [h]ave we killed Coreans enough to avenge the manes of the slaughtered American sailors? If so, let us haul off and say no more about it…[i]t is plain that we are not wanted in the Corea…[w]hy should we force the privacy of an ancient nation? Why break in upon the seclusion of ages because it has existed for ages? *Is our sort of civilization so saving, so precious, that men must have it forced upon them at the cannon's mouth* [my emphasis]?[138]

A tumultuous op-ed, "Bombshell Diplomacy" called for an end to the war in Korea, but *only* after what is essentially a blood-debt had been paid. What is most striking in this article, is the *Tribune*'s choice to critique the entire concept of the punitive expedition. The sovereign right of the Joseon state to be isolated from the United States was considered *more* important to the author of this op-ed, than to open Korea to a trade agreement with the western powers. After all the bombastic language disparaging the "barbarous" acts of the Korean people, the costs of the expedition, including the Korean costs, had won out.

In Ottawa, Illinois, the war that the *Tribune* had called for was reported on in July of 1871. The article gives an almost entirely inaccurate rendition of the *General Sherman* incident, noting that "[F]ive years ago the American ship Gen. Sherman went ashore on the Corean coast, a peninsula on the east side of China. The crews were horribly tortured by the natives, put in cages

[137] "Bombshell Diplomacy," *New-York Daily Tribune*, June 30, 1871.
[138] Ibid.

and carried around the country and exhibited. One man alone escaped to an American man-of-war, and detailed these atrocities."[139] There is no evidence that the Koreans that destroyed the *General Sherman* tortured and paraded the crew around the country, just as there is no evidence that *any* of the crew survived the initial conflict. It is possible that the *Ottawa Free Trader* confused the survivors of the execution of the French missionaries with survivors of the *General Sherman*, but it is uncertain if this is the case. The article continued, remarking on the unsuccessful venture of the *Shenandoah* in ascertaining the fate of the *Sherman*, noting that "the matter rested until a few months ago, when Admiral John Rodgers was ordered to Corea with full authority to demand redress, and if it was refused, to chastise the 'barbarians' to the extent of his ability."[140] The *Free Trader* asserted that Rodgers was given full authority to attack the Joseon state if necessary, including for reasons such as a denial of an audience over the *General Sherman*. This is a slight differentiation from some other reporting, in that there was no need to justify an attack with an assertion of a defense action; Admiral Rodgers was allowed to use force unprovoked.

"The Corean War" concluded with a dispatch from Admiral Rodgers to the Secretary of the Navy (George Robeson), recounting the Battle of Ganghwa, with Rodgers recounting that the "Coreans, not apologizing for their treacherous attack on the 10th inst., we landed on Kang Noe [Ganghwa], and took and destroyed the lower fort and munitions. On the 11th we took another fort, and then stormed and captured their stronghold. Five forts have been taken. The troop who defended them are reported as numbering 11,000."[141] The *Free Trader* provided potentially the shortest summary of the Korea expedition as relayed in this letter to Secretary Robeson. Interestingly, Rodgers makes no mention of the events of 1 June, rather that the Korean forces on

[139] "The Corean War," *Ottawa Free Trader*, July 1, 1871.
[140] Ibid.
[141] Ibid.

Ganghwa had instigated an attack on 10 June. This is an unnecessary complication by Rodgers, if the *Free Trader* had accurately relayed his dispatch, as Rodgers would have already had a justification to retaliate due to the events of 1 June.

The New Orleans press had much to say on the Korea expedition. An original op-ed appeared on Independence Day titled "An Actual War On Hand" in the partisan *New Orleans Republican*, an obviously political paper and a product of Reconstruction. The article challenged the American people:

> How many of the forty millions of people in these United States are aware this Fourth of July morning that they are constructively engaged in a foreign war, and that each one of them is liable to be summoned to defend the government whose proclamation is to be celebrated to-day? Yet such is the fact. The engagement has been made, the first battle has been fought, and the first victory declared in our favor. It depends entirely on circumstances how large this war may become, for although the initial hostilities were commenced with a dependency, the final fight may have to be made with the superior authority of the Emperor of China.[142]

A true attention-grabber, the *Republican* posited that the Korea expedition was *far* from over, and that there was a real danger of an expanded war with the Qing Empire, one that could very well require the drafting of American men. The question is whether this is a call to arms on Independence Day, or a warning to Louisianans to a protracted land war in Asia? The *Republican* likely intended for the former, as the article concluded that "in the midst of our patriotic celebrations, let us all pledge ourselves to stand by the American commodore [John Rodgers] who is flying the American flag over victorious fields on the Hong-hoa [likely Ganghwa]."[143] This is confirmed by the obviously propagandistic, and extremely inaccurate description of Korea given by the article: "The island of Corea is situated between the Yellow sea and the sea of Japan, and contained about ninety thousand square miles, and is inhabited by ten millions of people. *It is an*

[142] "An Actual War on Hand," *New Orleans Republican*, July 4, 1871.
[143] Ibid.

inhospitable country, both in its climate and politics [my emphasis]—the one being very severe and the other very exclusive."[144] This could almost be a translation from the German-language description from the Nashville *Staatszeitung* from 5 years prior, as it is hard to reconcile as large a mistake as listing Korea as an island, unless this was translated from another language. The statistics are also similar to the *Staatzeitung* article, pointing to a non-English origin for the *Republican*, and perhaps a non-German origin for the *Staatzeitung* as well.[145]

While obtusely slanted in its description of Korea, the *Republican* does provide a generally accurate recount or summary of Admiral Rodgers' report on the Korea expedition. While not mentioning the *General Sherman*, *Wachusett*, or *Shenandoah* by name, the article does allude to these past "negotiations", while concluding that Rodgers did not trust the Koreans as much as the previous investigations, and was thus just in his initiation of hostilities with Joseon. The war was not over however, as the *Republican* asserted that "[h]e [Rodgers] is still lingering near the scene of the conflict, awaining [sic] a new fight which was threatened."[146] The *Republican*, therefore, published this editorial to prepare the American public for a protracted war with Korea, and potentially China. By advocating for solidarity with the actions of Rodgers and supporting the decisions of the Grant Administration, the *Republican* justified that continued war, and in essence called for that continued war. After all, why publish a patriotic op-ed on Independence Day if the goal was not stirring unconditional patriotism for an unpopular conflict?[147]

---

[144] "An Actual War on Hand," *New Orleans Republican*, July 4, 1871.
[145] "Vermischtes." *Tennessee Staatszeitung*, November 13, 1866. The original text alludes to similar figures and wording to the *Republican* article. It is likely they used Japanese or Chinese sources, as the characters for peninsula "半島" mean "half-Island" in Chinese and Kanji.
[146] "An Actual War on Hand," *New Orleans Republican*, July 4, 1871.
[147] Judging *only* by the articles included in this study, it is likely the American public were not ecstatic for war with Korea.

In Ottumwa, Iowa, a town of smaller size compared to Keokuk and Davenport, an original editorial was published on 6 July 1871. With sources uncited, the author of the editorial remarked that

> Commodore John Rogers [sic] of the U.S. Navy was recently sent to Corea, a peninsula on the east coast of Asia, in close proximity to Japan, with a small fleet to call the Government of Corea to account for indignities and wrongs committed upon American vessels along the coast by the Corean cruisers. What his particular instructions were, or the extent of authority given him is not known, but one thing is certain he has been so treated by the Corean authorities, that he has opened the guns of his fleet upon one of their seaport towns, landed his marines, and captured several forts and a large amount of munitions for war.[148]

Although fairly inaccurate as to the circumstances of the *General Sherman*, with the author claiming American ships had been assaulted by Korean ships, as well as misreporting the circumstances of Admiral Rodgers' engagement, it is relatively accurate in the results of that engagement. More striking is the author's knowledge of the peninsula, noting that the Korean nation "numbers from ten to fifteen millions of people, and is a power of no mean proportions."[149] How the author of this editorial came to these numbers is unknown, as the Joseon population statistics in the nineteenth century were based on the number of households, not individual Koreans.[150] The *Weekly Ottumwa Courier* firmly sided with Admiral Rodgers, with no indication that the expedition had been a failure. The article is more concerned with treating Korea as a child that needed correcting on an international level for perceived injustices against Americans, rather than a waste of American military power in an inconclusive conflict. For the *Courier* to publish its own opinion on the Korea expedition is notable, considering it was easier to reprint op-eds from the New York press, or to leave out any substantial mention of the conflict in its entirety.

---

[148] "Commodore John Rogers," *Weekly Ottumwa Courier*, July 6, 1871.
[149] Ibid.
[150] For more information on the mechanics of the Korean household system, see Sungyun Lim, *Rules of the House* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2019).

At the end of July, a shorter, and religiously oriented article appeared in the New Orleans-based *Morning Star and Catholic Messenger*. The *Messenger* began by stating that the "war now going on in the Corea, between that country and the United States, will naturally give the following item an interest which it would possess at no other epoch[.]"[151] The *Messenger* continued with a letter concerning the status of a very specific survivor of the executions of French missionaries in 1866:

> "Mgr. [Monseigneur] Felix Clair Ridel, Bishop of Philippopolis, i.p.i. [*in partibus infidelium*], Vicar-Apostolic of Corea, elected 27th April, 1869, by the Propaganda [Sacred Congregation of Propaganda]. His Lordship is a native of France, and an alumnus of the seminary of Foreign Missions, at Paris, whence he was sent to the blood-stained mission of Corea. He became pro-Vicar of Corea after the martyrdom of his two predecessors, Mgr. Berneux and Mgr. Davenuy, in March, 1866, when he was one of the only three surviving priests there […] It is not known whether Mgr. Ridel has yet succeeded in returning to his vicariate. or [sic] what priests have accompanied him to Corea. *Catholic population 20,000* [my emphasis]."[152]

Two crucial pieces of information can be gleaned from this letter, if the *Messenger* is to be believed. The first of course is that "M. Ridel" had received a promotion to head of the missionary effort in Korea, meaning that he would be tasked to returning to Joseon even after being the sole survivor of Catholic persecution, while the Daewongun continued to remain in power. Second, if the *Messenger*'s estimates are to be believed, that there were 20,000 Korean Catholics in 1871, then the Daewongun and his faction had been unsuccessful in suppressing Christianity. This means that the entire five-year crisis that had tested Korean sovereignty against western powers had achieved very little for the Daewongun, much like it had achieved next to nothing for the westerners. The irony that developed over the period from 1866 to 1871, was that the reaction

[151] "India." *Morning Star and Catholic Messenger*, July 30, 1871.
[152] Ibid. *in partibus infidelium* essentially means "in the land of the non-believer". The Sacred Congregation of Propaganda or sacra *congregatio christiano nomini propaganda*, is a papal department charged with the spreading of Catholicism in non-Catholic countries.

against Christianity by the Daewongun's faction had only accelerated the opening of Korea to international relations.

By prosecuting French missionaries, the Joseon state had unwittingly brought western eyes over the Korean peninsula, and with no military support from the Qing, had suffered pyrrhic victories against French and American punitive forces. The *Messenger* showed that for all the rattling of the Joseon court, and the suppression of western influence, Korea had only begun to deal with its greatest challenges which would come in the latter-half of the nineteenth century, prophesized by the unwavering recognition of Catholicism in Korea by the Holy See.[153]

While San Francisco acted as a point of entry for a significant number of news reports throughout the United States, the small town of Weaverville, California also reported on the Korea expedition, and quite early as well, in August. A short dispatch appeared with little note in the *Weekly Trinity Journal*: "The American fleet has withdrawn from Corea to Chefoo [Yantai]. So far, the assault upon Corea appears to have accomplished nothing substantial."[154] Such a small note on the Korea expedition might appear typical, considering the small size of Weaverville with a population of roughly 1300 in 1870.[155] But given the comparatively-sized communities in Indiana and Iowa that had full-fledged editorials, it is actually more surprising that the *Weekly Trinity Journal* does not have *more* information on the Korea expedition.

Returning to the *New York Herald,* an article titled "The War in the Corea" was published with a detailed map of the Battle of Ganghwa, the titular battle of the expedition to Korea. Complete with western names for the escarpments and Joseon shore batteries, this map is detailed

[153] Catholics had been in Korea for at least a century before the events of 1866. Most of the victims of the Catholic suppression by the *Daewongun* were Korean and Chinese Catholics, as Chinese Catholic missionaries were actually the main avenue for Catholicism to enter into Korea. See the Jeoldu-san Martyrs Shrine, and canonization of the "Korean Martyrs" by Pope John Paul II in 1984. While persecution of East Asian Catholics certainly bothered the Church, it was the deaths of French missionaries that spurred Admiral Roze to invade Korea in 1866.
[154] "Democratic Speaking," *Weekly Trinity Journal*, August 19, 1871.
[155] 1870 United States Census statistics available at census.gov.

with the description: "[t]he Scene of Operations of Our Asiatic Squadron on the 10th and 11th of June, 1871, on the Salee River."[156] Beyond the map, "The War in the Corea" is a detailed look at the Battle of Ganghwa, including a list of commanding officers, company, and artillery strengths. Each step of the Battle of Ganghwa was laid out, from a brief mention of the actions on 1 June, to the capture of five Joseon forts on 10-11 June to the retreat of the Asiatic squadron back to Shanghai.[157] The Battle of Ganghwa was certainly a tactical victory for the American forces, but the *Herald* immediately cast doubts on the entire purpose of the Korea expedition, and whether this "spec of war" was more of a defeat than a victory:

> Thus has ended the first act of the Corean drama of 1871. Will there be a second act? It is true that we may congratulate ourselves on the success of American arms, but has the flame been worth the candle? Where has been the gain? Look at the affair in any light we please and we cannot escape coming to the decision that the expedition has turned out a *complete failure* [my emphasis]. What were its object and what has been attained? We were at first given to understand that the mission was to be altogether a pacific one—merely to go there and deliver a written request to make a treaty and to ascertain the fate of the crew of the General Sherman. *If this were the sole purpose, then the force sent up was disproportionately large* [my emphasis].[158]

Within a month it was clear from the perspective of the *Herald* that the Korea expedition had failed at the very least, and had dishonest intentions at the very worst. The deaths of some two hundred and fifty Koreans and three Americans had resulted in significant damage to Korean defenses on Ganghwa island, but had brought the United States no closer to a trade agreement with the Joseon state.

The events leading to the Battle of Ganghwa may have been a series of communication errors between American forces and the Joseon state, but the strength of five ships and some 750

[156] **"**The War in the Corea," *New York Herald*, August 22, 1871. The map is roughly half of page 3. The remainder is the text of the article.
[157] Ibid.
[158] Ibid.

personnel involved in the battle alone left increased doubt in the New York press as to the sincerity of the "pacific mission."[159] In that vein, the *Herald* concluded that

> after administering a little punishment, Mr. Low [Frederick Low, United States Minister to China] and Admiral Rogers [sic] seemed to consider that the objects of this 'pacific mission' were fulfilled, and therefore went away. And the consequence is this, that throughout China, Japan and Corea the impression is that AMERICA HAS SUFFERED A DEFEAT in no way inferior to that sustained by the French…inasmuch as we were entirely unsuccessful in our mission and were obliged to leave the Corea without effecting our object.[160]

The American victory at Ganghwa was interpreted as a defeat by *all* parties, as the New York press, the Qing, Japan, and the Joseon state saw the expedition as an impotent failure of American foreign policy in "opening" Korea to trade with western powers. A number of op-eds published in the New York press had called for war with Korea as revenge for the *General Sherman*, yet "public opinion," if the press were to be ascribed such a label, had turned against the Korea expedition within a month of its only major action, with several calling for the United States to leave Joseon alone.

The *New York Times* would concur with the *Herald*'s messaging in an article titled "Our Little War," published on 23 August 1871. A short summary of the circumstances of, and the events of the expedition, along with assurances that China had condoned any American retaliation to the General Sherman, are the body of the article.[161] The most interesting aspect of the article came with the purported ramifications of the expedition, and a loss of opportunity of follow-up. Due to the expedition, a number of "complications […] have been announced calling for the intervention of the English and German Governments in the affairs of Corea. may [sic] form a convenient excuse for getting creditably out of the difficulty by taking part in a general expedition

[159] "Expedition to Corea," *Reports of the Secretary of the Navy and of the Postmaster General* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1871), 280.
[160] "The War in the Corea," *New York Herald*, August 22, 1871.
[161] "Our Little War," *The New York Times*, August 23, 1871.

against the intractable natives."[162] The *Times* continued, that "failing any such opportunity, it seems tolerably clear that neither in China or Japan will our prestige be at all improved by an expedition which *we had not force enough to follow up* [my emphasis]."[163] The *Times* is concerned less with the loss of American personnel and materiel, or the loss of Koreans, but rather more concerned that not *enough* force was used to ensure American military might was felt across East Asia. This would also not be the last time a call for a triple intervention in Korea, as the events of 1894-95 had similar calls for a triple intervention though this time in the form of a French, German, and Russian composition on the Korean peninsula.[164] Another fascinating detail is in the conclusion of the article, as the *Times* concluded that the Koreans "consider the withdrawal of our ships as the result of the panic of the American 'outer barbarians.'"[165] Rarely would the "paper of record" refer to Americans as "outer barbarians" even in a mocking sense to the Koreans, and to see an article form the New York press using the language a Korean *Yangban* might use to describe American forces is potentially an exceptional case.

In Indiana, a smaller town than Evansville, Plymouth, published an editorial on the Korea Expedition. On the front page of the *Marshall County Republican*, an op-ed from the *New-York Tribune* was republished titled "Our Corean Elephant." Ostensibly an anti-war piece, the article began by stating:

> As all cool-headed people supposed from the first, our war elephant in the Corea has proved to be exceedingly unmanageable. It is so easy to get into difficulty, and hard to get creditably out of it, that vainglorious writers chose the first and were willfully blind to the second, so sure to come. But it has come, and we have on our hands a war in Corea which is a more fatal gift than any Siamese elephantine

[162] "Our Little War," *The New York Times*, August 23, 1871.
[163] Ibid.
[164] The First Sino-Japanese War (1894 to 1895) had numerous military advisors from western powers gauging the success and failure of the Qing and Japanese militaries, for more information on western involvement in that war, see Van C. Dijk, *Pacific Strife: The Great Powers and Their Political and Economic Rivalries in Asia and the Western Pacific 1870-1914* (Amsterdam University Press, 2015), 258-259.
[165] "Our Little War," *The New York Times*, August 23, 1871.

> present, which oppresses with its magnificence and impoverishes with its cost to keep.[166]

The author of this editorial represents the first example of an attack on the editorials that had called for war with Korea. With language reminiscent of the far more recent conflict in Vietnam, the author all but called the war in Korea a quagmire, and one that had been a known mistake before it had even begun. It should be noted, however, that the author is not arguing for an end to the war on mere moral grounds, but rather pointing to the impracticality of subduing the Joseon state to American domination, noting that to "go on is to organize a great expedition, invade the kingdom [Joseon], devastate the country, and reduce the millions of population to thousands."[167] To wipe out a vast proportion of the Korean population, or what the author called "fatalistic Orientals" was not the main issue, but that such a venture was an impossibility from a technical point of view. The article had more to say, however, on the newfound role of Korea in American politics, since "Corea has become the battlefield of American propagandism, *everything appertaining to the country takes on a new interest* [my emphasis]. If we have nothing else, we have brought forward to the notice of the civilized world a long-isolated distant nation, happy in its seclusion, so far as we can know, and prospering even without the aid of our superior civilization."[168] There is a hint of a nascent respect for the Korean people in standing up to the United States, and an overemphasis on the role the Korea expedition had on bringing the notice of the western powers to a "long-isolated and distant nation," considering the French expedition five years prior.

The article in the Republican omits an analysis of Korea printed in the *Tribune* and then concludes with a further check on the warmongers, stating that a "review of its [Korea and western interactions] historical facts and comparison with later events however, is not specially

[166] "Our Corean Elephant," *Marshall County Republican,* August 24, 1871, 1.
[167] Ibid.
[168] "Our Corean Elephant," *Marshall County Republican,* August 24, 1871, 1.

encouraging to ardent advocates of the new crusade in the Corea."[169] As much as the American press may have wanted a successful war and potential colony in Korea, "Our Corean Elephant" advocated by its end to leave the peninsula alone.

The *New York Times* would keep its eyes on the Korean peninsula throughout 1871, as a different conflict developed. In "Looking Toward Corea," the *Times* reported that "it seems that the Russians are now trying to get hold of Corea, The Yokohama *Gazette* says they 'are working to attain in that country more than America is attempting to secure by force of arms.'[…] On account of the late troubles between the Christian Powers and Corea, the Chinese Government have abandoned their claim of jurisdiction there."[170] Several important pieces of information are in this excerpt that actually challenge conventional thinking in regards to the Korean peninsula. The first is that Russia was already on the radar of the international press in relation to Korea, connecting the annexations of parts of Manchuria to a direct challenge to Japan and Qing China over the sovereignty of the Joseon state. This excerpt also posited that Qing China had already abandoned its protector status over the Joseon state, a claim challenged by the Sino-Japanese War of 1894 to 1895, a war ostensibly about over-lordship on the Korean peninsula. That the New York press had already concluded that China had lost its authority over Korea nearly a quarter century before an official loss of that claim, implies a perception of inevitability on the fate of China in the "public consciousness" in the wake of the failed American expedition to Korea.

The *Chicago Tribune* followed up on the Korea expedition by September, reporting that the "United States will not renew the attack on the people of Corea, but await the result of the British expedition. It is thought that ultimately the United States, Great Britain and the North

[169] Ibid.
[170] "Looking Toward Corea," *The New York Times*, August 26, 1871.

German Confederation may form an alliance against Corea."[171] This is not the first time that talk of a western alliance to subjugate Korea had been in the press, though what is unique here is talk of a British expedition. There would not be one on the scale of the French and American expeditions during the five-year crisis (1866 to 1871), though the British did occupy *Geomun-do* off the southern coast of Korea in from 1885 to 1887.[172] What the *Tribune* is most likely referring to is reported later in the paper, under the title "China," as the "British Steamer Ring-Dove had returned from Corea with two Englishmen captured by the Coreans from the wreck of the Chusan."[173] This event is reported to have occurred in May, before the American expedition, according to early Korean western historian and missionary Horace Allen, who reported that "The German schooner 'Chusan' was wrecked on the Sir James Hall Islands [four Islands off the *Ongjin* Peninsula, present-day North Korea]. The German Consul came from Chefoo [Yantai] in H.B.M.S. 'Ringdove' and found the men well cared for by the Koreans."[174] While it is not known if the *Tribune* knew the chronology of the Korea expedition and the rescue of the *Chusan* crew, it is clear that the *Tribune* wanted to frame the Korea expedition as an *international* crisis. The possibility of a joint English, German and American intervention may have been seen as a hopeful future response to the failure of the expedition, certainly from the point of view of the *Tribune* in gaining consistent readership in the international section.

The article also reported on a striking revelation. The *Tribune* admitted that

> Shanghai papers publish[ed] an authentic letter from the Corean Government to the Captain of the American steamer Wachusett [Shufeldt], when she went up the river, in 1868, to inquire after the crew of the ship General Sherman. It is friendly and conciliatory [sic] to the last degree, and had it been received, as intended, the

[171] "Washington." *Chicago Tribune*, September 2, 1871.
[172] As this is outside the scope of this project, a brief examination of the Port Hamilton occupation can be found with Sang-pil Jin, "The Port Hamilton (Geomundo) Incident (1885-1887): Retracing Another Great Game in Eurasia," *The International History Review* 41, no. 2 (2019): 280-303.
[173] "China," *Chicago Tribune*, September 2, 1871.
[174] Horace N. Allen, *A Chronological Index: Some of the Chief Events in the Foreign Intercourse of Korea* (Seoul: Methodist Publishing House, 1901), 1.

> subsequent bloodshed would never have occurred. It was delayed a few hours, and the Wachusett sailed without waiting.[175]

Within the same paper, on the same page, the *Tribune* on the one hand called for a triple intervention on the Korean peninsula for apparent grievances, and on the other admitted that those grievances had no international footing. The *Tribune* of course is not the first paper encountered in this study that contradicts its framing within the same article, but "China" is the first article to admit that the *Wachusett* had failed to communicate the Joseon government's response to the *General Sherman*. It is ironic that Robert Shufeldt, the captain of the Wachusett, whose impatience caused the deaths of roughly two hundred-and-fifty Korean lives, was the same person who would sign Joseon's first trade agreement with a western power in 1882.[176]

On China, the *Times* noted the clear propaganda value that the American failure in Korea had brought, as the Korea expedition "has been described to the Chinese public by their official purveyors of news in the following manner: 'Great victory over the Yang Kuay-tz![177] One thousand foreigners killed! Four foreign ships caught in the river and unable to get out!'"[178] The *Times* then attacked the *New York Herald* for its coverage of the Boss Tweed corruption scandal of 1871, by stating the Qing propaganda "bears a delicious family resemblance to the *Herald*'s long-continued treatment of the Ring frauds, and suggests that that paper must have made a study of the ingenuous vermillion edicts which are obviously so much after its own heart."[179] The essence of the article is to mock the political climate of Qing China in 1871, such as its extended

[175] "China," *Chicago Tribune*, September 2, 1871.
[176] This was of course the Shufeldt Treaty of 1882 between the United States and Korea.
[177] "Yang Kuay-tz" is extremely difficult to interpret, as this wording does not even slightly match a Wade-Giles romanization of Chinese. My best deduction from possible phonetic similarity is some sort of pejorative for a less-than-nothing person or peoples.
[178] "Chinese 'Politics,'" *The New York Times*, October 2, 1871.
[179] Ibid. For more on the 1871 corruption scandal around William M. Tweed, the man behind Tammany Hall, see Edwin G. Burrows and Mike Wallace, *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 1002-1020.

corruption and rebellion against the Qing through secret societies. By using the Qing response to the failed Korea expedition as a tool to mock the *Times*' largest competitor in New York City, "Chinese 'Politics'" is an article far more interesting that a tabloid-esque piece about "exotic" concoctions amongst secret societies, and an unexpected new direction for the New York press to take off of the failure of the expedition and the increased perception of an uncertain future for the Qing state.[180]

In November, the *New York Times* continued to situate the Korea expedition within the larger context of the East Asian political situation. "There was much comment by foreigners and Japanese at the action of the American Government in abandoning the expedition to Corea. This action, it is conceded, is detrimental to our [American] honor and highly prejudicial to the interests of foreigners, both in China and Japan." The *Times* continued with the "naval demonstration against Corea never should have been undertaken unless the American people were prepared to carry out their intention."[181] The *Times* related this observation by foreign powers of the expedition to heightened tensions between Japan and Korea, implying a political economic void could be filled by the Japanese, a militarily superior power to the Joseon state. "There is a rumor that Corea has made an attack upon the Japanese island of Tsusima [*Tsushima* or in Korean *Daemado*], lying between Nagasaki and Corea, it being claimed as Corean territory."[182] The lasting effects of the Korea expedition were already being felt by late 1871, with the New York press looking at rapidly evolving political situation around the Korean peninsula. While unlikely prophetic, the *New York Times* certainly began to predict that Japan would be the pre-eminent power in Korea, as the United States backed off from an unsuccessful venture into the Joseon state.

[180] Ibid.
[181] "China and Japan," *The New York Times*, November 30, 1871.
[182] Ibid. The Tsushima island dispute has a centuries-long legacy; this is certainly not the first time the dispute would have escalated to violence.

The *Chicago Tribune* also reported on the loss of face by the United States in the eyes of the Great Powers of East Asia. On the same day as the *Times*, the *Tribune* reported that there "is much comment by foreigners and Japanese at the action of the American Government on abandoning intercourse with Corea. It is considered highly prejudicial to our foreign interest both in China and [J]apan and should never have been undertaken unless the American people were prepared to carry out their intention."[183] Remarkably similar to a *New York Times* article mentioned above, "From Japan" is a near mirror of the sentiment to the "Paper of Record." For the *Chicago Tribune* and the *New York Times* to both conclude that the Korea expedition was a failure, and a dishonor that should not have been undertaken without sufficient force, is not that surprising. What is surprising is that both of these papers were Republican newspapers, which one would think, would support the actions of President Grant's administration. There was a partisan disconnect occurring between the press and the government. As some of the largest newspapers in circulation during this period, they were most likely to report on the same dispatches. This leaves open the possibility that the embellishments, such as the "detriment to our national honor," were already written in the dispatches from Yokohama, Japan, and were simply tweaked in the editing room before publication.[184]

The Korea expedition became front-page news in the *New York Times* in December of 1871. President Grant's State of the Union speech was published in full on the front page of the *Times*, within which Grant addressed the issues between the United States and Korea. Grant noted that

> [p]rompted by a desire to put an end to the barbarous treatment of our shipwrecked sailors on the Corean coast. I instructed our Minister at Pekin [Beijing, Frederick Low] to endeavor to conclude a convention with Corea for securing the safety and humane treatment of such mariners. Admiral RODGERS was instructed to accompany him with a sufficient force to protect him in case of need. A small

[183] "From Japan," *Chicago Tribune*, November 30, 1871.
[184] Yokohama is commonly cited as the dispatch source—Shanghai is the other "East Asian" location of origin for the likely telegraphed sources.

> surveying party, sent out on reaching the coast, was treacherously attacked at a disadvantage. Ample opportunity was given for explanation and apology. Neither came. A force was then landed. After an arduous march over a rugged and difficult country, the forts from which the outrages had been committed were reduced by a gallant assault and were destroyed. Having thus punished the criminals, and having vindicated the honor of the flag, the expedition returned, finding it impracticable, under the circumstances, to conclude the desired convention. I respectfully refer to the correspondence relating thereto, herewith submitted, and leave the subject for such action as Congress may see fit to take.[185]

President Grant described the events of the Korea expedition as favorably as possible to his own administration. Full responsibility was laid at the feet of the Korean forces on Ganghwa, "criminals" which required an "arduous march" to reach–considering the close landing between the five ships involved and the forts that is unlikely. Notice also that Grant placed further action, an option open to the United States, in the hands of Congress, which would further reduce the loss of prestige the expedition inflicted on his administration. Grant's remarks do not necessarily contradict *any* of the editorials in the New York press, and it is possible he was influenced by their calls for an end to the war, and by the American press more broadly.

In December, the Plymouth-based *Marshall County Republican* also published President Grant's message to Congress, which also found its way to the front page. The language is identical to that in the *New York Times*, though interestingly, the *Republican* asserted that this copy of Grant's address was "[f]or the Republican" specifically, and not made widely available to the American press.[186] The fact that Plymouth, Indiana, a town with approximately 2,500 residents in 1870, had two competing newspapers and still published an op-ed related to the Korea expedition and the full transcript of President Grant's address is what is most remarkable.[187] The partisan

[185] "The President's Message," *The New York Times*, December 5, 1871, 1.
[186] "President's Message." *Marshall County Republican,* December 14, 1871.
[187] The other paper, the *Marshall County Democrat*, ran from 1855-1870, as retrieved from Hoosier State Chronicles, https://blog.newspapers.library.in.gov/plymouth-democrat-history/. The population figure was estimated from publicly available census data.

nature of the *Republican* may indicate its desire to show a personal connection with Grant, as well as one-upping its partisan rival in town, the *Marshall County Democrat*.

Conclusion

Through this survey of the United States press from 1866 to 1871, it should be more than clear that coverage of events in Korea, whether those be the persecution of French Catholic missionaries or open war with the United States, were present in the largest cities, and in some of the smallest communities. It should also be clear that press had no consistent opinion as to what the United States should do about Korea. It is surprising that a country still deeply within the messy ending to its Civil War and its Reconstruction, had plenty of time to wage international conflict and to bring attention to international issues. The United States was apparently prepared, at least at the level of its print media, to wage an international war of massive proportions five years after the bloodiest in its history.[188]

Even in the pseudo-colony of Hawai'i (a true colony it was not until some decades later) there was significant interest in what was occurring in Korea. A decent portion of President Grant's address to Congress, which was reprinted in full in several publications across the United States, concerned the Korean expedition. The crises in Korea must have been well-known among the American public, as the papers covered in this study make up only a fraction of the total from this time. Since cataloguing *every* instance of "Corea" in the American press was not the goal of this study, but rather a survey of coverage across the United States, both geographically and chronologically, it is fair to say that the Korean peninsula had entered into the American mindset in force for the first time during this 1866 to 1871 period.

[188] By casualties, the American Civil War has no equal. By the sheer number of editorials calling for a continued war, an expanded war, or an end to the war because the force was not large enough, this statement rests.

Although accurate coverage of the events that unfolded in Korea was often times hard to find, there were serious efforts by American newspapers to at least attempt to convey a "truth" to the half-facts and rumors that many of these papers were likely working with. Some of the most accurate portrayals come from obvious sources, such as the well-established New York press, but also from unlikely places, such as Columbia, South Carolina and Plymouth, Indiana. Whether or not the papers were delivering the actually accurate recording of events is of course not the significance of this study, but that so many papers had attempted to describe "the Corea" for the first time to an American audience that likely had no idea there was a peninsula between China and Japan. A new memory had been built into the American consciousness starting in October of 1866, a memory that was genuinely alive by 1871. American interests in Korea were quelled only by a decade-long intermission, as the American press mentioned Korea through the actions of Japan during the lead-up to the Treaty of Ganghwa, not including the United States properly until the Shufeldt Treaty of 1882 which "opened" Joseon state.[189] Yet, the memory of this early period of American-Korean interaction, so well-illustrated by the American press, in all its ambivalence, would fade during the Japanese Colonial period, as a new "Korean War" replaced the first American-Korean war of 1871.

While the memory of the period from 1866 to 1871 has faded in relation to its "living" self in Korea and the United States, there are still significant strands of that memory that persist into the present. While the mixed opinions of the American press during this period has become a single narrative monopolized by the American military in the United States, the situation in Korea

[189] The Ganghwa incident of 1875 with the Japanese ship *Un'yo* and the subsequent Treaty of Ganghwa in 1876 cemented Japan as the first nation Korea would open up trade to. Peter Duus, *The Abacus and the Sword, The Japanese Penetration of Korea* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995). Devotes considerable time to the Japanese efforts to open Korea up in the aftermath of the American expedition. A classic work that holds fairly well on understanding the "opening" period in Korea's history, and the Shufeldt Treaty's place in it, can be found in C. I. Eugene Kim and Han-Kyo Kim, *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism, 1876-1910* (Publications of the Center for Japanese and Korean Studies, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967).

is significantly different. How those events are portrayed, in the United States and in North and South Korea, are the principal focus of the following chapters.

CHAPTER 2: *SINMIYANGYO* AND 1866 IN KOREAN MEMORY

North and South Korea have very present, physical reminders of the period from 1866 to 1871. In the North, there stands a monument to the destruction of the *General Sherman*, on the spot just off the Taedong river where it is believed to have been burned.[190] In the South, the entire island of Ganghwa is a living museum to the opening period, with two museums, the Ganghwa War Museum and the Ganghwa History Museum, showcasing different aspects of Ganghwa Island's history. Both of these museums contain information relating to the five-year crisis. [191] Beyond monuments and museum pieces, which will be examined later in this chapter, there is also a plethora of media both in the North and the South that commemorates or educates the Korean public on the *General Sherman* incident, *Byeonginyangyo* (병인양요) and *Sinmiyangyo* (신미양요).[192] In the North, articles were published as recently as 2018 concerning the *Sherman* and *Sinmiyangyo*, with multiple pieces in both Korean and English using the events as examples of Korean might over a defeated American foe. In the South, media is more diverse with news articles dating back to around 1966 up to the end of the twentieth century focusing on the "origin" of American diplomatic relations with Korea. Also in the South is the popular medium colloquially known as the "K-Drama," with several programs beginning in the 1990s illustrating the events from 1866 to 1871, with the most recent and widely available program being *Mr. Sunshine*. This

[190] Titled "미제 침략 선 셔먼호 격침기년비", or roughly "Monument to the Sinking of the US Invader *Sherman*."
[191] Several exhibits in its "First Floor Exhibition Hall " relate to westerners opening Korea at the Ganghwa History Museum, and the Ganghwa War Museum has the "Exhibition Hall 3" with important artifacts from *Sinmiyangyo*.
[192] Although stated above, a reminder that *Sinmiyangyo* is the "western Disturbance in the *Sinmi* year", the Korean name for the American expedition of 1871. *Byeonginyangyo* is the "western Disturbance in the *Byeongin* year", the Korean name for the French expedition of 1866. Year naming conventions before the adoption of Western or "solar" style calendars were based on Astrological conventions.

chapter will examine these varying aspects of North and South Korean media, and how the five-year crisis is used both to teach, to remember and to propagandize against an "imperial" foe.

Keep in mind that North and South Korea have conflicting national biographies, which are illustrated through the various aspects of memory examined below. In North Korea, resistance to all forms of imperialism, whether those be Japanese or American, take precedence over a type of "progressive" narrative found in South Korea. In the South, an anti-Joseon hardliner narrative (or anti-Daewongun) predominates the narrative, with Queen Min seen as a progressive force in the opening and modernizing of the Korean states to the world. The tragedy of both biographies does center on the inability of Korea to preserve its sovereignty against the Japanese Empire, though the approach at memorializing this tragedy (the loss of independence and sovereignty) is significantly different in the North and South, which is illustrated in the following sections.

South Korea (1966-present)

Four South Korean papers were examined in this study; the two with some of the most references to *Sinmiyangyo* and the "General Sherman Incident" were the still-circulating *Kyunghyang Sinmun* (경향신문) and *Dong-A Ilbo* (동아일보).[193] Two other papers, the *Mae-il Gyeongje* (매일경제신) and *Hankyoreh* (한겨레) are more recently established, and have fewer articles relating to the period from 1866 to 1871. The goal of this study is not an exhaustive list of *every* mention of *Sinmiyangyo*, but rather a chronological survey of the latter half of the twentieth century, in a similar methodology to the American papers that were contemporary to the events from 1866 to 1871.

[193] In Korean, the *General Sherman Incident* is literally "제너럴셔먼호 사건", which is "General Sherman Incident."

Fictional accounts as entertainment, historical pieces by professors, general news, and literary reviews are some of the examples of the material found in these four papers. The circumstances around why *Sinmiyangyo* and the *General Sherman* Incident find their ways into the South Korean press vary, as mentioned previously, but the fact that these events are getting *any* popular coverage in the shadow of the monumental Korean War of 1950 to 1953 is the most important revelation to be gained from these papers. A final note should be made on translation. Many of South Korea's papers before the 1990s were written in a mixture of *Hanja* and *Hangul*, meaning Chinese characters for specific nouns and names, and Korean letters for other grammar functions, as well as some nouns.[194] Due to this the translations of some of the older articles may be more approximate than those of the 1990s.

Newspapers

Between 1966 and the 1990s, there was an increasing trend towards providing visibility to Korea's first international encounters with the west during the period from 1866 to 1871. This correlates with a relaxation of censorship laws in the South Korean press, and the growth of the "K-Drama" on South Korean television. The following articles will show this increasing visibility, and the papers' relationship with visual and physical memorializations of the five-year crisis.

On 7 July 1966, almost exactly a century after the *General Sherman* incident, the 332nd installment of "Queen Min" included a mention of *Sinmiyangyo*. A series of fictionalized serials published in the *Kyunghyang Sinmun*, "Queen Min" is generally concerned with tales around the opening period of the Joseon state. This specific article mentions *Sinmiyangyo* in passing, but it is a notable landmark event, especially considering that this issue of the serial concerns the

[194] *Hanja* are Chinese Characters made to fit the Korean language, while *Hangul* is the Korean alphabet developed by Sejong the Great in the 15th century.

Donghak movement.[195] The short excerpt from the piece read "Twelve years ago *Sinmiyangyo* occurred, which had awoken [many] across the nation, including Seoul [my translation]."[196] While quite short in a story taking place at least a decade after the five-year crisis, it is notable for being published on the centennial of the *General Sherman*, and is the only article from these four papers that had an even implicit recognition of that fact.

Jumping ahead to the 1980s, the *Dong-A Ilbo* published an article titled "The First USFK (U.S. Forces, Korea), in the History of the First century of Diplomatic Relations between Korea and the United States [my translation]," which traced American diplomatic relations between Korea and the United States starting roughly in 1882. *Sinmiyangyo* is a focal point in the beginning of the article, as it is important to understand 1871 to understand the Shufeldt treaty of 1882.[197] *Sinmyangyo* is placed as the beginning of American forces arriving in Korea, as "Korea and the United States" asserted that "the U.S. *Monococy* (one of the 5 U.S. ships of *Sinmiyangyo*) arrived on the morning of May 3rd, at 8 a.m., at Jemulpo [Incheon] from Kobe, Japan [my translation]."[198] The *Ilbo* continued, introducing some interesting names that were a part of the American expedition, as "among them [Rodgers' five ships] were minister Scott [possibly Admiral Winfield

---

[195] "Minbi" 閔妃 [Queen Min], *Kyunghyang Sinmun 경향신문*. July 7, 1966. *Donghak*, or "Eastern Learning", was a religious movement that gained traction in response to the opening of Korea. A good work to learn more about *Donghak* is George L. Kallander, *Salvation through Dissent: Tonghak Heterodoxy and Early Modern Korea*, (Korean Classics Library—Philosophy and Religion, Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2013).

[196] "Minbi"閔妃 [Queen Min] *Kyunghyang Sinmun 경향신문*. July 7, 1966. Original text, with *Hanja* replaced with *Hangul*: "*신미양요가 일어나고 서울을 비롯해 전국에 척화비를 세우고하던 때이너 햇수로치면 십이년전이다*."

[197] "Hanmibaek Nyeon Yeon (Sugyo 1 Saeg) Dolikyeobon Ryeok Yeon Sawae Baljacheui 5 Choichowae Juhanmigongsa Poteu"韓美百年「修交 1 世紀」돌이켜본 歷史의 발자취 <5> 최초의 駐韓美公使 푸트 [The First USFK (U.S. Forces, Korea), in the History of the First Century of Diplomatic Relations between Korea and the United States], *Dong-A Ilbo 동아일보*, December 12, 1981.

[198] Ibid. Original text, with *Hanja* replaced with *Hangul*: "*공사일행은 일본(코베) 신호에서(모노케시) 호(신미양요 때참가했던 미함5 척중 하나)를 타고5 월3 일 아침 여덟시 아침햇살에 빛니는 제물포항에 발을 내더뎠다.*"

Scott Schley], Japanese interpreter Saito (Secretary of Foreign Affairs) and Yun Chi-ho [my transcription]."[199] It is not clear who Saito is in this context, as there is no reference to a Japanese interpreter of Korean by name in Admiral Scott Schley's report, the ship on which "Saito" is claimed to be on.[200] As for Yun Chi-ho, he would have been 7 years old in 1871, so it is unlikely he had yet left Japan in any capacity from his schooling.[201] Inaccurate in the precise events and persons involved in *Sinmiyangyo*, the *Ilbo*, much like the American papers of the nineteenth century, was primarily concerned with retelling the importance of *Sinmiyangyo* and the origin of the American presence on the Korean peninsula. Memory of *Sinmiyangyo* was as difficult to remember in 1981, as it was in 1871.

In 1982, the *Kyunghyang Sinmun* published "The Korea-U.S. Relationship Rediscovered, Part 6: The Epilogue in its Historical Development [my translation]." Part of series on the relationship between the United States and Korea, the end of this series evokes *Sinmiyangyo* with the background of the strained relationship between the early Reagan administration and Chun Doo-hwan's South Korea.[202] The *Sinmun* mentions the *General Sherman* and *Sinmiyangyo* as

---

[199] "Hanmibaek Nyeon Yeon (Sugyo 1 Saeg) Dolikyeobon Ryeok Yeon Sawae Baljacheui 5 Choichowae Juhanmigongsa Poteu"韓美百年「修交 1 世紀」돌이켜본 歷史의 발자취 <5> 최초의 駐韓美公使 푸트 [The First USFK (U.S. Forces, Korea), in the History of the First Century of Diplomatic Relations between Korea and the United States], *Dong-A Ilbo 동아일보*, December 12, 1981. Original text, with *Hanja* replaced with *Hangul*: "*일행중에는 공사부부와 비서인(스커토)와 함장 사관약간명 일본인 통역(사이토)(제등수일랑 당시 일본 외무장상 형의 비서)와 윤치호가 있었다.*"

[200] "Expedition to Corea," *Reports of the Secretary of the Navy and of the Postmaster General* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1871), 294-297.

[201] Yun Chi-ho is an important figure in the Korean independence movement of the early twentieth century. A good article on Yun Chi-ho's rule ROLE in the March 1st movement and the "Wilsonian moment" in the "rising tide of color", with some background on his life, see Chris Suh, "What Yun Ch'i-ho Knew: US-Japan Relations and Imperial Race Making in Korea and the American South, 1904-1919," *Journal Of American History* 104, no. 1 (2017): 68-96.

[202] Choi Young-hee 최영희, "Han-Migwangyeowae Chaegyeonhyeon 6 Aepilrogeu Saeroun Ryeok Yeoksawae Jeongae" 韓·美관계의 再発見 (6) 에필로그 새로운 歷史의 展開 [The Korea-U.S. Relationship Rediscovered, Part 6: The Epilogue in its Historical Development], *Kyunghyang Sinmun 경향신문*, February 11, 1982, 11. For more information on the 1981-87 economic crisis between South Korea and the United States, see the edited volumes by a number of economists Jongryn Mo and Ramon Hawley Myers et. al., *Shaping a New Economic*

important predecessors to the Shufeldt negotiation, as "before this [1882 Shufeldt treaty], the General Sherman incident occurred in the Taedong river in 1862 [sic], and by 1871, *Sinmiyangyo* began on Ganghwa Island [my translation]."[203] The paper provides a general narrative of events, though the date for the *General Sherman* incident is inaccurate. Considering the numbers are in Arabic script, it is unlikely on the translator's part, but on the *Sinmun* and the author of this particular article. Beyond the relatively petty quibble, the article continues with an important point, that "while we [Koreans] call it *Sinmiyangyo*, it was for the Americans the Korean War, and the *newspapers at that time pointed to Koreans as barbarians* [my emphasis]; before the Korean-U.S. Treaty [1882], most American perceptions would have been like this [my translation]."[204] The *Sinmun* mentions the perception in American newspapers at the time of *Sinmiyangyo*. This is a fascinating connection between the American perception of the "Corean War" and the Korean perception some hundred years later, situating the Korean reflection of the impact of *Sinmiyangyo* with the American public's understanding of it in 1871. Combine this with the more topical conversation about American interests in Korea in the 1980s, and "The Korea-U.S. relationship rediscovered" engages quite well between Chun's South Korea and the Daewongun's Joseon.[205]

Relationship: The Republic of Korea and the United States (Hoover Institution Press Publication; 417. Stanford, Calif.: Hoover Institution Press, Stanford University, 1993).

[203] Ibid. Original text, with *Hanja* replaced with *Hangul*: "*이에 앞서 1862 년에는 대동강에서 제너럴 셔먼호사건이 있었고 1871 년에는 미합대의 강화도 포격으로 (신미양요)가 일어낫다.*"

[204] Choi Young-hee 최영희, "Han-Migwangyeowae Chaegyeonhyeon 6 Aepilrogeu Saeroun Ryeok Yeoksawae Jeongae" 韓·美관계의 再発見 (6) 에필로그 새로운 歷史의 展開 [The Korea-U.S. Relationship Rediscovered, Part 6: The Epilogue in its Historical Development], *Kyunghyang Sinmun 경향신문*, February 11, 1982, 11. Original text, with *Hanja replaced with Hangul*: "*우리는 신미양요라고 하지만 그때 미국으로서는 (한국전젱)이었고 당시의 신문은 한국인을 가리켜라고 표현하였는데 아미도한-미수호조약체결 이전에있어서 대부분 미국인의 한국에 대한 인식은 이정도였을 것이다.*"

[205] Ibid.

In the latter half of the 1980s, an article comparing the Taiping Rebellion to the *General Sherman* incident and *Sinmiyangyo* in popular memory. Written by Yi Eun-gyeong (이은경) and published in the *Kyunghyang Sinmun*, "General Sherman Sailors and the Fire on the Taedong River; The Taiping Heavenly Kingdom and its Lost Remnants [my translation]" cites Professor Bang Seon-ju (방선주) and the rationalization of westerners for war in China and Korea.[206] The article began with a reiteration of the events that had occurred, such as why the *General Sherman* was in Korea, and how the United States responded in 1871. What is central to the article, however, is Bang's analysis of William Speer (1822-1904), who wrote extensively on China in the latter half of the nineteenth century, as a Presbyterian minister in China.[207] The article concludes with an analysis from Bang, noting that

> [i]n addition Bang likened it [American response to what was happening in Korea] to Speer's Conscience Declaration [unknown], with [Bang] noting that American records at the time supported Joseon's position, while selling *Sinmiyangyo* and raising enthusiasm for the U.S. military and their bravery. This is similar to "Opium is evil, but war is God's will as it is the only way of preaching Christ;" the logic of rationalizing the [Second] Opium War [my translation].[208]

---

[206] Yi Eun-gyeong 이은경, "Daedonggangseo Bultan Misyeomeonho Subudeureun Taepyeongcheongugui nan Paejanbyeong" 大同江서 불탄 美셔먼號 水夫들은 太平天國의 亂 패잔병 [General Sherman Sailors and the Fire on the Taedong River; The Taiping Heavenly Kingdom and its Lost Remnants], *Kyunghyang Sinmun 경향신문*, August 27, 1986, 7.

[207] Information on Speer is not centralized, but this information can be found in pieces from a variety of sources, such as the Presbyterian Church in Chintown's website, pccsf.org. His most famous work is William Speer, *The Oldest and Newest Empire: China and the United States* (Pittsburgh, PA: Robert S. Davis &Co., 1870).

[208] Yi Eun-gyeong 이은경, "Daedonggangseo Bultan Misyeomeonho Subudeureun Taepyeongcheongugui nan Paejanbyeong" 大同江서 불탄 美셔먼號 水夫들은 太平天國의 亂 패잔병 [General Sherman Sailors and the Fire on the Taedong River; The Taiping Heavenly Kingdom and its Lost Remnants], *Kyunghyang Sinmun 경향신문*, August 27, 1986, 7. Original text, with *Hanja* replaced with *Hangul*: "*또한 신미양요직후 신문-잡지마다 조선을매도하고 미국군의 용맹찬양에 열을 올리던 와중에서 조선의 입장을 지지한 당대 미국인의기룩이라는 점에 주목,방씨는 이를(스피어목사의 양심선언) 이라고 비유했다. 이는 당시 구미선교사 사이에팽배하고 있던 '아편은 악이지만 전쟁은 기돗교전파의유일한 길이기에 하나님의뜻." 이리는 아편전쟁합리화논리에 대한 분노의 의미도 담겨있을것이라고 해석했다."*

Bang has an interesting study of how language is used, comparing American media rhetoric to the rhetoric surrounding the Taiping Rebellion and the Second Opium War. Religious undertones, and in many cases overtones, permeated western military expeditions in East Asia throughout the nineteenth century, and for Bang to focus on this in the Catholic-leaning *Kyunghyang Sinmun* is an implicit criticism of religiosity used as an excuse for war.

Also in this article is a picture of a large cannon, looking similar to common cannon mounted on ironclad warships during the 1860s.[209] The caption reads "a cannon loaded on the sunken Sherman [*General Sherman*] from the Taedong River [my translation]."[210] It is likely the 1986 unveiling of the North Korean memorial, "Monument to the sinking of the US Invader *Sherman*" is the source of this picture of one of the *Sherman*'s guns, though the caption and the photograph itself lend no origin to *where* the gun is placed, and it does not look as if it is an official memorial site from the photo alone. The North Korean monument is likely the impetus for the *Kyunghyang Sinmun* to publish something related to the five-year crisis, as it will be made clear later in this chapter that North Korea has a much higher stake in discussions of the *General Sherman* and *Sinmiyangyo*.

In the first year of the *Hankyoreh*'s run an article appeared discussing the American occupation of Korea from 1945 onward and its relation to American-Korean relations in the past. An article titled, "Do You Remember September 8th?" features the United States' earliest

[209] The image resembles a 32-pdr Dahlgren gun, but it is unclear from the caption what *type* of naval gun it is.
[210] Yi Eun-gyeong 이은경, "Daedonggangseo Bultan Misyeomeonho Subudeureun Taepyeongcheongugui nan Paejanbyeong" 大同江서 불탄 美셔먼號 水夫들은 太平天國의 亂 패잔병 [General Sherman Sailors and the Fire on the Taedong River; The Taiping Heavenly Kingdom and its Lost Remnants], *Kyunghyang Sinmun 경향신문*, August 27, 1986, 7. Original text, with *Hanja* replaced with *Hangul*: "대동강에서 침몰된 셔먼호에 실렸던 대포"

interactions with Korea, and the long shadow those interactions had.[211] The United States in the nineteenth century appears around the end of the article, as it is juxtaposed to the American occupation of Korea in 1945, as Jae Han-seok (제한석) notes that "[t]he first meeting between Korea and the United States dates to about 80 years ago [in 1945] in 1866 [my translation]."[212] The article then continues with a description of the *General Sherman* incident, in a similar fashion to the *Kyunghyang Sinmun*. *Sinmiyangyo* is mentioned in relation to another "first", as "This [war] is called *Sinmiyangyo*, or more specifically by the Americans, the Korean War. This is the first militant interaction between Korea and the United States, and how it came about [my translation]."[213] The article concludes reminding Koreans of the ever-present nature of the American military, comparing the shaky start to Korean-American relations to the chaotic split of the North and South, in so few of words. While not directly critical of the American forces in South Korea, the article is certainly thought-provoking, by linking the long history of American-Korean relations with the living, ever-present memory of American soldiers on the peninsula and their role in its division.[214]

In December of 1988, *Hankyoreh* brought up the *General Sherman* and *Sinmiyangyo*, once again in dialogue with the present relationship between the United States and South Korea. An article titled "How Should the United States View the Korean Peninsula? [my translation]," deals

---

[211] Jae Han-seok 제한석,"9wol 8ireul asinayo?" 9 월 8 일을 아시나요? [Do You Remember September 8th?], *Hankyoreh 한겨레*, September 9, 1988. September 8 1945 was the day the United States arrived in Southern Korea led by Lieutenant General John R. Hodge.

[212] Ibid. Original text: *"한국과 미국의 첫 만남은 이로부터 약 80 년전인 1866 년으로 거슬러 올라간다."*

[213] Ibid. Original text: *"이것이 당시의 표현으로는'신미양요', 좀더 정확히 밀해서 한미전쟁인 것이다. 한국과 미국간의 전투적인 첫 상봉은 이렇게 이루어졌다."*

[214] Jae Han-seok 제한석,"9wol 8ireul asinayo?" 9 월 8 일을 아시나요? [Do You Remember September 8th?], *Hankyoreh 한겨레*, September 9, 1988.

with artistic portrayals of the *General Sherman* and *Sinmiyangyo* in South Korea, and how those portrayals were and continued to be strained due to the relationship with the U.S. in the present. The article posits "[h]ow has our art portrayed centuries of U.S.-Korean relations, which began with violent clashes in the General Sherman (1866) and *Sinmiyangyo* (1871) [my translation]?"[215] The *Hankyoreh* continued with a response, that "the recent solidifying of the view of a unilateral "blood alliance" with the U.S., and with the U.S. seen as an objective force, the opportunity to show the U.S. in art and literature has been stymied [my translation]."[216] The article points to the strained relationship between the United States and Korea, and its warming up in 1988, as source for a cultural shift for artistic portrayal of the more unsavory parts of the U.S.-Korea relationship to be reduced. This may have much to do with 1988 being a power shift from Chun Doo-hwan to Roh Tae-woo brought on by mass demonstrations against Chun Doo-hwan in 1987 known as the "June Struggle." Roh also had a much more aggressive foreign policy in relation to strengthening relations with the United States compared to Chun.[217] With *General Sherman* and *Sinmiyangyo* both evoked in the present in relation to the United States, memory of those events in South Korea held a strand into the close of the twentieth century.

On 1 January of 1991, the *Kyunghyang Sinmun* published an article titled "Year of the Sheep, Words of Blessing [literal translation]." The article is a relatively optimistic reflection on

---

[215] Oryong 오룡, "Hanbandoneun Migugeul Eoddeohgae Boaya Haneunga" 한반도는 미국을 어떻게 보아야 하는가 [How Should the United States View the Korean Peninsula], *Hankyoreh 한겨레*, December 7, 1988. Original text: *"제너럴셔먼호 서건(1866)-신미양요(1871)등 격렬한충돌로 시작된 한-미관계가한 세기를 넘겼고 미군진주가 거의 반세기에이르는 동안 우리의 예술은 그것을 어떻게 받아들여 왔는가."*

[216] Ibid. Original text: *"최근 일방적인'혈맹'의 관점에서벗어나 미국을객관적 실체로 보려는 시각이 뿌리내리는 가운데미술과 문학에 반영된 미국의 모습을 점검하는 계기가 미련됐다."*

[217]For more on the Roh Tae-woo government and its effect on South Korea, see Robert E. Bedeski, *The Transformation of South Korea: Reform and Reconstitution in the Sixth Republic under Roh Tae Woo, 1987-1992* (London; New York: Routledge, 1994).

the year ahead, yet reminds its readers that it had not always been so. "However, history was not always so smooth in the Year of the Sheep, remember. One hundred and twenty years ago, five U.S. ships arrived in *Sinmiyangyo*, in retaliation to the attack on the *General Sherman* on the Taedong River[.]"[218] The *Sinmun* continues with other important, though tumultuous events that occurred during the Year of the Sheep, such as the March 1st Movement.[219] For *Sinmiyangyo* to be included as a major event of the Year of the Sheep (or Goat) over a more recent event, such as the assassination of Park Chung-hee, is a remarkable reflection into the deep past of Korean history, over an emphasis on an event likely in many reader's lifetimes.[220] The optimism of 1991 may have led the *Sinmun* to look into the deeper past; an indication that Korea had finally overcame the chaos that had ruled its history from the *General Sherman* to Roh Tae-woo.

By 1994, the *Mae-Il Gyeongje* published a small article, or rather a review, of some arts and culture pieces, titled "Background Politics and Cultural History Drawn from the Old Han Dynasty [probably Yi Dynasty, my translation]" focuses on a series of historically-themed volumes published by Lee Su-gwang in the *JoongAng Ilbo*.[221] *Sinmiyangyo* appears as the *Gyeongje* explains the contents of the volumes, with "[t]he second volume (Alas, the Year of the Sickness), which centers around the time of Catholic Oppression to the selection of Queen Myeongseong. The third volume (Land of the Hermit) is concerned with *Sinmiyangyo* [my

---

[218] "(Yanghae) Deokdam"「羊해」德談 [Year of the Sheep, Words of Blessing], *Kyunghyang Sinmun 경향신문*, January 1, 1991. Original text, with *Hanja* replaced with *Hangul*: *"그렇다고 양띠해에 역사가 반드시 순탄했던 것만은 아니란 사실도 아울러 기억해둘 필요가 있다. 1 백20 년전 이해엔 미군함5 척이5 년전 대동강서 불태워진제너럴 셔먼호사건의 보복으로쳐들어온 샌미양요가발생했고"*

[219] On March 1st, 1919, Koreans across the country and the world declared their independence against the Japanese Empire, drafting a declaration of independence and holding massive demonstrations in Seoul.

[220] Park Chung-hee was the military dictator of South Korea from roughly 1961-1979, when he was assassinated by KCIA director Kim Jae-gyu. Chun Doo-hwan replaced him after a brief acting presidency under Choi Kyu-hah.

[221] "Guhanmal Baegyeong JeongChi-Minjungsa Geuryeo" 舊韓末 배경 정치·민중史 그려 [Background Politics and Cultural History Drawn from the Old Han Dynasty], *Mae-il Gyeongje 매일경제신*, April 10, 1994.

translation]."[222] While tucked away near the end of the 10 April issue of the *Gyeongje*, its inclusion at all shows that there was some sort of consumer base for stories and histories surrounding the five-year crisis, and the opening period of Joseon more generally. It also shows that *Sinmiyangyo* could be discussed divorced of a discussion of the U.S.-Korea relationship in the present.

This changed within the month, as the United States returned the first of many spoils that had been taken from Korea in 1871. The *Dong-A Ilbo* published a short report titled "U.S. Forces Korea to Return Cannon from *Sinmiyangyo* to Korea," which detailed exactly that, a return of a cannon taken from one of the Ganghwa forts to South Korea.[223] The article begins, noting that "[i]t is expected that one of two of the cannons that were taken from Ganghwa island during the Old Han Dynasty [Yi Dynasty] by U.S. forces during *Sinmiyangyo* of 1871 will be returned to Korea."[224] The article continues noting that the cannon once returned would be displayed at the War Memorial of Korea in Seoul, on the order of President Kim Young-sam. The cannon at the time was located at the U.S. Naval Academy in Maryland, where the majority American loot from *Sinmiyangyo* had been kept in the decades after 1871.[225] It is likely that the cannon is still at The War Memorial of Korea, as there is an extensive exhibit related to the "Port Opening" period at the museum, though there are so many similar guns in the exhibit that it is unclear which gun was

---

[222] Ibid. Original text, with *Hanja* replaced with *Hangul*: *"제 2 권은(아아,병인년) 편으로 천주교대탄압과민자영이 왕비로간택되는 시점까지를 담고 있다. 제 3 권은 (은자의 나라) 편으로 신미양요가 내용의 중심."* Queen Myeongseong is "Queen Min," wife of King Gojong.

[223] "Sinmiyangyoddae Gajeogan Daepomi, Hangugae banhwan Chujin" 신미양요때 가져간 大砲 美,한국에 반환 추진 [U.S. Forces Korea to Return Cannon from *Sinmiyangyo* to Korea], *Dong-A Ilbo 동아일보*, April 20, 1994. The U.S. Forces Korea is the American Command structure for U.S. Army, Air Force, and Naval divisions located in South Korea.

[224] Ibid. Original text with *Hanja* replaced with *Hangul*: *"구한말의 신미양요(1871 년)때 미국이 강화도에서 가져갔던 대포 2 문중 1 문이 한국으로 돌아올전망이다."*

[225] Ibid.

returned by the United States in 1994. Kim Young-sam's involvement in the return of the cannon and in the location of its final resting place, once again brings political significance to *Sinmiyangyo* with relation to the U.S.-South Korean relationship. The return of the cannon was a gesture of good-will from the United States to South Korea, likely due to tensions with North Korea and the increasing democratization of South Korea during the 1990s. It may also be related to 1990 American law that initiated the returning of Native American artifacts, if there was a larger artifact repatriation program outside of the United States itself.[226]

The *Dong-A Ilbo* published an article titled "Vivid Old Joseon Dynasty Defense Map" which showcased, in color, three maps of the fortifications around Joseon after the five-year crisis. *Sinmiyangyo* appears along with the *Byeonginyangyo* as catalysts for these maps, as "[t]he maps are a result of the Daewongun, who adhered to a policy of a closed country, experienced the 1866 *Byeonginyangyo* and the 1871 *Sinmiyangyo* and tried to bolster the defense of each province to cope with increasing western pressure [my translation]."[227] The *Ilbo* pushes *Sinmiyangyo* beyond 1871 as these maps are for a self-strengthening project that began in 1872, according to the article. This decenters the idea of a gap from 1871 to 1876, by showing that the Joseon state was very concerned about continued western incursions, though with the ousting of the Daewongun in 1873, Joseon policy would rapidly shift to an air of inevitability to "opening" the country to westerners, due in no small part to Japan.[228]

---

[226] An article from 1995 shows that the repatriation of Native American artifacts continued into the mid-1990s. See Douglas M. Pravda, "Museum Returns Native American Sacred Artifacts," *Harvard Crimson*, September 19, 1995.

[227] "Yetteojeon Saengsaenghan Joseonmal Gukbangjido"옛터전 생생한 朝鮮末「국방地圖」[Vivid Old Joseon Dynasty Defense Map], *Dong-A Ilbo 동아일보*, March 3, 1995. Original text with *Hanja* replaced with *Hangul*: *"이 지도를은 쇄국정책을 고수하던 대원근이 병인양요(1866)와 신미양요(1871)를 겪으면서 서양의 압력에 전극으로 대치하기 위해 전국각 군현의 방위 능 력을 제고하려했던 당시 상황을 보여준다."*

[228] Choe, *The Rule of the Daewongun*, 166-176.

Also in 1995, a very different piece was published in the *Ilbo*. Titled "The 140 million won General Sherman comes to life," deals with a brand new docu-drama on KBS 1, a large television station in South Korea at the time. The article begins with noting that in October "KBS1's "Brilliant Dawn" Will Finish up Filming the General Sherman Fire for 140 Million Won [my translation]."[229] This was a fairly large price for a single prop to be destroyed; the *Ilbo* lists the dimensions of this *General Sherman* at "thirty meters long, eight meters wide and three and a half meters high [my translation, but little room for error]."[230] Rather surprisingly, these dimensions are nearly one to one scale for an average side-wheel steamer from the 1860s, which is what the *General Sherman* was purported to be. Building a full-size replica of the *General Sherman* only to destroy it is certainly dedication to a form of realism, one that is beneficial for a truly accurate dramatization of such an important event in Korean history.

By 1999, the trend towards the popularization of the five-year crisis in South Korea was plain. While in the 1980s *Sinmiyangyo* was evoked in conversation with then-current relations with the United States, we can tell from a short description of the *Mae-Il Gyeongje* ,a television program, or perhaps a special, that the General Sherman Incident was now of interest for its own sake. Titled "19th Century Opening-Broadcasting University 'Korea on the Map'….at 10:30PM," the short piece detailed a television program dealing with the opening period presumably hosted

[229] "Jeneoreol Syeomeonho 1eok 4cheonmanwondeuryeo Silmul Bogwon" 제너럴 셔먼호 1 억 4 천만원들여 실물 복원 [KBS1's "Brilliant Dawn" Will Finish up Filming the General Sherman Fire for 140 Million Won], *Dong-A Ilbo 동아일보*, July 7, 1995. 140 million won is about $120,000 USD, though 1995 figures may vary by a margin. Original text:*"제너럴 셔먼호 1 억 4 천만원들여 실물 복원 KBS1 '찬린한 여명' 10 월방영 막판 실제 불태워 촬영"*

[230] Ibid. Original text: *"길이 30m, 폭 8m, 높이 3.5m 규모의"*

by the Korean Broadcasting University.[231] While the series explores the events of both 1866 and 1871, the 11 June "guide explains the French invasion, which called for the freedom of Catholicism, with a naval vessel originating from Shindong [likely Shandong] province, China in 1866 [my translation]."[232] The educational importance of conveying what had happened during the five-year crisis is obvious by the media time given to it. With the 1990s showing an uptick in the topic, and with two articles showing its popularization on television, the trend in South Korea was increasing visibility for the era 1866 to 1871.

South Korean newspapers had incorporated the *General Sherman*, *Byeonginyangyo,* and *Sinmiyangyo* into a multitude of articles, with increasing normalcy as the South Korean press became independent from the South Korean government. From 1966 to 1999, a subtle shift in what was an "acceptable" application of the five-year crisis is noticeable; a trend from barely noticeable historical serials to mundane television guides illustrates the increasing popularity of the "opening" period in Korean history. Unlike in the United States, Korean media had a consistent mentioning or incorporation of this history, feeding a living memory that had otherwise died in the U.S. This "feeding" was helped along not only by the printed Korean press, but also by its visual media, a genre of art with significant importance in the age of the "K-Drama."

Visual Media

---

[231] "19 Segiui Munhogaebang Bangsongdaehak … 'jidoro bon hanguktt' Bam 10si 30bun" 19 세기의 문호개방 방송대학'지도로 본 한국…'밤 10 시 30 분 [19th Century Opening-Broadcasting University 'Korea on the Map'….at 10:30PM], *Mae-il Gyeonje 매일경제신*, June 11, 1999. While the translation literally means "Broadcasting University", it is not impossible that the *Gyeonje* intended to write Broadcasting System, part of the Acronym for the Korean Broadcasting System, or KBS.

[232] Ibid. Original text: *"19 세기문호개방과통상교역, 천주교 포교의자유를요구하던이양선출몰지역과 1866 년중국신동성지푸에서 출발해 조선을 침략한 프랑스군의침탈 과정을 지도를 통해 자세히 설명한다."*

The earliest docu-drama, or "*Daehadrama*" analyzed in this study was mentioned by the *Dong-A Ilbo*. That series, known as "Brilliant Dawn," ran from 1995 to 1996 and featured a 1:1 scale of the *General Sherman*, and documented the events of the opening period from 1866 to 1895. It appeared on KBS1 during the 9:40 PM block on Saturdays and Sundays.[233] While there is little centralized access to episodes of "Brilliant Dawn," there is a supposed collection of episodes that have been uploaded to YouTube, with 37 episodes of the roughly hour-long series theoretically available for viewing. Unfortunately, the episodes have been cited for copyright violations by KBS, and are not viewable currently.[234] What is available for viewing is a short and extremely poor quality excerpt of a dramatization of Admiral Roze deciding to attack Korea, which paints him in a sympathetic light with his advisors being the deciding "push" that led to his decision.[235] Although totally out of context of its intended episode, and the series in general, this excerpt does provide the level of detail that KBS wanted to convey to a Korean audience, with fairly well-spoken French actors wearing believably period-correct clothing and a setting that is certainly a plausible French frigate.

There is another excerpt available of "Brilliant Dawn" that portrays the events of *Sinmiyangyo*. Frederick Low, Rodgers and their retinue, represented by American actors, are

---

[233] "TV3sawae Daehyeongdeurama Gyeongjaeng Bongyeokhwa" TV3 社의 대형드라마 경쟁 본격화 [3 TV Companies are Starting to Compete in Daehandramas], *Yonhap News 연합뉴스*, October 17, 1995. Little information on the show is available outside of scant news articles talking about its budget and cast before it premiered. Brilliant Dawn is "찬란한 여명" or *Cheonranhan eomeong* in Korean.

[234] "찬란하 여명," YouTube Channel, "김성태," Last updated June 14, 2017, https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL3R2AkW9Hu51q5y2dfXDvz0WJNwn6285q. While this YouTube channel claims these are episodes of "Brilliant Dream," they are more likely episodes of the 2001 *Daehadrama* "Empress Myeonseong."

[235] "찬란하 여명," YouTube video, 1:13, "jpdoumeyrou," June 29, 2014, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wJKhavPt5fw.

portrayed in a significantly more negative light than Roze.[236] The 18-minute excerpt is relatively general in terms of the Battle of Ganghwa, but it does portray Eo Jae-yeon rallying his troops as well as his final stand, in overly dramatic fashion. It ends with the taking of Eo's *Sujagi*, and a cut to real footage; a short tour of some of the artifacts taken by the Americans on display at the Museum of the U.S. Naval Academy.[237] The combination of the dramatization of *Sinmiyangyo* with a real tour of parts of the Museum of the U.S. Naval Academy shows a concerted attempt at KBS to provide an educational and entertaining bridge between the past and present. "Brilliant Dawn" implies that these artifacts *were still* spoils of war kept by the United States long after friendly diplomatic relations and a military alliance had been established between the two. While it has not been possible to ascertain the total budget for the show, it can certainly be estimated to be in the millions of U.S. dollars, as it employed dozens of actors and actresses, included full-scale props, and ran for one hundred roughly hour-long episodes. For KBS to invest such a significant amount of time and money into a *Daehadrama*, especially during the 1990s when a series of scandals rocked the Kim Young-sam administration, shows that there was serious demand from the Korean public for stories told around the opening period .[238]

A more famous *Daehadrama* appeared on KBS in 2001. Running for one hundred and twenty-four episodes from 2001 to 2002 at the Wednesday-Thursday 9:50 PM time slot, "Empress Myeonseong" follows the life of Queen Min from her marriage to King Gojong in 1866, to her assassination in 1895. There is much "Empress Myeongseong" has in common with "Brilliant Dawn," though the quality of series appears to be significantly higher. An excerpt showing the

[236] "신미양요," YouTube Video, 18:57, "김규보," November 21, 2017, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XfUDKa9m1p0.
[237] Ibid.
[238] An example of one of the scandals was his son's involvement in financing his election, "More scandal in South Korea President Kim tarnished: Democracy is on trial as election looms.," *Baltimore Sun*, May 27, 1997.

first three years of the five-year crisis in a series of short scenes is available on YouTube, with the quality in the dramatization noticeably higher than that which appeared five years earlier. The excerpt begins with a re-enactment of the *General Sherman* incident, complete with the *Sherman* firing on Korean crowds on the banks of the Taedong river, and with an overlaid narration giving the "facts" of how the incident played out. Bak Gyu-su is noted as giving the order to send fire-ships to destroy the *Sherman*, but the deaths of the crew are left out.[239] The excerpt then jumps to the *Byeonginyangyo*, with a battle scene between Korean and French soldiers.[240] While Admiral Roze is not shown at all in the clip, what is shown is French soldiers taking valuable books from Ganghwa, likely a reference to the French looting nearly 300 volumes of the Joseon *Uigwe,* which had yet to be returned as of the filming of "Empress Myeongseong."[241] The excerpt shows that the program placed the marriage of Queen Min and King Gojong within the context of these chaotic events, as the scene that follows the looting of the French is their marriage procession, watched closely from an elevated position by the Daewongun. This is then immediately followed by a dramatization of the *China* incident of 1868, with German Ernst Oppert, the American F.H.B. Jenkins (or E.F.B. Jenkins) and the French priest who accompanied them Stanislas Féron all portrayed in their plot to steal the remains of the Daewongun's father as political leverage.[242]

In only two minutes this excerpt shows the precarious situation Queen Min and King Gojong faced, even before the *Sinmiyangyo* occurred. The dramatization of the lesser-known

---

[239] "1866~68: 서양 열강의 출몰," YouTube Video, 2:56, "Patterson R.," November 23, 2019, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o9podl0-4qE. Bak Gyu-su (1807-1877) was the Governor of *Pyongan* province when the *General Sherman* Incident took place, and gave first the warning to the *Sherman* to turn back and then the order to destroy the ship.

[240] *Byeonginyangyo* is the French Expedition of 1866.

[241] Ibid. The *Uigwe* are records of the Joseon royal rituals and ceremonies, or essentially royal protocols. Nearly 4000 books exist dealing with various aspects of funerary, matrimonial, and religious rituals and protocols. The Looted *Uigwe* were returned to South Korea in 2011.

[242] Ibid. While mentioned very briefly by American papers, Ernst Oppert's attempt at body-snatching severally affected the Joseon Government's perception of foreigners. A recent news article recalling the events is Robert Neff, "German merchant's bodysnatching expedition in 1868," *The Korea Times*, July 21, 2010.

China incident is also interesting, as it was not a major event like the American and French invasions, but its effect on the Daewongun and the Yi family in general was no less significant.[243] Considering "Empress Myeonseong" was a more personal drama around the life of Queen Min, it is more sensible to include the *China* incident not only for its ramifications towards the perception and reception of westerners, but also for its direct effect on the Yi family as well.

The final *Daehadrama* is certainly the most well-known outside of Korea, and definitely has the highest budget of any of these series, inflation or not. "Mr. Sunshine" debuted in 2018 at a total production cost of some 40 billion won, and has to date won several awards including Drama of the Year at the 6th APAN awards.[244] The first episode of "Mr. Sunshine" centers around *Sinmiyangyo,* as the expedition is central to the life-changing moments for two of the main characters of the series. Eugene Kim (Lee Byung-hun), an orphan stowaway on an American ship, wants to earn his citizenship through military service in the United States Marine Corps; Jang Seung-gu (Choi Moo-sung), the son of a gunner was present at the Battle of Ganghwa against the Americans.[245] The Battle of Ganghwa is an essential part of the episode, with dramatic scenes of American Marines and Joseon soldiers battling over the battlements of Ganghwa forts, all while constant shelling from the American ships fills the screen with smoke and noise. While almost entirely fictional in its premise, there are two important scenes that are "re-enacted" during the Battle of Ganghwa scenes. The death of Lieutenant Hugh McKee, who was described as being impaled and shot during the ascent over the walls of a Ganghwa fort, is dramatized by "Mr.

[243]Choe, *The Rule of the Daewongun*, 112. Choe argues that the *China* incident was a direct cause of the Joseon state suspending its "Goodwill to strangers" policy on shipwrecked westerners.
[244] Park Jin-hai, "Mr. Sunshine' features high-end cinematography," *The Korea Times*, October 10, 2018. Yim Hyun-su, "'Mr. Sunshine' Lee Byung-hun wins top prize at APAN Star Awards,'" *The Korea Herald*, October 14, 2018.
[245] *Mr. Sunshine*, "Episode 1," Episode number 1, Directed by Eung-bok Lee, Written by Eun-sook Kim, tvN, July 7 2018. Jang Seung-gu is technically a supporting character, but his character-building story is featured prominently in Episode 1.

Sunshine"; though McKee is never mentioned, what appears to be a Marine Lieutenant, matching McKee's description, is stabbed and shot as they go over the wall,.[246] The other scene is the fall of Eo Jae-yeon's *Sujagi*, with American Marines picking it up, and the raising of the American flag as the young Jang Seung-gu (Choi Moo-sung) mourns the death of his father.[247]

While "Mr. Sunshine" features the relationship among the United States, Japan, and Korea as central to the progression of its plot, it paints the Joseon government in a definitely negative light, as the Daewongun is presented in the first episode as responsible for the American attacks, as his obstinate refusal to speak with the Americans and his aggressive attitude towards westerners is seen as the problem. King Gojong is portrayed as an aloof sixteen-year old who *would* be sympathetic to the Americans, if it were not for his overbearing father, the Daewongun. As for *Sinmiyangyo* itself, the entire affair is portrayed as some kind of inevitable tragedy to befall Koreans with the blame at the feet of the Joseon court, not with the Americans who escalated the conflict to what it became.[248] Considering the main character Eugene Kim (Lee Byung-hun) eventually works directly for President Theodore Roosevelt by 1902, there appears to be a significant amount of white-washing of early Korean-American relations, with the perception that within three decades the United States had become Joseon's favored nation.[249]

"Mr. Sunshine" is the fourth highest-rated K-drama in Korean television history, so it is problematic that such a popular series with a large audience base would have unusual framings of

[246] *Mr. Sunshine*, "Episode 1," Episode number 1, Directed by Eung-bok Lee, Written by Eun-sook Kim, tvN, July 7 2018. "Expedition to Corea," *Reports of the Secretary of the Navy and of the Postmaster General* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1871), 283.
[247] Ibid.
[248] Ibid.
[249] *Mr. Sunshine*, "Episode 1," Episode number 1, Directed by Eung-bok Lee, Written by Eun-sook Kim, tvN, July 7 2018.

the beginning of relations with the United States.[250] The series is also available on the streaming platform Netflix in the United States, which makes the series even more problematic as an educational endeavor. The dramatization shows white-washed Korean-American diplomatic relations and unusual racial dynamics that are anachronistic to an American audience with little to no memory of what the American expedition of 1871 was or what it was for.

The presentation of the events from 1866 to1871 in South Korean media has evolved from more educational, dramatized programs running on late-night television, to well-produced mostly fictional historical dramas widely available on streaming platforms. While the entertainment value of *Sinmiyangyo* has come into vogue within the last decade, the historical reality and its implications in the formation of Korean-American relations has become less important. What this means for the future of Korean representations of the opening period is uncertain, but the trend towards the blockbuster and away from the more accurate docu-drama is telling for the commercialization of historical memory.

Museums--Seoul and Ganghwa

On Ganghwa Island, there are several museums devoted to the storied history of foreign encounters that have taken place there. Of these, two have specific exhibits devoted to the "opening" period of Ganghwa's history, the Ganghwa History Museum and the smaller Ganghwa War Museum. There are also historical sites all over the island, such as the restored site of Gwangseongbo fortress, but these locations, unlike the museums, are not designed to illustrate the

[250] Yi Nam-Gyeon 이남견, " (TVpunghyanggyae) 'Miseuteo Seonsyain' Gim Tae-ri, Horro Salanama waebyeong Hwaldong Gyeosok…Sicheongryul 18% dolpa 'yujongwaemi'" [TV 풍향계] '미스터 선샤인' 김태리, 홀로 살아남아 의병 활동 계속...시청률 18% 돌파 '유종의 미 [Kim Tae-ri of 'Mr. Sunshine' survived alone and continued his righteous army career. The ratings have surpassed 18 percent in the first half of the year], *SportsQ*, October 1, 2018.

history of the island. The sites are featured in the exhibits of those museums, however, providing an opportunity for visitors to continue their exploration of the island.

While the Ganghwa History Museum is *the* Museum on the island in terms of its size and scope, the Ganghwa War Museum has a larger space devoted specifically to the *Byeonginyangyo* and *Sinmiyangyo*. This space is on the second floor of the museum, in the "Joseon" Exhibition Hall 3, which includes a large exhibit space for displaying Eo Jae-yeon's *Sujagi*.[251] The museum website also lists various weapons and uniforms on display from Korean, French, and American militaries from this period, with a special note that the Marine Corps artifacts had been returned "in rental format" to the museum in 2007.[252] This second floor hall is the only area of the museum that showcases these conflicts, as the museum has a vast chronological scope from the pre-historic era to the Korean War of 1950-53. The museum is also not as centrally located as the Ganghwa History Museum, and likely receives less traffic, and likely a smaller budget, than the History Museum. The Ganghwa War Museum and the Ganghwa History Museum are both under the same county office and share some commonality in what they decide to cover, prompting some questions as to why there are two museums to begin with.[253]

The Ganghwa History Museum, though not devoted to the conflicts that occurred on the island like its war-specific counterpart, does have a significant display of the *Byeonginyangyo* and *Sinmiyangyo*. On its first floor in an area titled "Joseon-Modern Ganghwa," several displays feature western encounters. Of these, two scaled Dioramas dramatize the *Byeonginyangyo*, in the form of a likely one to seventy-two scale battle and *Sinmiyangyo* in a nearly one to one scale of

---

[251] "전시실 소개, 전시안내," *Ganghwa War Museum*, https://www.ganghwa.go.kr/open_content/museum_war/display/permanent/exhibition_f2.jsp.
[252] Ibid. This is likely a reference to the *Sujagi* itself as it was returned in October 2007, according to "What is the ICPRCP and what does it want?," *Korea JoongAng Daily*, January 13, 2009.
[253] This is deduced from the websites of both museum being nearly identical, with links to the Ganghwa County Office prominently featured on both.

the Battle of Ganghwa.[254] The *Sinmiyangyo* display features American soldiers scaling the cliffs of Gwangseongbo Fortress, with an American cannon prominently featured aiming up towards the fortress walls. Joseon soldiers are shown firing down into the Americans, mirroring every dramatization of the battle shown on television.[255] While the Ganghwa History Museum has fewer specific artifacts available to showcase these western disturbances, the museum does provide a well-organized exhibit with the necessary information, and dramatized model battles, to compensate for lack of historical pieces. The History Museum appears to be a newer construction as it features a more flowing exhibit philosophy compared to the War Museum, which coupled with its central location on the island would certainly point to a more attractive location to visit for learning about Ganghwa's history.

Moving to nearby Seoul, there are primarily two sites which feature the opening period in relation to *Sinmiyangyo,* the National Palace Museum of Korea, and the War Memorial of Korea. The National Palace Museum is only important tangentially, as it was the first site that showcased the *Sujagi* when it was returned to Korea in 2007, but most evidence suggests that the flag is no longer showcased at the museum, at least exclusively.[256] Beyond this, the National Palace Museum does have an exhibit devoted to the "Korean Empire," with a plethora of artifacts from Emperor Gojong's tenure and a brief mention of the opening period.[257]

The War Memorial of Korea is far more focused on the opening period than the Palace Museum, with a significant portion of the "War History Room" devoted to the conflicts between 1866 and 1871. Artifacts including physical copies of combat records by Joseon troops against

---

[254] "1 층 전시실, 전시," *Ganghwa History Museum*, https://www.ganghwa.go.kr/open_content/museum_history/display/permanent/exhibition_f1.jsp.
[255] Ibid.
[256] Chung Ah-young, "General's Flag Returns Home From US," *The Korea Times*, October 22, 2007.
[257] "Korean Empire," *National Palace Museum of Korea*, https://www.gogung.go.kr/perm.do?pLng=en&viewName=perm05.

the French and Eo's *Sujagi* are on display in the museum, along with a number of uniforms, firearms and cannon from French, American, Japanese and Korean forces.[258] An interactive map shows the locations of conflicts during the opening period between the French, Japanese and American forces, along with descriptions placing the opening period within the context of western imperial expansion.[259] The *Sujagi* appears to be hanging above the room judging by the showcase photo featured prominently on the webpage, though this forms a contradictory location for the *Sujagi* as the Ganghwa War Museum also claims to have the flag, or at least a space for it. Considering that the War Memorial is certainly the largest war museum in South Korea, the total space devoted to the opening period is just a fraction of its showcased exhibits, but it is still a significant exhibit on the *Byeonginyangyo* and *Sinmiyangyo* in a well-maintained and heavily-visited museum. The War Memorial is certainly in the best position for maintaining the memory of the events from 1866 to 1871 through a physical space in South Korea, though even in this museum it could be overshadowed quite easily by the two halls devoted to the more catastrophic Korean War.[260]

The memory of *Sinmiyangyo* and the events that led to it are well-remembered in South Korea, through printed, visual and physical manifestations. Though the methods with which these events are remembered widely vary, they each keep some semblance of that memory easily accessible to the South Korean public. Whether or not the portrayal of these events is accurate is another issue altogether, but it is relatively safe to note that the museums which feature episodes from the five-year crisis are fairly accurate. Portrayals on television and in print media are more

[258] "'Port Opening' Period, The War History Room," *The War Memorial of Korea*, https://www.warmemo.or.kr/LNG/exhibition/exhibit.do.
[259] Ibid.
[260] "The Korea War Room 1," *The War Memorial of Korea*, https://www.warmemo.or.kr/LNG/exhibition/exhibit.do.

unreliable, though these too, have educational value as well as entertainment value. In North Korea, the value of the five-year crisis has a drastically different imperative.

North Korea

While in South Korea there are mixed methods of presenting the five-year crisis, from a purely military encounter to the opening of a much greater cultural interaction, in the North these events have only one use: a tale of triumph over a foreign invader. North Korean news agencies, as well as a monument on the banks of the Taedong river, fashion the defeat of the United States and all western invaders as a prelude to the inevitable victory that the North will achieve over the West, as the narrative goes. Noting this, the first newspaper included in this study is from 2015, quite recent in relation to the project. In fact, all of the North Korean articles are from the last five years, with an increased output in March of 2017.[261] Some of these articles are published in Korean, while other are in English, so the language of the article is divorced from its context, as the English and Korean articles are actually different, and not translations of one or the other. The North Korean news agencies examined in this study include *Uriminzokkiri* (우리 민족끼리), or literally " between our people", the *Rodong Sinmun* (로동신문) which is the main state newspaper of North Korea, and *Naenara* (내나라), which is the official internet portal for North Korea which publishes its own articles as well. A direct connection between the Kim family and the *General Sherman* is illustrated in the following newspapers, helping to mythologize a specific biography of the North Korean nation in which the Kim family has *always* been the vanguards for the defense of the people of Korea, especially against the United States. The use of the *Sherman* as opposed to

[261] These newspapers were sourced from an online archive hosted by KCNAwatch.org, which includes records dating back to 1997. Why output increased in 2017 in particular is hard to ascertain, given the size of the KCNAwatch archive.

Sinmiyangyo to illustrate the victory of Korea over the United States is thus featured far more frequently in the North Korean press.

Published on 22 December 2015, the *Uriminzokkiri* article titled "American Invaders of Joseon Prelude: The Unequal American-Joseon Treaty [my translation]" deals with the North Korean spin on the events that lead to the Shufeldt Treaty of 1882.[262] The article is generally concerned with the Shufeldt Treaty, but notes that in "order to understand the 130-year old unequal treaty with the United States, the treaty must be looked at in context with the American invasion and contact from 1865 to 1914 [my translation]."[263] The article then chronicles a list of American imperial actions throughout the 19th century leading up to the Shufeldt treaty, such as the Kanagawa Treaty with Japan of 1854, and the annexation of Texas and the Mexican-American war (1846-48). In this list, *Uriminzokkiri* includes the events of the five-year crisis, but in remarkable shorthand compared to the larger context of American expansion, leaving out any of the details of *Sinmiyangyo* one might expect to see in a piece critical of American imperialism. The article does end with the implications of opening the country to the United States, noting that "The major problem was that Queen Min took power and promoted unequal treaties after the Daewongun lost power. Beginning with the treaty with Japan in 1876, United States (1882), England (1883), Germany (1883), Italy (1840 [sic, 1884]), Russia (1884), France (1886), Austria (1892), Belgium (1901), Denmark (1902) and the Qing Dynasty in 1892[sic, likely mean 1882] all

[262] "(Migugui Joseonchimnyaksa, geu Seomageul Bondaten) (1)Bulpyeongdeungjeogin (Jomisuhotongsangjogyu) ui Chegyeol"《미국의 조선침략사, 그 서막을 본다》(1)불평등적인《조미수호통상조규》의 체결 [American Invaders of Joseon Prelude: The Unequal American-Joseon Treaty], *Uriminzokkiri 우리 민족끼리*, December 12, 2015.

[263] Ibid. Original text: *"130 여년전에 맺어진 조선과 미국 최초의 불평등조약인 이《조미수호통상조약》을 보다 잘 리해하기 위해 조약이전에 발생한 조선과 미국의 접촉과정과 1865 년부터 1914 년까지 미국의 침탈과정을 함께 살펴보아야 한다."*

entered into unequal treaties [my translation]."[264] Placing the blame on Queen Min and not on the aggression of the Daewongun is a striking difference from South Korean portrayals of the two. This is certainly a political move as well as potentially a patriarchal one on the part of North Korea. Also, by listing out all of the treaties Joseon signed with foreign powers in quick succession, the *zokkiri* reifies the ineptitude of the Joseon state and the untrustworthiness of foreigners, westerners and easterners alike.

The *Rodong Sinmun* published an article on 30 March 2016 titled '"U.S. Imperialists are the Sworn Enemy of the Korean People' The illegal American Expedition and the Aggressive Act on Ganghwa Island [my translation]," which is a far more overt denunciation of American imperialism writ large through American actions that constitute *Sinmiyangyo*.[265] The *Sinmun* sacralizes this article by beginning it with "Comrade Kim Il-sung, the great leader, preached as follows:" an assured way to enforce the *ethos* that the *Sinmun* certainly wants to portray.[266] The article is at least portrayed as an encouraging speech or lesson coming from Kim Il-sung. Whether this was said by Kim Il-sung is harder to determine as there is no date given in the article to pinpoint it, but the impression is certainly given that it *was* said by him. Kim Il-sung, or the writer of the

---

[264] "(Migugui Joseonchimnyaksa, geu Seomageul Bondaten) (1)Bulpyeongdeungjeogin (Jomisuhotongsangjogyu) ui Chegyeol"《미국의 조선침략사, 그 서막을 본다》(1)불평등적인《조미수호통상조규》의 체결 [American Invaders of Joseon Prelude: The Unequal American-Joseon Treaty], *Uriminzokkiri 우리 민족끼리*, December 12, 2015. Original text: *"더욱 큰 문제는 대원군 실각후 명성황후가 권세를 잡고 불평등조약을 람발한데 있었다. 1876 년 일본과의《강화도조약》을 시작으로 미국(1882), 영국(1883), 도이췰란드(1883), 이딸리아(1840), 로씨야(1884), 프랑스(1886), 오스트리아(1892), 벨지끄(1901), 단마르크(1902) 그리고 청나라와는 1892 년에 불평등장정을 체결했다."*

[265] Seo Nam-Il 서남일, "(Mijeneun Joseoninminui Bulgudaecheonui Wonssu) Bulbeommudohan Miguk (joseonwonjeonghamdae)ui Ganghwadochimgonghaengwi"【미제는 조선인민의 불구대천의 원쑤】불법무도한 미국《조선원정함대》의 강화도침공행위 ['U.S. Imperialists are the Sworn Enemy of the Korean People' The illegal American Expedition and the Aggressive Act on Ganghwa Island], *Rodong Sinmun (Kr)로동신문*, March 30, 2016.

[266] Ibid. original text: *"위대한 수령 김일성동지께서는 다음과 같이 교시하시였다."*

article Seo Nam-Il, recalled the events of the *General Sherman* incident in the lead up to *Sinmiyangyo*, noting that in "January 1871, they [Americans] sent another threatening letter to Joseon to force it to sign the unequal treaty under the pretext of the incident [*General Sherman*]. If the "Friendship relations" were destroyed, then the Joseon government would take responsibility for it [not the Americans]."[267] The *Sinmun* continued with a description of the invasion, noting the well-prepared and equipped American forces, and their multiple attempts at defeating the Korean forces on Ganghwa. The article concludes with the lesson: "In 1871, when the Korean people fought and defeated the American invasion (*Sinmiyangyo*), the Korean people achieved a great victory in history. Thus, *The U.S. has always been defeated in battles with the Korean people* [my emphasis, my translation]."[268] The sentiment of inevitable victory against the United States is not unique amongst North Korean articles, but by giving the article the authority of North Korea's greatest hero-figure, Kim Il-sung, the *Sinmun* gives an additional level of credibility to this "victory" motif.

In September, the *Sinmun* continued the "inevitable victory" theme in their English-language edition, in an appropriately named article "Aggressors Will be Bound to Meet Death." The first line of this article evokes the *General Sherman* directly, which is the central theme of the

---

[267]Seo Nam-Il 서남일, "(Mijeneun Joseoninminui Bulgudaecheonui Wonssu) Bulbeommudohan Miguk (joseonwonjeonghamdae)ui Ganghwadochimgonghaengwi" 【미제는 조선인민의 불구대천의 원쑤】 불법무도한 미국《조선원정함대》의 강화도침공행위 ['U.S. Imperialists are the Sworn Enemy of the Korean People' The illegal American Expedition and the Aggressive Act on Ganghwa Island], *Rodong Sinmun (Kr)로동신문*, March 30, 2016. Original text: *"놈들은 1871년 1월 조선봉건정부에 또다시《셔먼》호사건을 구실로 불평등적인《항해 및 통상조약》에 조인할것을 강요하는 협박문을 보냈다.그러면서 만일《조약》의 체결을 거부하여 이른바《친선관계》가 파괴되면 그 책임을 조선측에서 져야 한다는 실로 얼토당토않은 궤변을 늘어놓았다."*

[268] Ibid. Original text: *"우리 나라 력사에서《신미양요》라고 불리우고있는 1871년 미국의 무력침공을 물리치기 위한 투쟁에서 조선인민은 또다시 력사적승리를 이룩하였다.*
이렇듯 미국은 조선인민과의 싸움에서 언제나 련전련패만을 당하였다."

article as a whole: "This is the 150th year of the sending of the U.S. imperialist aggression ship General Sherman to the bottom of the River Taedong by the patriotic struggle of Pyongyang people after illegally intruding into it and committing monstrous atrocities."[269] In North Korea, the *General Sherman* is portrayed as an intentional mission by the United States to "open" Korea for trade, as opposed to a private venture using a merchant marine-registered steamer. The anniversary of the *Sherman* is evoked in the present, as the article continues noting that the

> U.S. is acting rashly, unaware of how anachronistic and suicidal its persistent ambition for aggression against Korea is. It is serious mistaken, oblivious of the history of its defeat. If the U.S. imperialists dare provoke the DPRK [North Korea], it will wipe out them, the sworn enemy, to the last man by merciless nuclear strikes. The aggressors are bound to meet death only. The DPRK will always emerge victorious in the confrontation with the U.S. and it is bound to suffer irretrievable defeat at all times. *This is the immutable law and tradition proven by the history of DPRK-U.S. confrontation* [my emphasis].[270]

Such bombastic and threatening rhetoric is not atypical of North Korean statements, but to compare the *General Sherman* Incident with the apparently prophesized "immutable law" of the defeat of the United States should it continue its course with the north, is striking. Invoking the *Sinmun* is pulling from the first aggressive act ever committed against Korea by an American to justify the North Korean line in the present, using the early victories of Joseon against the United States as direct harbingers to the future if aggression were to escalate between the two powers.

In March of 2017, three articles were published in quick succession on *Naenara*. The first of these deals with the *General Sherman* incident and is a very short retelling of the event from a North Korean perspective, though notably far more "objective" than the *Naenara* article from September 2016. The *Naenara* makes the case that the "intrusion by General Sherman was the start of the US invasion of Korea."[271] This claim is supported by the *Naenara* through a largely

[269] Ri Hak-Nam, "Aggressors Will Be Bound to Meet Death," *Rodong Sinmun (En)*, September 5, 2016.
[270] Ibid.
[271] "Incident of General Sherman," *Naenara (En)*, March 16, 2017.

fictitious account of the incident, with the *Naenara* purporting that the *General Sherman* came "[a]rmed with four cannons and carrying 90 combat personnel, it stole into the estuary of the Taedong River on August 16, 1866. Having sailed up near Pyongyang, the aggressors raped women, looted people's wealth and kidnapped Korean soldiers."[272] The only plausible piece from those claims is the "kidnapped Korean soldiers," though in reality this was the entourage of Yi Hyon-ik, deputy commander of the Pyongyang military headquarters who had pursued the *Sherman* as it made its way towards Pyongyang.[273]

A "part two" *Naenara* article was published the following week, in similar succinct fashion, though the subject of this article was the U.S.S. *Shenandoah*. In the expected flowery language, the *Naenara* article picks up where the previous article left off:

> Far from drawing a lesson from the incident of the General Sherman in 1866, the United States dispatched the aggressor ship Shenandoah into the territorial waters of Korea. In March 1868, commanded by a lieutenant colonel of the US Navy [John C. Febiger], carrying 230 men and armed with nine cannons […] firing bullets and shells at random and watching for a chance to intrude into the Taedong River.[274]

Already portraying the Americans as random aggressors seeming only to want to do harm to Koreans, the article continues, positing that a short engagement took place and that the *Shenandoah,*"[f]rightened by the sudden attack, the ship dared not resist and fled. Next day the aggressors landed on Piryon Island committing violence against the inhabitants and forcing them to convey letters to their government, before fleeing."[275] The Americans were cowardly as well as wantonly aggressive, as the narrative goes. There is no mention as to *why* either the *General*

[272] Ibid.
[273] Choe, *The Rule of the Daewongun*, 111.
[274] "Incident of Shenandoah," *Naenara (En)*, March 25, 2017.
[275] Ibid.

Sherman or the *Shenandoah* had sailed up the Taedong to begin with, only that they had ill-intent and open hostility.

The third March *Naenara* article concerns the Daewongun, and once again touts a pro-Daewongun stance and an anti-Queen Min stance. In regard to the Daewongun's ultra-protectionist policies and his resistance to France and the United States, the *Naenara* notes that "[h]is policy gave some help to Korea, which had not carried out the bourgeois revolution, in checking the aggression of capitalist powers and defending the sovereignty of the country in a short term[.]"[276] In an Orthodox Marxist line, *Naenara* praises the Daewongun for accelerating the class contradictions of feudalism, while simultaneously recognizing that the Daewongun was a feudal ruler. The article ends with a subtle critique of Queen Min, noting that when "Queen Min and her clique secured power after Prince Taewon resigned in late 1873, the foreign policy of the feudal government was changed into that of opening up the country *for the foreigners* [my emphasis]."[277] The crucial "for" instead of "to" implies that Queen Min was some sort of foreign collaborator according to the North Korean line, and that the foreignness of the outside was the corrupting force upon Korea, not necessarily the supposedly already collapsing feudal structure that the *Naenara* claimed was accelerated by the Daewongun's policies. The article uses the five-year crisis as a lesson in resistance to foreign interference, in a similar vein to the articles that the *Sinmun* had published. It is not the feudal structure necessarily that is a problem, but foreign interference and a willingness to allow it to occur. The party line is speaking through the past to the *Naenara* audience.

[276] "Regent Prince Taewon," *Naenara (En)*, March 29, 2017.
[277] Ibid.

In May, the *Rodong Sinmun* published an exceptionally long piece titled "The Brilliance of the Warrior Upon the Empty Earth 'The Green Pine Tree of Namsan.'"[278] However unrelated the titled sounds, the article reports on the opening of a new museum marking the 105th anniversary of the birth of Kim Il-sung. The *Sinmun* provides numerous paragraphs devoted to praising the Kim family, with a sprinkling of information regarding the actual contents of the museum, such as that it has one hundred rooms.[279] The article mentions the *General Sherman* quite prominently, noting that the first room of the museum features art depicting Kim Eung-woo (1848-1878), the great-grandfather of Kim Il-sung holding a torch and pointing towards the *Sherman* with the intent to destroy it.[280] It is quite common for the North Korean government to overemphasize the role Kim Eung-woo played in the destruction of the *General Sherman*, though it is certainly possible he was present. This would explain why North Korea puts so much propagandistic value on the destruction of the *Sherman*, as it can directly link the origin of the Kim family with the origin of Korean struggle against the United States; a powerful legitimizing tool. The article continues with further descriptions of the exhibits, noting the numerous Korean victories against foreign aggression, such as the *Byeonginyangyo*, *Sinmiyangyo*, and the Port Hamilton incident and numerous Japanese conflicts.[281] Most interestingly, this article mentions Kim Eung-woo in matters relating to the *General Sherman*. The trend among these articles leans more towards a

[278] Han Yeong-min 한영민,"Biun-I Deuriwondeon I ddangae Ryeoksaui Saebyeokeul Bulreoon (Namsanui Pureun Sonamu)" 비운이 드리웠던 이 땅에 력사의 새벽을 불러온《남산의 푸른 소나무》[The Brilliance of the Warrior Upon the Empty Earth 'The Green Pine Tree of Namsan'], *Rodong Sinmun (Kr) 로동신문*, May 4, 2017. "The Green Pine Tree of Namsan" is a North Korean folk(ish) song, as for the rest of the title, this is essentially a transliteration.
[279] Ibid.
[280] Ibid. This painting is absolutely real, and can be found here: http://www.jayoo.co.kr/news/articleView.html?idxno=6385.
[281] Ibid. The Port Hamilton Incident was a military occupation where the British Royal Navy Occupied *Geomun* Island from 1885 to 1887. The official cause was a supposed secret agreement with Russia that the Koreans were making for them to use the island as a coaling station.

collective Korean action or a justified Joseon government, not the direct action of the sanctified Kim family.

In 2018, the *Sinmun* published "Intensive Aggressive Actions on Ganghwa Island [my rough translation]." Essentially identical in intent to previous *Sinmun* articles about the *General Sherman* and *Sinmiyangyo*, this article does however provide more detail as to the chain of events leading to the "disgraceful, crushing defeat" of American forces in 1871.[282] The emphasis in the article is not on *why* the Americans had come to Korea, though this time the *General Sherman* is at least mention as a pretext for the 1871 expedition. The emphasis lies in the resounding defeat of the Americans at the hands of the Korean people, not just the Joseon state, and not with the heroic action of Kim Eung-woo.[283] The importance here is not necessarily the content of the article, as it does not say anything new from three years prior, but in its context and the recentness within which it was written.

The above article appeared on the cusp of the thaw of diplomatic relations between North Korea, South Korea and the United States, the month before the first Inter-Korean summit under President Moon Jae-in took place in April. Two months later, the first United States-North Korea summit took place in June 2018. .[284] Use of Korean history to attack the weakness of the United States against Korea drastically declined after this article, but it is likely this will not be the last to invoke the *Sherman* and *Sinmiyangyo*.

The usage of the *General Sherman* and *Sinmiyangyo* as harbingers of victory against the United States is the central theme to these North Korean papers. Other methods of reifying this

[282] Ahn Cheol-gwan 안철관, "Nalgandojeokin Ganghwado Chimgonghaengui" 날강도적인 강화도침공행위[Intensive Aggressive Actions on Ganghwa Island], *Rodong Sinmun (Kr) 로동신문*, March 20, 2018.
[283] Ibid.
[284] Essentially the beginning of the 2018-19 "detente" between North Korea and the United States happened immediately following this piece.

version of the history of the five-year crisis include the previously mentioned "Monument to the Sinking of the US Invader *Sherman*" on the banks of the Taedong river, as well as postage stamps from 2006 that commemorate the sinking of the *Sherman*.[285] Due to the direct connection between the Kim family and the *General Sherman*, the use of the *Sherman* incident to illustrate the victory of Korea over the United States, and the multi-generational resistance of the Kims to purported American aggression, has a higher propagandistic value than *Sinmiyanygo*. Both incidents are celebrated as victories by North Korea, but the *General Sherman* appears to have a unique and special place in the narrative of triumph that North Korea reinforces. This is likely due to the event happening in present-day North Korea, its association with the Kim family, and as its place as the first "conflict" involving Americans to occur on Korean soil.

Conclusion

In North and South Korea, there is little doubt that the memory of the five-year crisis is kept alive quite well. While in South Korea that memory is "misremembered" for entertainment purposes, the crux of the history is still accurately recounted and memorialized in Seoul's and Ganghwa's museums and historical sites. South Korean newspapers repeatedly used the events from 1866 to 1871 as reminders as to how relations began between Korea and the western world, while television programs sought and continue to seek to entertain as well as educate South Koreans on the rapidly changing reality that Joseon faced in the latter half of the nineteenth century.

In North Korea, a very different picture to these events is constantly reified to the North Korean people. The focus lies solely with the American-Korean contacts, with the *Byeonginyangyo* downplayed in favor of the *General Sherman* incident and the *Sinmiyangyo*. The

[285] For the monument, an image can be found here: http://blog.daum.net/gonearethedays3/31, a Korean blogpost discussing early Korean-American contact. An image of the stamp can be found here: https://www.snupps.com/Exploring_Stamps/item/14778889--north-korea-stamp-2006-general-sherman-incident, a stamp blogging site which features the same language on the stamp as the title of the memorial.

retelling of the actual events in their most accurate detail is not all the focus of North Korean remembrance, rather it is the propaganda value that these events provide to the North Korean state that is the chief focus in their recounting. Whether in memorials, museums or news articles, the *General Sherman* and *Sinmiyangyo* are seen as great victories for the Korean people against an American enemy randomly attacking, raping and looting the Korean people totally unprovoked. The Kim family also has a personal stake in the *General Sherman*, as Kim Il-sung's great-grandfather Kim Eung-woo was apparently present at its destruction. This myth revolving around Kim Eung-woo is known outside of North Korea, as an extensive article in the *New Yorker* traces the national myths of North Korea back to the *General Sherman* Incident.[286] If aspects of the American press are well aware of North Korea's mythology around the Kim Dynasty, then the proliferation of North Korean "constructed" memory has been successful. The fact that Kim Eung-woo's role was well overplayed, turning Kim from a present official during the *General Sherman* Incident into the chief advocate for its destruction, is no longer relevant as North Korean state has successfully proliferated its preferred version of events.[287]

Some direct differences in how the five-year crisis is remembered include how the Daewongun is portrayed. In the South, he is seen as an incompetent leader who caused unnecessary bloodshed with westerners, while in the North the Daewongun is praised for his resistance to American imperialists infringing on the sovereignty of Joseon. The same is true in reverse for Queen Min, as she is a celebrated figure in the South, her faction being seen as

[286] Philip Gourevitch, "Alone in the Dark: Kim Jong Il plays a canny game with South Korea and the U.S.," *The New Yorker*, September 8, 2003.

[287] An example of Kim's overplayed role can be found in Han Yeong-min 한영민,"Biun-I Deuriwondeon I ddangae Ryeoksaui Saebyeokeul Bulreoon (Namsanui Pureun Sonamu)" 비운이 드리웠던 이 땅에 력사의 새벽을 불러온 《남산의 푸른 소나무》 [The Brilliance of the Warrior Upon the Empty Earth 'The Green Pine Tree of Namsan'], *Rodong Sinmun (Kr) 로동신문*, May 4, 2017.

responsible for the "modernization" of Korea, while in the North she is seen as a Quisling-type character, with her clique responsible for the destruction of an independent and whole Korea. More nuance is given to the opening period in South Korea, while in the North the entire period is seen as a gradual loss of sovereignty and national power to the foreign "invaders," whoever they may be. Another obvious difference is the role that the Kim family plays in the five-year crisis. In the South, Kim Eung-woo is not mentioned at all, in any capacity, while in the North massive murals are painted of him leading the actions against the *General Sherman*. Finally, the treatment of the Joseon state varies in the North and South, with the North taking a consistent pro-Joseon stance, that the actions of the Joseon court were justified; it was the western influences that caused the collapse of the Joseon state more so than the system already in place. In the South, the Joseon state is frequently portrayed as backward and corrupt, as well as callous in its regard for human life, at least up to 1873 and the rise of Queen Min. Thus, a generally anti-Joseon political stance is common in entertainment, as the South Korean national narrative is celebratory of the "progressive" story of Queen Min and the tragedy of Korea unable to resist the forces of the Japanese Empire, with "Mr. Sunshine" exemplifying that national biography.

While memory in Korea of the events from1866 to1871 are kept alive by a vast array of political and cultural forces, the same cannot be said for the United States, where the memorial capital has been accumulated primarily with a dedicated few military institutions and pop-historical references, which will be examined in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 3: AMERICAN MEMORY OF THE *GENERAL SHERMAN* AND THE KOREA EXPEDITION

Memory of the United States-Korea interaction before 1882 is continued by a dedicated few amateur, or in some cases professionally obscure, military historians in the United States. A handful of documentaries and websites provide the bulk of information outside of the scholarly work on the period from 1866 to 1871. While knowledge of the five-year crisis is available to American undergraduate students that study modern East Asian or Korean history, this version of events is similar is not identical to the South Korean version, and in the case of American military academies, an even more sanitized history of that period with a focus on the military actions alone.[288] Outside of American universities, the most important piece of American memory lies in the work of one man, who has bridged the cultural gap between South Korea and the United States, and was one of the primary parties responsible for the return of Eo Jae-yeon's *Sugaji* to South Korea. Thomas Duvernay is that individual, who has an interesting story that led from recoloring Civil War photographs to the publishing of two articles on *Sinmiyangyo*, and a book in the works as well.[289] Duvernay, the United States Naval Academy and popular history websites form the basis of this short chapter, as the truth is there is little in the United States today related to the five-year crisis.

American Military Museums, Foundations

At the National Museum of the United States Marine Corps in Virginia, there is an exhibit dedicated to the American Expedition to Korea in the "Global Expeditionary Force" section on the

[288] A good example of an undergraduate textbook that mentions the *General Sherman* Incident and the American expedition is Patricia Ebrey and Anne Walthall, *Modern East Asia from 1600: A Cultural, Social and Political History* (Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2014), 370-71.
[289] Thomas Duvernay claims on his website that he has published his book, but it is unavailable on any medium yet known. Its title and publisher are unknown, but judging by his articles, it is likely he is planning to, or has published some sort of work on *Sinmiyangyo*.

first deck of the museum grounds. The Museum has a virtual tour on its website, with a short audio narrative of what it describes as the "Salee River conflict," and a single image showing an American flag, three cannon and a mural of a red-caped marine charging forward towards what could be presumed to be a Korean fort.[290] The narrative text to the audio is also available which describes the Korea expedition starting at the Battle of Ganghwa: "Korean gunners opened fire from coastal forts near the Yellow Sea when Admiral John Rodgers' five U.S. warships approached on 31 May 1871 to negotiate a treaty of friendly commerce. Rodgers, receiving no apology for the armed reception, launched a seaborne assault."[291] The narrative ends with a look to future noting that "U.S. Marines would return to these same narrow channels and mudflats 79 years later to seize the port of Inchon in the Korean War."[292] Rodgers' expedition is portrayed as innocent in the escalation of force at the Salee River. In fact, there is almost no background given to the reasons for the expedition, and only a very brief description of the Battle of Ganghwa. The Marine Corps is interested only in the past feats of the marines, and not necessarily in the historical context in which they were used by the United States government, and certainly not in the realities of the five-year crisis in Korea.

Unlike the Marine Corps, the United States Navy does not celebrate the American Expedition to Korea as openly. Until 2007 the United States Naval Academy museum housed several looted artifacts from the 1871 expedition, such the *Sujagi* or a series of standards that were stuffed behind another exhibit that were uncovered accidently in cleaning, in 2017.[293] There is, however, no mention of any pieces, or even ship models, from the 1871 expedition on the United

[290] "Global Expeditionary Force, Salee River, Korea," "Tour Detail," *National Museum of the United States Marine Corps*, http://www.virtualusmcmuseum.com/GEF_2.asp.
[291] Ibid.
[292] Ibid.
[293] US Naval Institute Staff, "Korean Battle Flags with Links to Kim Jong Un Found at Naval Academy," *USNI News*, December 15, 2017, https://news.usni.org/2017/12/15/kim_jong_un_flags_usna.

States Naval Academy website. Given the poor maintenance of the Navy's loot from 1871, it is likely that the entire incident has been generally forgotten by the museum staff, though a member of USNA's faculty in the history department, CDR Benjamin "B.J." Armstrong, has written a piece on the expedition, and delivered a lecture on it as well at the academy.[294] Within the National Navy Museum system, which includes the Washington D.C. museum as well as USNA museum and eight other museums, there is not even the slightest mention of the Korea expedition, which is remarkable considering the number of ships and seamen involved in the event.[295]

The Naval Historical foundation *does* include some information related to the 1871 expedition. Published in its entirety on its website, the 1966 pamphlet titled "Marine Amphibious Landing in Korea, 1871," is a short 24-page article detailing the importance of the Battle of Ganghwa in the USMC, as well as a biographical sketch of Captain McLane Tilton, the commander of the marine detachment that landed at Ganghwa. Written by Carolyn A. Tyson with a forward from Marine Corps General Wallace Greene Jr., the pamphlet is an excellent background to the American perspective on the 1871 expedition, using Tilton's personal letters, the official report to the Secretary of the Navy, and newspapers as sources.[296] The purpose of the publication of the pamphlet was to show "an early example of the proficiency of the Marine Corps in Amphibious operation, and the close cooperation that has always prevailed in such operations."[297] This pamphlet is somewhere in between an academic article and an amateur biographical piece,

[294] BJ Armstrong's lecture straddles the line between public and academic history. The period is not his main area of expertise, though he does teach a course involving 19th century American Naval history. "Shifley Lecture: Korean Expedition 1871," YouTube Video, 42:42, "USNA Museum," March 14, 2018, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XRdGivtc-8M.

[295] There is no advertised exhibits which would indicate the inclusion of the 1871 Korea expedition, or for that matter anything between 1865-1898. Full list of U.S. Navy-approved Museums can be found here: https://www.history.navy.mil/content/history/museums/nmusn/navy-museums.html

[296] Carolyn A. Tyson, "Marine Amphibious Landing in Korea, 1871," *Naval Historical Foundation* 5, (January 1, 1966): 1-24, https://www.navyhistory.org/marine-amphibious-landing-in-korea-1871/.

[297] Tyson, "Landing in Korea," frontmatter.

but its importance to the Naval Historical Foundation was great enough that it was digitized for mass consumption. Associated directly with the National Museum to the U.S. Navy in D.C., the Naval Historical Foundation is one of two organizations, the other being the USNA, that have *any* reference or any effort to preserve the memory of the Korea expedition of 1871. That task was accomplished best by the Marine Corps, yet the event is still a clear footnote in the branch's history.

Popular Blogs, Pop History

Irregular sources of memory of the events from 1866 to 1871 create a sort of patchwork of gap-filling that the official military museums leave out. Most of these Blogs and skewed Pop History sites take similar liberties as the Marine Corps in selecting which facts of the events are used in creating a narrative, but there is no doubt that the military memory of the Korea expedition has been preserved, at least among a niche community of military history enthusiasts.

The first of these is perhaps the most credible, as it is the Blogspot of the Hampton Roads Naval Museum, which is part of the U.S. Navy's national museum system. The post is a plainly written and informative essay split into two parts, detailing the background to the expedition, followed by a shorter description of the Battle of Ganghwa.[298] The center of the essay is the U.S.S. *Colorado*, Admiral Rodgers' flagship, around which the author builds the story of the expedition. Nothing contradictory to the narratives that the Marine Corps subscribes to is found in this essay, but a new term shows up for the Korea expedition: the "Weekend War."[299] While it is certain that the information that is conveyed in this essay is likely sourced from the official reports to the Secretary of the Navy, the term "Weekend War" is not found in any documents or early histories that chronicled these events. It is uncertain were the author of this blog found its usage, though the

[298] Elijah Palmer, "USS Colorado and the Korean Expedition of 1871," *Hampton Roads Naval Museum*, May 27, 2014, http://hamptonroadsnavalmuseum.blogspot.com/search/label/Korean%20Expedition%20of%201871.
[299] Elijah Palmer, "USS Colorado and the Korean Expedition of 1871," *Hampton Roads Naval Museum*, May 23, 2014, http://hamptonroadsnavalmuseum.blogspot.com/search/label/Korean%20Expedition%20of%201871.

author claims that "[w]ith *Colorado's* steam launches leading the way, the men left the fleet and headed towards Ganghwa Island in what would later be called the 'Weekend War.'"[300]

Writing for the "National Security Insider" magazine "War on the Rocks," BJ Armstrong published "The United States and Korea: Rediscovering Artifacts of the Naval Past," which is essentially the script to the lecture he gave at the USNA, with some adjustments. The most important aspect of this article is the final section titled "Memories and Rediscovery," where Armstrong addresses the gap in American memory concerning the Korea expedition of 1871.[301] Armstrong notes that the "Korean expedition is still mentioned in the curriculum taught to midshipmen at the Naval Academy. But it is just a small moment in the narrative of expansionism and the foreign relations of the United States at the end of the 19th century." He continues noting that "[d]espite its minor role in their studies, midshipmen stream into Mahan Hall between their classes to see the captured banners and weapons. Together with their professors [(likely including Armstrong)], they admired the incredibly preserved colors and imagery, decorative feathers and markings, and surprisingly good condition of the materials. The events on the Korean peninsula do not seem quite so long ago."[302] According to Armstrong, the memory of the Korea expedition is reinforced through the curriculum at the USNA, though given the poor treatment those "decorative feathers and markings" received at the USNA museum, it is unclear how *true* Professor Armstrong's sentiments are.[303] Armstrong concludes by placing the blame on the abstraction of information thanks to the "digital age," positing that in "our contemporary digital world,

[300] Ibid. There is no evidence that the Korea expedition was ever called the "Weekend War," as the term "weekend" was not popularized until the end of the nineteenth century at the earliest.
[301] BJ Armstrong, "The United States and Korea: Rediscovering Artifacts of the Naval Past," *War on the Rocks*, January 17, 2018.
[302] BJ Armstrong, "The United States and Korea: Rediscovering Artifacts of the Naval Past," *War on the Rocks*, January 17, 2018.
[303] US Naval Institute Staff, "Korean Battle Flags with Links to Kim Jong Un Found at Naval Academy," *USNI News*, December 15, 2017, https://news.usni.org/2017/12/15/kim_jong_un_flags_usna.

sometimes we forget that the American relationship with the Korean peninsula has been made through a century and a half of history."[304] While the intent of Dr. Armstrong is to educate future naval officers and he thus presents the 1871 expedition through the eyes of the Navy for its tactical and technical value, he is the first American academic to recognize the dearth of memorialization around the expedition in the United States.

In the *National Interest*, another national security/military blog-magazine, an article titled "The Forgotten Korean War you Might not Find in the History Books: and American was involved," is essentially an informative article documenting the 1871 Korea expedition for the readers of the *National Interest*. It takes a relatively sympathetic tone to Joseon, placing the blame for the escalation of the conflict on Frederick Low, as "Low's own records show the attack on the Ganghwa fort[s] was motivated by a desire to demonstrate American power over what he considered to be a weaker nation, rather than out of any reasonable expectation that it would achieve the political objectives of his mission."[305] The author, Roblin, also critiques the consequences of the expedition noting that the "Korean campaign showed the United States adopting many of the most reprehensible aspects of nineteenth-century Western Imperialism."[306] Roblin presents one of the strongest critiques of the Korea expedition in the greater memory of the event, outside of academia. Even within academia, few scholars have incorporated the Korea expedition into the narrative of the expansion of American Empire, as it is normally treated as a discrete event within the opening period of Korea. All the more interesting is the location of this piece, the *National Interest*, a well-known conservative magazine founded by Irving Kristol, one

[304] Armstrong, "The United States and Korea."
[305] Sébastien Roblin, "The Forgotten Korean War You Might Not Find in the History Books," *National Interest*, September 16, 2017.
[306] Sébastien Roblin, "The Forgotten Korean War You Might Not Find in the History Books," *National Interest*, September 16, 2017.

of the "godfathers of Neoconservatism" surely the last place one would expect to find a direct critique of American interventions in other nations. It is not implausible that Roblin "snuck in" the critique at the end of his article, unbeknownst to the editors at the *National Interest*.

The *Council on Foreign Relations* blog "The Water's Edge," featured an article about the "memory" of the Korea expedition of 1871. Authored by the owner of the blog and senior vice president of the *CFR*, James M. Lindsay, the article titled "TWE [The Water's Edge] Remembers: The Korean Expedition and the Battle of Ganghwa (Shinmiyangyo)," is an editorial relating the Korea expedition to the current positive relationship between the United States and South Korea.[307] It is plainly written and easily accessible, as Lindsay assuredly hoped to connect the Korea expedition to the friendly relations the United States and South Korea enjoy in the present, in a similar narrative to South Korean papers from two decades before. Lindsay states that "[s]ometimes good relationships get off to a bad start. The United States and South Korea are a case in point."[308] The blog takes a neutral tone, beginning the narration with the Korea expedition, with only slight reference to the *General Sherman*. Lindsay provides only general descriptions of the Korea expedition, and does not provide connections between the *General Sherman*, the expedition, and the Treaty of 1882; he is more concerned with a factoid-esque "did you know" style of writing on the subject. He does end his blog with an interesting quote from the historian-turned op-ed advocate for interventionism Robert Kagan, noting that the "1882 treaty established 'permanent relations of amity and friendship' between the peoples of Korea and the United States. That amity with South Korea continues to this day. But most Americans don't know that, as the historian Robert Kagan put it, 'the self-proclaimed disinterested and peace-loving Americans had

[307] James M. Lindsay, "TWE Remembers: The Korean Expedition of 1871 and the Battle of Ganghwa (Shinmiyangyo)," *Council on Foreign Relations,* June 10, 2013.
[308] Ibid.

introduced themselves to Korea by killing its people.'"[309] What was selectively "remembered" in this case glosses over the gap in that "amity" between 1905 and 1945, as well as any deeper analysis of *why* the expedition ended in battle.[310]

An article published on *HistoryNet*, a website that is part of the large amateur military history enthusiast consortium the World History Group, titled "Waking the Hermit," details the Korea expedition of 1871 in a day-by-day narrative, nearly akin to the official reports given to the Secretary of the Navy. The article is concerned with placing the expedition within the context of expanding western powers in the latter half of the nineteenth-century, and even makes a case for its "rediscovery" amongst historians, arguing that while "largely dismissed by modern historians[…], the 1871 battle [of Ganghwa] foreshadowed current concepts of global force projection, particularly by means of amphibious warfare."[311] This argument is strikingly similar to the Marine Corps' purpose for memorializing the expedition, if not identical as Callo also sees the expedition as a "foreshadowing" the Korean War of 1950 to 1953, much like the Marine Corps museum exhibit. Callo ends his general retelling of the Korea expedition with a look to the future, positing that the "question remains whether they can meet future challenges with any measure of the unity they once shared as a kingdom."[312] With this interesting closing , Callo expresses his doubts that a divided Korea can withstand foreign intervention again, although the period of wonton invasion has essentially ended in East Asia, Callo keeps the core themes of his article on

[309] James M. Lindsay, "TWE Remembers: The Korean Expedition of 1871 and the Battle of Ganghwa (Shinmiyangyo)," *Council on Foreign Relations*, June 10, 2013.
[310] In 1905 Theodore Roosevelt washed the United States of any responsibility for the protection of Korea that was laid out in the 1882 treaty, essentially handing the Korean Empire over to Japan in exchange for Japanese non-aggression towards the Philippines. Korea was a colony of Japan, and later incorporated into the core of the Japanese Empire from roughly 1905 to 1945, when diplomatic relations between an independent Korean state and the United States resumed.
[311] Joseph F. Callo, "Waking the Hermit," *HistoryNet*, July 2019.
[312] Joseph F. Callo, "Waking the Hermit," *HistoryNet*, July 2019.

national security and intervention, perhaps the most exciting topics for the amateur military historian.

The common trend among American memory of the five-year crisis is specifically militaristic and presentist in nature. The events from 1866 to 1871 are prioritized at the back end, with the Korea expedition of 1871 being the most commonly "remembered" piece of that period. The scant museum exposure is compensated by a plethora of national security and military history blogs that use the Korea expedition as a benchmark in American foreign policy or in military tactics, with few, such as the Roblin article, taking a critical stance on the expansion of American empire. This study suggests that the *General Sherman* and the events leading to the American expedition to Korea have been largely forgotten in a civilian context, being nearly completely memorialized as storied and obscure battle in the long "glorious" history of the United States military. There is however, one American that bridged the gap between the American military's remembrance of its past and Korean views of the five-year crisis: Thomas Duvernay.

Thomas Duvernay

Currently a Professor in Basic Studies at Yeungnam University in Gyeongsan, South Korea, Thomas Duvernay is best known in Korea as a serious hobbyist and ardent advocate for traditional Korean archery. On that subject he has written a book and maintains an extensive website with links to numerous resources for its study and propagation to the United States.[313] A man of many interests, Duvernay is also quite passionate about the American expedition to Korea in 1871, having written two articles and supposedly a book on the subject.[314] Most importantly, he is one

[313] Thomas Duvernay, "KOREAN TRADITIONAL ARCHERY," http://www.koreanarchery.org/classic/.
[314] Duvernay is not the only American to write about *Sinmiyangyo* in an amateur capacity. C. Douglas Sterner wrote a short work on the Korea expedition, though this work is essentially an overview of the event. See C. Douglas Sterner, *Shinmiyangyo-The Other Korean War* (CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2018).

of the persons responsible for returning Eo Jae-yeon's *Sujagi* back to South Korea from its place in Mahan Hall among other looted spoils of war at the USNA museum.

Duvernay's first article concerns the firearms used during the *Sinmiyangyo*, and is a comparison between American and Joseon weaponry. A plainly written and quite short piece, Duvernay primarily uses Admiral Rodgers' report to the Secretary of the Navy to document what sorts of firearms were used by the Koreans and the Americans, with some supported secondary source material, namely American Civil War firearm histories.[315] Duvernay makes the case that the American and Korean forces were equally matched in all but their firearms technology, which proved to be decisive in deciding the outcome of the Battle of Ganghwa. Duvernay also shows where firearms technology rests in the present in South Korea, briefly mentioning the firearms manufacturer Daewoo in an attempt to show the drastic change in military technology that South Korea achieved in a century.[316]

His second article on the *Sinmiyangyo* is significantly longer, but is extremely specific it what it intends to do. Duvernay attempted to map out the exact route that the American troops used in the Battle of Ganghwa, based on the order of battle found in the official report to the Secretary of the Navy, surviving photographs of the environment, terrain maps of Ganghwa island, and GPS and metal detector surveys of the likely locations that Duvernay ascertained.[317] Duvernay done two field surveys of Ganghwa island before the publication of this article, one in 1999 and another in 2001. His third survey was conducted in 2010.[318] Duvernay recovered numerous artifacts from these surveys, such as shell fragments and shell casings still in the ground

[315] Thomas Duvernay, "A Comparison of Firearms Used in the Shinmiyangyo," *Minjok Munhwa Nonch'ong* 44, (April 2010): 255-274.
[316] Ibid., 272.
[317] Thomas Duvernay, "Field Survey of the United States 1871 Line of March in Korea," *Minjok Munhwa Nonch'ong* 48, (2011), 485-521.
[318] Ibid., 488.

where he had deduced the line of battle had marched and exchanged fire. In total, he conducted six field surveys by the writing of this article.[319] Duvernay successfully mapped the battlefield, and in his conclusion, argued for its preservation as it was in the process of being developed in commercial or residential space, advocating for a comprehensive survey to be conducted to better preserve the site.[320]

His passion for history as well as battlefield archeology is more than apparent in these articles, as Duvernay has devoted a significant amount of his free time to create a battlefield restoration project for the *Sinmiyangyo*. There may be no one in South Korea more passionate than Duvernay on this subject, considering his central position in returning the *Sujagi*. Duvernay was the primary advocate for its return to South Korea, remarking to the *Korea Herald* that at its exhibit in the USNA museum that '"[e]xcept for a small card, you would not have known what it was,'[…] the museum's exhibits grew and [its] space diminished, the flag was eventually rolled up and placed on the bottom shelf of a display case."[321] Duvernay succeeded in have the *Sujagi* returned in 2007, but claimed that only '"when the Koreans fully understand the meaning of the Sujagi will the flag return permanently.'"[322] Duvernay found a way around the U.S. Navy's own rules, as the *Baltimore Sun* noted that "[i]nitially, it wasn't clear that the flag could be returned because of U.S. laws ordering that 'colors' taken in battle from adversaries be displayed at the Naval Academy [….] Returning it on a loan [was] a way to circumvent those rules[.]"[323] It is likely that Duvernay himself was overemphasizing the importance of the *Sujagi* to the South Koreans, comparing it to the Liberty Bell in its supposed historical significance. Yet Duvernay

[319] Ibid., 498-513.
[320] Ibid., 515.
[321] Jurie Hwang, "American Campaigns for flag's return," *The Korea Herald,* October 29, 2010.
[322] Ibid.
[323] Bradley Olson, "Korean flag to be returned on loan basis," *Baltimore Sun,* October 11, 2007.

was absolutely right in stating that the flag would be properly cared for and displayed in a proper exhibit, as South Korean museums on Ganghwa and in Seoul have made space to display it. As of the time of this study, over a decade since the return of the *Sujagi*, the flag has certainly earned its keep within the collective memory of South Korea.

Thomas Duvernay has essentially "saved" Korean artifacts from American museums, while simultaneously working to preserve the battlefield where the Battle of Ganghwa took place. Of all the Americans who keep the memory of the *Sinmiyangyo* alive, it is likely Duvernay is the most active of them. Not concerned with framing the expedition within a presentist foreign policy, military narrative, Duvernay has worked to preserve the physical remains of this significant event, to remind the world just how significant this "little war" actually was.

Conclusion

The American memory of these five tumultuous years of first state-to-state interaction between the United States and Korea is heavily weighted towards a very specific type of memory. The United States military, in particular the Marine Corps and the Navy, have a virtual monopoly on the physical reminders of the period from 1866 to 1871, which heavily leans on 1871. Little mention of the *General Sherman* incident, or the voyages of the *Wachusett* and *Shenandoah* appear in exhibits and museum blogs in the United States. Beyond the museums, where the artifacts that remain appear to be egregiously neglected, the memory of *Sinmiyangyo* and the events leading to it seem to only interest national security and military history magazines. The events of the five-year crisis do not appear in an entertaining format in any visual media, and the accounts that recounted are generally one-sided, positive pieces on the heroics of the American military.

Only the work of Thomas Duvernay, who is as much a Korean recounter as an American one, attempts to save the physical memory of the five-year crisis from neglect and destruction at the hands of a rapidly forgetful American collective memory. For a series of events that

culminated in an American war five thousand miles from the continental coast which captivated the American press for five years, it is remarkable how quickly the American memory filtered those events out. Overshadowed by larger and technically successful interventions and war of conquest, the first American Korean War became overlaid by its far more famous mid-twentieth century counterpart; wars that were nearly a century apart. While the Korean Peninsula remembers, the United States has compartmentalized its early international imperial ventures into the more obscure corners of its collective memory.

CONCLUSION

The discrepancy in memory of *Sinmiyangyo* and the events that led to it between the United States and Korea form the underlying question to the main argument of this thesis, that being *why* these events are remembered so differently. This is a difficult question to reckon with, but one with a few likely answers that this project illuminates throughout its course. First, , in the United States, the *General Sherman* Incident and the subsequent political fumbling of an ill-prepared federal government that led to the Korea expedition were quickly overshadowed by both domestic issues, such as the breakdown of American Reconstruction, and the subsequent forging of a treaty with Korea by Robert Shufeldt in 1882. This overshadowing compounded over time, as the American empire expanded its influence in Latin America and, of course, in the twentieth century participated in the Korean War. Because of that overshadowing, only American military branches directly associated with the expedition continued to memorialize it in any meaningful way, as Chapter 3 shows.

As for Korea, the simplest answer for why the five-year crisis continues to captivate Koreans in our present, is that the events occurred in Korea, and materially affected Koreans in far more substantial ways than in the United States. The politicization of *Sinmiyangyo* and the *Sherman* by the North Korean state should not be too surprising, as North Korea relies on propaganda against its enemies, especially when it can incorporate the Kim line into the collective memory of struggle against those enemies. In South Korea, the more diverse usage of the events from 1866 to 1871 speaks to a diverse media, with television shows, docudramas, op-eds and book reviews surely illustrate.

In chapter one, it was clear that the American press frequently reported on what was happening in Korea, while also providing ample editorials for correspondents to speculate to the

American public as to what was happening in East Asia. All over the country and in some of the smallest communities coverage of the *General Sherman*, French Expedition and the American expedition of 1871 was easily accessible. It is not unlikely that the American public had not only a concern for what was happening in Korea, but also an appetite for more news concerning the peninsula. While the reported news was often inaccurate, as shown with the timeline of events laid out in chapter one, what is more important is that reporting was occurring, occurring frequently, and rumor and speculation were absolutely publishable to the American public. That fact alone points to an increased consumption for news concerning Korea.

Chapter two shows that North and South Korea have entirely different memorial prerogatives. In North Korea, the *General Sherman* takes center stage. The event happened in view of present-day Pyongyang, and was the first time Koreans, whether those be an "unauthorized mob" or Bak Gyu-su, attacked an American ship and killed American nationals. The propaganda value of that alone is not sufficient, however. The North Korean government must also tie the destruction of the *General Sherman* to the great-grandfather of Kim Il-sung, Kim Eung-woo. By legitimizing the Kim family a group of multi-dynastic patriots always concerned with destroyed American imperialism, the *General Sherman* becomes a sacred event in North Korea. It is the starting point of Korea's anti-imperialist struggle.

In South Korea, no single event takes the prize of attention, but there is not one way of remembering the five-year crisis. In the papers, talk of the *Sinmiyangyo* or the French expedition of 1866 or the *General Sherman* take on different roles. Whether as a setting in a fictional serial about Queen Min, an editorial on how far American-Korean relations have come, or on how coverage of the five-year crisis by western missionaries mirrored their thoughts on the Taiping Rebellion; the papers *are* remembering these events in unique contexts. Visual media is a bit less

diverse, but is doing just the same. While the so-called *Daehadrama*s frequently use the French and American expeditions as backdrops to telling personal stories about fictional or fictionalized characters, there is a concerted effort to accurately portray them, even for entertaining purposes. Historical accuracy down to the minutia is downplayed, but historical accuracy in the larger sense of these K-dramas is still a concern for the directors and producers of these programs. With the popularity of "Mr. Sunshine" upon its release, it is likely now more than ever that South Koreans know about the *Sinmiyangyo*. South Korean museums in Seoul and on Ganghwa island have also made a concerted effort to place the five-year crisis into the context of the larger opening period in Korean history. As the twenty-first century progressed to the present, South Korean museums received artifacts from the United States and France on a permanent loan basis, creating a need for new and accessible exhibits to tell the story of western designs on Korea in the second half of the nineteenth century. South Koreans definitely remember 1866 to 1871 in the collective sense, which is far more than what can be said in the United States. It should be noted, however, that South Korea also has a national biography to maintain in its conveyance of the five-year crisis in its media and museums. Queen Min is viewed as a modernizer open to the ideas and technologies of the westerners and Japanese, unlike the conservative and isolationist Daewongun. This perception of Queen Min plays into the larger narrative of South Korea as the once backward nation that embraced western technology to become one the wealthiest nations on earth. The Joseon state is viewed as backward and anti-modern in South Korea, which is reflected in its media representations such as those found in *Mr. Sunshine*. This is why Queen Min is the "favored" figure in the South Korean national myth, instead of the anti-western Daewongun. This ideological bent in the South Korean national narrative is the mainstream interpretation of the five-year crisis that the western world relays in its institutions as well.

Chapter 3 showed that the United States is a virtual desert in the memory of the five-year crisis. Even the museum at the United States Naval Academy *heavily* neglected its pieces looted during the Korea expedition, so much so that it was more than willing to give them back to South Korea at the insistence of expedition advocate Thomas Duvernay. There is a monopoly on memory in the United States, with nearly critique-less national security magazine articles and military history websites serving as the main transmitters of knowledge and memory of American-Korean interactions before 1882. There is a political bent in the United States that is similar to the North Korean line. In the U.S., militarist conservatives have almost complete control of the narrative of early American imperial ventures, as the main magazines and authors of publications have that overt political leaning. All of the museums are military museum *run* by the military, which generally whitewashes the mistakes made by the United States that ended in the Battle of Ganghwa; glory to the Marine Corps takes precedence over the question of *why* the marines were in Korea to begin with. Thomas Duvernay may be the only light in American memory of the five-year crisis, as his dedication to preserving the battlefield on Ganghwa island and consistently advocating for the return of looted Korean cultural and military items more than shows.

The question remains as to why the American public would have so much interest in Korea in 1866 to 1871, but that in the present there is almost no interest in that time period by Americans interested in American nineteenth century history. I speculate the chief reason is the overshadowing of the events by the American Civil War on one end, and the end of Reconstruction and the beginning of the Gilded Age on the other. While interest in North and South Korea as nations and cultures has never been stronger today, the memory of those beginnings has been lost in the national narrative. Now, 1882 or more accurately 1945 is the year that "Korea" enters the American collective memory. Perhaps even 1950 is that start date. The American public may

forget about the nineteenth century altogether, but the true shame here lies with the museums of the United States, which never mention the transnational interaction Korea and the United States had in 1866 to 1871, or so grossly neglect the artifacts and the narrative itself as to forget its essence.

Future research directions that this project has uncovered are quite numerous. In "Mr. Sunshine" and in "Empress Myeongseong," K-Dramas from 2018 and 2001 respectively, Black American marines are shown in the dramatizations. While I have found no record of an integrated Marine Corps prior to the *de jure* segregation caused by the 1893 Supreme Court case *Plessy v. Ferguson*, it is a central plot point in "Mr. Sunshine", as it is the main character's motivation to join the Marine Corps to become an American citizen.[324] This could mean two things. The first is the most likely; that the producers of these K-Dramas included Black American actors in their cast as there are Black Americans in the United States, not aware of the potential anachronism. The second possibility would require further research, that there *were* Black marines in Korea at the Battle of Ganghwa. If the American records did not show this, then the existence of a story or record from Korea of Black marines could be something to pursue, as this would challenge our current understandings of race and empire in a pan-oceanic United States expansion.

Another direction is the reassessment of American Empire. While this has been done in the diplomatic and military contexts, there has been little work on the expansion of the definition of imperialism. The *General Sherman* and the numerous attempts by Ernst Oppert to open Korea were *private* ventures, financed by firms, not states. The role of private companies in financing the destabilization of nation-states and the exploitation of their resources is seldom covered outside of the massive semi-private imperial venture of the 17th and 18th centuries. Korea could serve as

[324] See *Mr. Sunshine*, "Episode 1," Episode number 1, Directed by Eung-bok Lee, Written by Eun-sook Kim, tvN, July 7 2018.

a geographical case study in the role of the firm in destroying the national sovereignty of a state, should one pursue that direction.

The United States and Korea have had a long relationship, broken only on an "official" basis by the Japanese colonial period (1910 to 1945). The memory and memorialization of that long relationship, both at the national, diplomatic level and the personal level, is something that should be cultivated if Americans and Koreans wish to pursue closer, transnational ties. Understanding the origins of American empire, and the origins of the *end* of an isolated Korea, will help both nations to better understand how their relationships could change in the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A Note on the Newspapers:

The Korean and American newspapers found in this study come from a variety of online sources. In lieu of indicating the origin of the paper on each reference, an abbreviation found after the reference in parenthesis indicates its origin as follows:

(LOC)—Library of Congress archive

(NAV)—NAVER online newspaper archive

(GAL)—GALE primary sources, Nineteenth Century Newspapers

(TIM)—TimesMachine New York Times online archive

(KCNA)—KCNA Watch newspaper archive

Visual Media

"1866~68: 서양 열강의 출몰." YouTube Video, 2:56. "Patterson R." November 23, 2019, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o9podl0-4qE.

"찬란하 여명." YouTube video, 1:13. "jpdoumeyrou." June 29, 2014, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wJKhavPt5fw.

"찬란하 여명." YouTube Channel, "김성태." Last updated June 14, 2017, https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PL3R2AkW9Hu51q5y2dfXDvz0WJNwn6285q.

Mr. Sunshine. "Episode 1." Episode number 1. Directed by Eung-bok Lee. Written by Eun-sook Kim. tvN. July 7, 2018.

"신미양요." YouTube Video, 18:57. "김규보." November 21, 2017, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XfUDKa9m1p0.

"Shifley Lecture: Korean Expedition 1871." YouTube Video, 42:42. "USNA Museum." March 14, 2018, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XRdGivtc-8M.

Online Blogs and Magazines

Armstrong, BJ. "The United States and Korea: Rediscovering Artifacts of the Naval Past," *War on the Rocks*, January 17, 2018.

Callo, Joseph F. "Waking the Hermit," *HistoryNet*, July 2019.

Lindsay, James M. "TWE Remembers: The Korean Expedition of 1871 and the Battle of Ganghwa (Shinmiyangyo)," *Council on Foreign Relations*, June 10, 2013.

Palmer, Elijah. "USS Colorado and the Korean Expedition of 1871," *Hampton Roads Naval Museum*, May 23, 2014, http://hamptonroadsnavalmuseum.blogspot.com/search/label/Korean%20Expedition%20of%201871.

Palmer, Elijah. "USS Colorado and the Korean Expedition of 1871," *Hampton Roads Naval Museum*, May 27, 2014, http://hamptonroadsnavalmuseum.blogspot.com/search/label/Korean%20Expedition%20of%201871.

Roblin, Sébastien. "The Forgotten Korean War You Might Not Find in the History Books," *National Interest*, September 16, 2017.

Museums

"1 층 전시실, 전시." *Ganghwa History Museum*, https://www.ganghwa.go.kr/open_content/museum_history/display/permanent/exhibition_f1.jsp.

"Global Expeditionary Force, Salee River, Korea—Tour Detail." *National Museum of the United States Marine Corps*, http://www.virtualusmcmuseum.com/GEF_2.asp.

"전시실 소개, 전시안내." *Ganghwa War Museum*, https://www.ganghwa.go.kr/open_content/museum_war/display/permanent/exhibition_f2.jsp.

"Korean Empire." *National Palace Museum of Korea*, https://www.gogung.go.kr/perm.do?pLng=en&viewName=perm05.

"The Korea War Room 1." *The War Memorial of Korea*, https://www.warmemo.or.kr/LNG/exhibition/exhibit.do.

'"Port Opening' Period, The War History Room." *The War Memorial of Korea*, https://www.warmemo.or.kr/LNG/exhibition/exhibit.do.

Newspapers

Baltimore Sun, 2007.

Boston Daily Advertiser, 1866, 1867, 1871. (GAL)

The Charleston Daily News, 1866. (LOC)

Chicago Tribune, 1866,1867, 1871. (LOC)

The Daily Cleveland Herald, 1868. (GAL)

Daily Davenport Democrat, 1866. (LOC)

Daily Gate City, 1867. (LOC)

The Daily Phoenix, 1866. (LOC)

Dong-A Ilbo, 1981, 1994, 1995. (NAV)

The Emporia News, 1870. (LOC)

The Evansville Journal, 1866, 1867. (LOC)

Hankyoreh, 1988. (NAV)

The Hawaiian Gazette, 1868. (GAL)

The Korea Herald, 2010, 2018.

The Korea Times, 2007, 2018.

Kyunghyang Sinmun, 1966, 1982, 1986, 1991. (NAV)

Lowell Daily Citizen, 1867. (GAL)

Mae-il Gyeonje, 1994, 1999. (NAV)

Marshall County Republican,1871. (LOC)

Morning Star and Catholic Messenger, 1871. (LOC)

Naenara (En),2017. (KCNA)

National Intelligencer, 1866. (GAL)

New Orleans Republican, 1871. (LOC)

The New Yorker, 2003.

New-York Daily Tribune, 1866, 1871. (LOC)

New York Herald, 1866, 1867, 1871. (LOC)

The New York Times, 1866 1867, 1868, 1871. (TIM)

The North American and United States Gazette, 1866. (GAL)

Ottawa Free Trader, 1871. (LOC)

Raftsman's Journal, 1866. (LOC)

Rodong Sinmun (En), 2016. (KCNA)

Rodong Sinmun (Kr), 2016, 2017, 2018. (KCNA)

SportsQ, 2018.

The Sun, 1867. (LOC)

Tennessee Staatszeitung, 1866. (LOC)

Uriminzokkiri, 2015. (KCNA)

USNI News, 2017, https://news.usni.org/2017/12/15/kim_jong_un_flags_usna.

Weekly Ottumwa Courier, 1871. (LOC)

Weekly Trinity Journal, 1871. (LOC)

Yonhap News, 1995.

Articles

Ames, William. "The National Intelligencer: Washington's Leading Political Newspaper." *Records of the Columbia Historical Society, Washington, D.C.* 66/68 (1966): 71-83.

Duvernay, Thomas. “A Comparison of Firearms Used in the Shinmiyangyo.” *Minjok Munhwa Nonch’ong* 44, (April 2010): 255-274.

Duvernay, Thomas. “Field Survey of the United States 1871 Line of March in Korea.” *Minjok Munhwa Nonch’ong* 48, (2011), 485-521.

Chang, Gordon H. "Whose "Barbarism"? Whose "Treachery"? Race and Civilization in the Unknown United States-Korea War of 1871." *Journal of American History* 89, no. 4 (2003): 1331-1365.

Jin, Sang-pil. "The Port Hamilton (Geomundo) Incident (1885-1887): Retracing Another Great Game in Eurasia." *The International History Review* 41, no. 2 (2019): 280-303.

Kim, Myong-ho 김명호. “Gaeneoreol Syeomeon-ho sageongwa Bak Gyo-su” 제너럴셔먼호 사건과 박규수 [Bak Gyo-su and the General Sherman Incident]. *Daedong Munhwa Yeongu 대동문화연구* 42, (2003): 309.

Kim, Nam-hyun 김남윤, and Hong Jong-kyu 홍종규. “19 Saegi (1810-1871) Miguk Nyuyok Eonroneul Tonghae bon Joseonwae Imiji 19 세기(1810~1871) 미국 뉴욕 언론을 통해 본 조선의 이미지 [Images of Joseon in the 19th Century (1810-1871) through New York Media in the U.S.]. *Gangwon Sahak 강원사학* 31 (2018): 137.

Moreno, Gary. "Rage Against the Monarchy: American Reaction to French Intervention in Mexico." *Journal of the West* 47, no. 3 (2008): 48-55.

Murray, Ian. “Seward’s True Folly: American Diplomacy and Strategy During ‘Our Little War with the Heathens,’ Korea, 1871.” *Penn History Review* 18, no.2 (Spring 2011): 43-68.

Nahm, Andrew and Albert Castel. “Our Little War with the Heathen.” *American Heritage* 19, no. 3 (1968).

Paullin, Charles Oscar. "The Opening of Korea by Commodore Shufeldt." *Political Science Quarterly* 25, no. 3 (1910).

“Pyeongan Gamsa-ga Pyeongyang Baekseongdeuri Seoyangbaereul Bulsareugo Yeongguk Saram Choenanheoneul Jugyeotdago Bogohada” 평안 감사가 평양 백성들이 서양배를 불사르고 영국 사람 최난헌을 죽였다고 보고하다 [An Inspector General of Peace Reports that the People of Pyongyang Burned Western Boats and Killed British Choi Nan-heon]. *Gojong Sillok* 3. Gojong year 3 July 27, no. 1, 1866.

Tyson, Carolyn A. “Marine Amphibious Landing in Korea, 1871.” *Naval Historical Foundation* 5, (January 1, 1966): 1-24. https://www.navyhistory.org/marine-amphibious-landing-in-korea-1871/.

Books and Theses

Allen, Horace N. *A Chronological Index: Some of the Chief Events in the Foreign Intercourse of Korea*. Seoul: Methodist Publishing House, 1901.

Bedeski, Robert E. *The Transformation of South Korea: Reform and Reconstitution in the Sixth Republic under Roh Tae Woo, 1987-1992*. London; New York: Routledge, 1994.

Boot, Max. *The Savage Wars of Peace: Small Wars and the Rise of American Power*. Basic Books, 2002.

Burrows, Edwin G., and Mike Wallace. *Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Choe, Young Ching. *The Rule of the Daewongun, 1864-1873: Restoration in Yi Korea.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Davidson, James. *The Island of Formosa, Past and Present. History, People, Resources, and Commercial Prospects. Tea, Camphor, Sugar, Gold, Coal, Sulphur, Economical Plants, and other Productions*. London and New York: Macmillan & co., 1903.

Dennett, Tyler. *Americans in Eastern Asia: a Critical Study of the Policy of the United States with Reference to China, Japan and Korea in the 19th Century*. Macmillan, 1922.

Dijk, Van C. *Pacific Strife: The Great Powers and Their Political and Economic Rivalries in Asia and the Western Pacific 1870-1914*. Amsterdam University Press, 2015.

Duus, Peter. *The Abacus and the Sword, The Japanese Penetration of Korea*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Ebrey, Patricia, and Anne Walthall. *Modern East Asia from 1600: A Cultural, Social and Political History*. Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2014.

Foner, Eric, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877*. New York: Harper & Row, 1988.

George, Douglas Edward. "The Low-Rodgers Expedition: a study in the foundations of U.S. policy in Korea" (MA Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, June 1988).

Griffis, William Elliot. *Corea, The Hermit Nation.* London: W.H. Allen & Co., 1911.

Hulbert, Homer B. *The Passing of Korea*. New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1909.

Hwang, Kyung Moon. *Past Forward: Essays in Korean History*. London: Anthem Press, 2019.

Janney, Caroline. *Burying the Dead, not the Past: Ladies Memorial Associations and the Lost Cause.* Chapel Hill: North Carolina Press, 2008.

Janney, Caroline. *Remembering the Civil War: Reunion and the Limits of Reconstruction*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2013.

Kagan, Robert. *Dangerous Nation*. Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group, 2006.

Kang, Joe woong. *The Korean Struggle for International Identity in the foreground of the Shufeldt Negotiation: 1866-1882*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 2005.

Kim, C.I. Eugene. *Korea and the Politics of Imperialism, 1876-1910*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1967.

Kinsley, Philip. *The Chicago Tribune, Its First Hundred Years*, Vol. 2, *1865-1880*. New York: A.A. Knopf, 1945.

Lim, Sungyun. *Rules of the House*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2019.

Mansfield, Mike. "American Diplomatic Relations with Korea (1866-1910)" (MA Thesis, University of Montana, 1934).

Mo, Jongryn and Ramon Hawley Myers et. al. *Shaping a New Economic Relationship: The Republic of Korea and the United States*. Hoover Institution Press Publication; 417. Stanford, Calif.: Hoover Institution Press, Stanford University, 1993.

Osgood, Robert V. *From King Cane to the Last Sugar Mill : Agricultural Technology and the Making of Hawaii's Premier Crop*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2015.

Paullin, Charles Oscar. *Diplomatic Negotiations of American Naval Officers: 1778-1883.* Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press, 1912.

Reports of the Secretary of the Navy and of the Postmaster General. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1871.

Risley, Ford. *Civil War Journalism*. Westport: ABC-CLIO, LLC, 2012.

Sterner, C. Douglas. *Shinmiyangyo- The Other Korean War*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform, 2018.