

**Citizenship and memory in Eastern Europe and
East Asia:
A Comparison**

Proceedings of the 25th International Conference of Europeanists,
Chicago,
28-30 March 2018

Edited by Nobuya Hashimoto

March 2020
Kwansei Gakuin University
Nishinomiya, Japan

Nobuya Hashimoto (ed.)
Citizenship and memory in Eastern Europe and East Asia: A Comparison

Proceedings of the 25th International Conference of Europeanists,
Chicago,
28-30 March 2018

First Published in 2020
Copyright 2020 by the editor and contributors

School of Humanities, Kwansei Gakuin University
1-1-155, Nishinomiya Uegahara, Japan 662-8501
E-mail: history-memory@kwansei.ac.jp

Preface

Nobuya Hashimoto

This publication is the proceedings of a panel titled “Citizenship and Memory in Eastern Europe and East Asia: A Comparison.” It was presented at the 25th International Conference of Europeanists: *Europe and the World: Mobilities, Values & Citizenship*, held from March 28 to 30, 2018, in Chicago, USA. The panel was organized by the international research project, “Interdisciplinary Research on the Function of National Histories and Collective Memories for the Democracy in the Globalized Society [NHCM].”

The NHCM was commissioned and sponsored by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science [JSPS – one of the most influential governmental funding agencies working for the promotion of sciences, including humanities and the social sciences, in Japan] within the framework of its *Topic-Setting Program to Advance Cutting-Edge Humanities and Social Sciences Research, Global Initiatives, 2016-2019*. This program seeks to establish “dialogue and interaction between Japanese and overseas researchers and the generation of globally significant results through the advancement of international joint researches across diverse fields of the humanities and the social sciences and the building of robust international networks.”

When the project started, the JSPS’s Commission for the Promotion of Humanities and Social Sciences assigned us the mission to develop “interdisciplinary research on exclusivism and democracy in the globalized society” (<https://www.jsps.go.jp/english/e-kadai/global/index.html>.) This mission was proposed based on the concerns of commission members about the “diffusion of ethnic, racial, religious cultural exclusivism, and hatred toward the ‘other’ under globalization, and the crises of democracy in the contemporary world.” In fact, according to a member of JSPS’s Commission, the agenda-setting of the program was prompted by the incident of Charlie Hebdo in Paris and its aftermath. This is an indication of the commission’s insight into the intensified crises of contemporary democracy arising from the globalized social and cultural divides.

Tasked with this meaningful but difficult assignment, we began to organize a research group with 21 colleagues from Japan, including mainly historians and some specialists of vernacular studies, political sciences, and theology, and started to align the assignment to the context of history and memory studies. Simultaneously, we invited foreign scholars from Korea, Germany, Poland, the United States, Australia, and Canada as partners and advisers in our project, based on the preceding research projects that we had organized earlier with foreign colleagues. The focal point of the project is based on the following questions:

- How have different histories and memories been constructed within the national framework?
- How have complex past events been mobilized for political or diplomatic use between/within nations?
- What is the mechanism through which histories and memories function as dividing forces and exclude the artificially constructed concept of “others”?
- What is the role and responsibility of history and historians in the face of endangered democracy?

The panel in Chicago was organized to clarify the meanings of citizenship in light of these interests, aiming at a comparison between European and Asian experiences. As the "Introduction" by Professor Hiromi Komori, a chairperson of the panel, explains its object and structure, I do not need to describe them here. Although Professor Constantin Iordachi of the Central European University sent in his excellent paper “Dual Citizenship and (re)Imagined National Communities: In Post-Communist Romania and Hungary” for the panel, and Professor Carol Gluck and Dr. Zuzanna Bogumił referred to his paper in their comments, he could not, unfortunately, contribute his paper to this Proceedings.

The NHCM's aims, activities, and results are presented in detail on its website in five different languages (<http://history-memory.kwansei.ac.jp/en/index.html>). This publication is also an attempt to inform global audiences of the NHCM's activities and to preserve them for further discussion regarding the issue. The NHCM itself has concluded its official activities since the project term, as settled by the JSPS, expired toward the end of 2019, but we hope to

continue and develop international scholarly dialogues and discussions on our theme, which is increasingly gaining significance amid the global crises of democracy, human rights, and mutual tolerance among different nations.

Contents

Preface	iii
<i>Nobuya Hashimoto</i>	
Contents and Contributors	vi
Introduction to panel proceedings	1
<i>Hiromi Komori</i>	
Ideology or racism? The historical origin of immigration control regime in post-war Japan	4
<i>Sara Park</i>	
Memory on the Korean ‘compatriots’ and defining the boundary of the Korean national community	18
<i>Seung-Min Lee</i>	
History, “Christian Nationalism,” and Neoliberal Politics in Hungary	35
<i>Yudai Anegawa</i>	
Comment	
Citizenship and Memory in Eastern Europe and East Asia: A Comparison	43
<i>Carol Gluck</i>	
Citizenship as moral capital in Eastern Europe and East Asia: comment	51
<i>Zuzanna Bogumił</i>	

Contributors

Nobuya Hashimoto	Professor of Kwansei Gakuin University, Japan
Hiromi Komori	Professor of Waseda University, Japan
Sara Park	Lecturer of University of Helsinki, Finland (Associate Professor/Lecturer of Kobe University until January 2020)
Seung-Min Lee	Institute of Asian Studies, Waseda University, Japan
Yudai Anegawa	Assistant Professor of Chiba University, Japan
Carol Gluck	Professor of Columbia University, USA
Zuzanna Bogumił	The Institute of Archaeology and Ethnology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Poland

Introduction to panel proceedings

Hiromi Komori

The Objective of the panel

These proceedings contain papers presented at the panel of the 25th International Conference of Europeanists: Europe and the World: Mobilities, Values & Citizenship, held at Chicago in March 2018. Under the title “Citizenship and Memory in Eastern Europe and East Asia: A Comparison, three papers were presented, which followed by the comments.

One of the foundations of modern nation-states is a sense of belonging, developed on the premise of citizen’s equal membership in a society, and supported by their individual consents. However, changes have been taking place in this premise.

In the age of globalization and international migration, the debate on citizenship in ‘Western’ Europe has diversified, with concepts such as multi-tiered citizenship and ‘light citizenship’ emerging. They focus on the liberal character of the ideas involved, and the changing nature of the role of social integration. Although the liberal citizenship has not been always predominant even in ‘Western’ Europe, especially after the September 11 attack in 2001.

Regarding these changes both in the ideas and in the practices of citizenship, there are commonalities between the former socialist states of ‘Eastern’ Europe and the countries of East Asia. Namely they include the ethnic segregation in a society at home and the tightening of relationships with ‘compatriots’ abroad through dual citizenship. These phenomena in Eastern Europe as well as in East Asia demand us to compare the historical background and the current situation of them.

Especially we examine the relationship between history/memory and citizenship. Taking into consideration factors, such as regime transition and redemarcation of borders, we explore the influences of discrepancies in the sense of national belonging, fellow-feeling and identity politics in a state as well as in international relationship. Hopefully our inquiries would provide useful

perspectives and insights on the acceleration of intolerance, exclusionist attitudes, and crisis of democracy.

Contributors

Our panel consists of 3 papers and 2 discussants, as briefly introduced in the following.

Yudai Anegawa presents the case of Hungary. Currently, the historical narratives that are similar in content to interwar “Christian nationalist” ideas are shared by supporters of the Government of Victor Orbán and the far-right political forces. At the same time, recent Hungarian politics appears as typical European right-wing populism with its racist and anti-European Universalist attitudes. In his paper, Anegawa disentangles the intricate coincidences.

Seung-Min Lee deals with the policies as well as the attitudes in Korean society regarding compatriot/Overseas Koreans. Lee examines the historical origin and development of the Korean Government’s perception toward the overseas Koreans and the Korean nation. Her interests include the influence of historical memory in the processes of legally defining who should be a member of Korean nation.

Sara Park presents the immigration control of the post-war Japanese Government based on the historical documents. Park claims that the immigration control system enjoyed considerable leeway under the certain circumstances in the treatment of immigrants as well as ethnic minorities in post-war Japan.

Originally the fourth paper on dual citizenship in post-communist Romania and Hungary was also included in panel. For the unexpected reason the fourth speaker could not attend the symposium and the paper was just delivered to the audience.

Finally, a few words about insightful comments by the discussants. Zuzanna Bogumił refers to citizenship as a historical compensation for the injustice the ethnic kin experienced outside homeland in the past. As for Carol Gluck points out that the countries of Eastern Europe and East Asia share the freezing memory during the Cold War period and the liberation from the Cold War narratives.

Here I will repeat the question asked by Gluck. What does it mean citizenship beyond the border? As Bogumił argues, whether such a non-territorial citizenship functions only as moral capital.

We hope these proceedings serves as a good launching point for those having interest on issues discussed here.

Ideology or racism?

The historical origin of immigration control regime in post-war Japan

Sara Park

1. Introduction

What defines borderline of citizenship? How people see the borderlines in particular historical and/or social settings? This paper tries to answer these questions through immigration control policies in postwar Japan. Japan is often referred as a highly homogeneous country that ethnic, racial and national memberships virtually overlap. In fact, the percentage of registered foreign population in Japan (2.2% in January 2019¹) is considerably low in OECD countries, making Japan as almost ethnically homogeneous country. Regardless you underline its merits or demerits, such high homogeneity is still regarded as a particularity of Japanese society. This condition generates various arguments; Japan is one of the few industrialized countries not to have experienced the tremendous inflow of international migrants²; Post-war social homogeneity was built on Japan's high level of income equality³; geographical isolation of Japan supported cultural homogeneity⁴.

On the other hand, the myth of homogeneity has often received criticisms and fictitiousness. Sociologists in Japan have pointed out that the "100 million middle class consciousness" was just a fantasy among certain social sectors⁵. Indigenous peoples in Hokkaido and Okinawa have not been publicly recognized, nor the suppression by the Japanese Government has not been accused yet⁶.

This paper argues that the ethnic homogeneity in contemporary Japanese society is a result of excluding ethnic diversity from national membership. So-called immigration control regime⁷ consists of immigration control and refugee recognition act, nationality act and sometimes family registration act. While high arbitrariness and wide discretion in immigration control regime are often criticized⁸, scholars and activists have argued their origins. Some state such arbitrariness and discretion are residuum of Japan's colonialism⁹, others

emphasize influence of the Cold War in the northeast Asia¹⁰. The former sees unstable residential rights of Koreans and Taiwanese from the Imperial Ordinance of Alien Registration (in 1947) to the notification of special permanent residency (in 1991) vividly signifies incomplete decolonization of former Japan Empire. For the latter, it is the logic of “friend-enemy distinction” by Carl Schmitt under the Cold War.

However, neither of post-colonial racism or anti-communism ideology can fully explain the historical transition of the immigration control policy. Although often regarded as ethnically identical, Koreans and Chines/Taiwanese experienced highly different legal status according to their ties to two Korean/Chinese governments. Although the Cold War in northeast Asia changed drastically since 1991 and communism is not regarded as a primary threat to capitalist society, arbitrariness and discretion in Japan’s immigration control regime has not changed. Above all, those who lost citizenship did not cry out in protest collectively. These facts suggest that at least another logic is required to explain the origin of immigration control regime besides of anticommunist ideology and postcolonial racism. This paper clarifies the logic and mechanisms of defining borderline of citizenship in postwar Japan through description of formation process of immigration control regime immediately after the Second World War.

1-2 Previous studies

Scholars of the history of immigration control policy have often discussed this period as the vantage point. Yasuaki Ohnuma (1979-80; 2004) reviewed the history of immigration control regime in Japan and pointed out the Allied Power’s lack of plan for decolonization as well as Japanese Government’s initiative in immigration control policy; he gave a detailed description on how immigration control regime in Japan originally targeted Koreans in Japan. On the other hand, Tessa Morris-Suzuki¹¹ studied the history of Koreans in Japan, clarified the irregular migration from Korea and Cold War in Northeast Asia played crucial roles in forming the ethnic community in post-war Japan. Her main argument is that the Korean War and its preceding ideological conflict in Korean Peninsula forced many Koreans to leave the country, and such refugees

who escaped to Japan seriously influenced the community of Koreans in Japan as well as Japan's immigration control policy. Matthew Augustine, like Morris-Suzuki, studied the irregular migration from Korea to Japan and underlines importance of Imperial Ordinance of Alien Registration. Imperial Ordinance of Alien Registration as a means of suppression of irregular migration from Korea became the prototype of the immigration control policy in post-war Japan, and the imperial ordinance was a measure of "blockade Japan" according to BCOF¹², thus a part of tactics of the Cold War in northeast Asia.

These studies clarify, or presuppose that the post-war immigration control system in Japan targets mainly Koreans in Japan. Furthermore, one of the reasons of such targeting is irregular migration from Korea to Japan under the Cold War in northeast Asia, and/or such irregular migration was regarded as a threat in such international politics. However, there remains another unanswered presupposition; why and how Koreans were regarded as different groups from Japanese? Ohnuma described the smooth process of blanket deprivation of Japanese nationality of Koreans as a semblance of concordance. This concordance signifies the shared understandings of the borderline of citizenship both among Japanese and Koreans; without this understanding, citizenship in post-war Japan could not have been drawn. However, previous scholarship has not yet proved the mechanism of this concordance. In the following section, first I consider the mechanism that produced the semblance of concordance in the process of irregular migration of Koreans to Japan, and then analyze how the mechanism related to the postcolonial racism and anticommunist ideology.

2. Background

2-1 Military occupation of Japan

The origin of the immigration control regime can be traced back to the military occupation of Japan by the Allied Powers just after Japan's defeat in the Second World War. From September 1945 to April 1952, Japan experienced indirect occupation by the Allied Powers that had Far East Committee and Allied Council for Japan as the top, and mainly consisted of the Eighth Army of

the United States. The commander of United States Army Forces in the Far East, Douglas MacArthur, was appointed as the position of the General Headquarters/Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (GHQ/SCAP), who led Japan's demilitarization and democratization both substantially and symbolically. Besides the SCAP, United States Army Forces, Pacific (USAFAPAC) mainly concerned local military occupation and the British commonwealth Occupation Forces took part in Chugoku and Shikoku Areas.

These Occupational Forces indirectly occupied Japan; SCAP in Tokyo gave instructions (in the form of Memorandums, Instruction Notes) to the Japanese Government and the Japanese Government drafted, passed and enforced the instructions in the form of domestic laws. Except for the Home Ministry and those conflict to post-war reforms were retained so that smoothly enforce the reforming instructions. The Central Liaison Office worked for the negotiations and translation/interpretations between GHQ/SCAP and the Japanese Government. In local municipalities, the USAFPAC supervised and advised the demilitarization process and the enforcement of the reforms, as well as policing and censorship.

2-2 Repatriations to and from Japan

As for the immigration control, Japan lost its diplomatic independence, thus it was the occupational forces that led the migration control of Japan. The first issue that faced post-war Japan was the flows of the repatriates; from August 1945, six million Japanese started repatriation from ex-colonies and military occupied areas in mainland China, Southeast Asian countries and South Pacific Islands. Although the number of deaths among Japanese repatriates are relatively fewer than other Axis countries, notably Germany, the repatriation left tragedies among repatriates; war-displaced people left behind in China by their Japanese relatives in their infancy is one of the legacies of the period¹³. On the other hand, most of the repatriates from Japan were two-million Koreans and 24,000 Taiwanese, both the people from ex-colonies.

This repatriation is conducted in a chaotic situation. Young, single laborers who had come to Japan by force immediately left Japan to their homeland. However, those who lived in Japan for decades with their families did

not repatriate, at least immediately. How to exclude these former subjects of the Japan Empire from newly-born nation state—the main concern of the immediate post-war Japan lies in this point.

2-3 Irregular migration from Korea to Japan

Repatriation and immigration of Koreans were other important issues for the Japanese Government and the Occupation Forces. Most Koreans in Japan returned to their homeland as soon as Japan's defeat was announced, and more than 1,300,000 people had been repatriated by March 1946. Still, about 500,000 to 600,000 Koreans remained in Japan that spring. The Japanese Government and SCAP tried to repatriate them, but harsh property limits and the political, economic, and social turbulence in South Korea discouraged Koreans from returning to their homeland.

Another related problem had to do with return migration from Korea. These immigrants—most of whom were trying to escape the violence associated with the White Terror (unjustified arrest and suppression of free speech by the authorities) and/or the political and social instability in their countries—were regarded as illegal entrants by the occupying forces and the Japanese Government, and thus were suppressed. According to the Ministry of Justice, the number apprehended and charged with illegal entry reached its peak in 1946 (17,733), then decreased by half in 1947. It then increased again until 1949, and dropped after 1950 (Ministry of Justice, 1975: 87). The total number of apprehensions from 1946 to 1950 was 45,960.

Number of detentions of illegal entrants to Japan¹⁴

Year/Place of Detention	1946	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951
Offshore			1,358	729	329	729
Place of embarkation		5,239	6,160	6,324	1,572	2,410
Domestic		771	460	1,449	553	364
Total	17,733	6,010	7,978	8,032	2,434	3,503
Escaped	3683	1,467	2,046	2,710	1,170	1,143

About ninety percent of the irregular migrants are Koreans who departed from ports along the southeast coast of the Korean Peninsula, such as Pusan

and Masan, or from Cheju Island, which is located off the southwest shore of the Korean Peninsula. Therefore, the major routes for illegal entry ran between Korea's southeast coast and Japan's northwest coast.

3. turning minority into alien

3-1 the prototype of immigration control

The Imperial Ordinance of Alien Registration was one of the solutions meant to address this situation by putting “troublesome” Koreans under the rule of the Japanese Police without recognizing their nationality and/or status as foreigners. The ambiguity of Koreans' status caused problems in that the Japanese Government could not control the trouble caused by the Koreans, especially after the Chinese government recognized that the Taiwanese in Japan were Chinese and thus nationals of the Allied Powers. For example, the Central Liaison Office, the special office in the Japanese government that liaised with the Occupation Forces, underlines in one of its reports in 1946, titled *Illegal Activities of Koreans*, that the Koreans in Japan were involved in illicit activities. The office reported that “recently, [Korean's] organized illegal activities have occurred repeatedly, caus[ed] significant threat among Japanese”¹⁵. In another report, the Central Liaison Office picked up illicit activities committed by the “Korean, Chinese, and Formosan” (Central Liaison Office 1946b) that took place in the Miyagi, Osaka, and Nagasaki Prefectures. As a result, the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers concluded the following regarding the status and treatment of the Koreans and Taiwanese (“Formosan-Chinese”):

Reports from the authorities concerned with the enforcements of SCAP direction and from the appropriate Japanese agencies indicate that Formosan-Chinese and Koreans have been taking advantages [sic] of their apparently doubtful status to evade the law. This strongly indicates the necessity of instituting adequate, additional jurisdictional and judicial controls for the purpose of curbing such unlawful activities¹⁶.

The Imperial Ordinance of Alien Registration was issued on May 2, 1947. On the following day, the Japanese Constitution was issued; therefore, this ordinance was the last Imperial Ordinance in Japan. The immigration and alien registration policy that was announced in the Imperial Ordinance of Alien Registration was simple: not all aliens can enter Japan (Article 3). It also enacted requirements that aliens who enter and stay in Japan more than 60 days must register in the municipalities (Article 4), the municipalities must keep registry books of foreigners (Article 5), aliens who change their registered facts must apply for a change to their registration (Article 8), and so forth. Any foreigners who violated the ordinance would be subject to repatriation (Article 12).

What made the ordinance unique was that it defined people from the former colonies of Japan, namely Korea and Taiwan, as aliens in application of this ordinance (Article 11). Onuma points out that the “Imperial Ordinance of Alien Registration controls Koreans and Taiwanese in Japan, who, according to Japanese Government, still possessed Japanese nationality, with sanction of forced repatriation. This ordinance was the prototype of postwar immigration control system that crack down on ethnic minorities in the same society”¹⁷. By defining Koreans and Taiwanese as aliens, the ordinance placed them under the power of immigration control and the possibility of forced repatriation. It also prepared the framework for postwar Japan’s immigration control system, which consisted of the Alien Registration Act (issued in 1952) and the Immigration Control Act (issued in 1951). In other words, the basic policy of the Imperial Ordinance of Alien Registration on immigration and alien control were inherited by these two acts at the end of the occupation of Japan.

3-2 identifying “Korean illegal entrants”

I once analyzed the process of irregular migration of Koreans¹⁸ and pointed out as follows; Korean irregular migrants were found out as such not because they looked like Koreans but because they looked just unfamiliar to the local occupation forces, police, and the residents. Finding unfamiliar ships and groups of people, especially in relatively small villages, should not be difficult. The problem lies in the fact that such searches of unfamiliar ships and people

was understood to be for the control of Korean irregular migrants, and that the immigrants themselves believed that it was easy to determine that they were Korean by looking at their faces or trusting their intuition. In addition, regarding unfamiliar ships and people as illegal entrants is not possible without a preexisting concept of illegal entry. Without receiving information that illegal entrants are coming and without the enforcement's emphasis on the immigrants' landing, unfamiliar ships and people would not be regarded as smuggling boats and illegal entrants. The registration of people as Korean was intended both to find illegal entrants and to strengthen the connection between the concepts of "Korean" and "illegal entry." The Imperial Ordinance of Illegal registration defined the legality of entry depending on who the entrant was, not how he or she entered Japan.

3-3 Rhetoric of anti-communism

Ethnic attribute of Korean and irregularity in migration did not only relate to each other in considering the immigrants' judicial treatment; each character had something to do with anticommunist ideology. The following report from the 8th Army implies that being Korean, agents of Communist organizations and "inimical to the objectives of the occupation" are interchangeable.

Illegal entry of Koreans is (...) entry of agents from Communist dominated areas and the influx of personnel who swell the membership of certain organizations inimical to the objectives of the occupation¹⁹.

On the other hand, the document also collects oral testimonies from the apprehended migrants, who describe themselves as victims of the communists.

"The people are caught between two fires—if they take the side of the police against the Communists or that of the Communists against the police, they are oppressed by the opposing side." (A resident of Cheju Island)

“The communists suddenly started rioting, burning, murdering and looting and the police and vigilantes were not strong enough to control them. Every time there is a riot, young people are seized and disappear. Under these troubled conditions the young people cannot carry out their normal work.” (Statement by Ri Ji Ko, 25, Cheju Island)²⁰

Most of the migrants in this quarterly report are from Jeju island in the southwest of Korean Peninsula. Therefore, the “riot” and “troubled conditions” signify so-called Jeju 4·3 Incidents (Jeju sasam sageon), or “Jeju Uprising”. The Special Law for Truth Investigation about the Jeju 4·3 Incident and Honoring Victims (Article 2) defines the incident as “the incident causing civilians’ sacrifices in the process of armed conflicts and the suppression operations beginning March 1, 1947 to 4·3, 1948 through September 21, 1954.” Against the divided general election in 38 degree south of Korean Peninsula, South Korean Labor Party organized uprising that invited harsh counter-attack from the police, ultra-rightist paramilitary bodies, South Korean- and the U.S. armies. During seven years of conflict, unarmed villagers were often targeted by both sides; according to tThe Jeju 4·3 Incident Investigation Report, the reported number of victims is 14,028 (death of 10,715, missing of 3,171, residual disability of 142), more than 300 villages were damaged. Among the victims, 10,955 people (78.1%) were killed or injured by so-called Punitive Force, consisted of the government, military, the police and paramilitaries, Guerrillas; 1,764 people (12.6%) were by guerrillas. The total violence was committed between the Punitive Force and the Guerrillas with 86.1% and 13.9% of the forces respectively. The number includes the victims of children under 10 years old (5.8%, or 814 persons), seniors over 61 (6.1%, or 860 persons), representing 11.9% of the total victims, and females (21.3%, or 2,985 persons). As compared to the situation of the damage, the rhetoric adopted by the “Korean illegal entrants” appears to be rather interesting; they insist themselves not as the agent of the communists but as the victims of the Communist, who “started rioting, burning, murdering and looting”. Such image obviously sticks to the images of the communists spread by the police, paramilitaries and the South Korean Government, those who killed, burned and looted the villagers.

The documents by the Allied Powers show multi-layered twists; it was anticommunism that led people to irregular migration rather than communism, or at least, the conflict between them. On-site reports of the irregular migration record the voices of the migrants who see themselves as the victims of the communism, which the local military quarters does not deny. Nevertheless, when the issue was discussed in Tokyo, the immigrants were equated with communist agents. Ethnic attribute of Korean and irregularity in migration did not only relate to each other in considering the immigrants' judicial treatment; each character had something to do with anticommunist ideology.

3-4 Mixture of ideology and racism

Both BCOF and SCAP related irregular migration from Korea to Korean ethnic organizations and saw the biggest organization, Korean League, as a threat or pro-communist. In October 1948, BCOF in Ehime Prefecture release a document "the control of illegal migration in Ehime Prefecture" that summarizes and reckons up the problems as follows;

- about 500 students traveled illegally from Korea to Japan, conducted research about Korean ethnic organization and Koreans' legal status in Japan and returned to Korea in July.
- from 23 to 29 August, about 30-40 Koreans made three to four groups, stayed in hotels in Matsuyama, Ehime prefecture, then traveled to Osaka area with close contact to Korean League Ehime Prefecture branch.
- Korean League actively took part in obtaining alien registration card for the irregular migrants and the profit was sent to North Korea and the USSR. Close relation between Korean League and Japan Communist Party/ DPRK.

Already in December 1947, SCAP related to irregular migration to Korean League, describing as the following.

This is believed that the documents [registration cards] and the money, had been intended for the Korean League—the documents to be

disseminated among the Korean people in Japan and the currency to be utilized by the league to further their mass communist indoctrination these materials are presumed to have originated in north Korea under auspices of the Russians²¹.

However, Korean League did not make profit from irregular migration or officially helped irregular migrants. Rather, they did not get involved to irregular migrations or migrants as an organization, insisting that the Koreans who had lived in Japan before the end of the Second World War should be treated differently from those who migrated to Japan after the war for the first time, or again, from Korea. From the documents produced by the field-level report, the occupation forces seem to share the fact that the individual irregular migrant cannot be regarded as agent of communist organization. At the same time, occupation forces could not get rid of the doubt that ethnic organization took part in irregular migration. Such fear was strengthened if some irregular migrants depended on the support from relatives, family members and friends in local ethnic organization. The documents shows the confusion or connection of the two possibilities of the communist entry to Japan and the communist support of such migration.

Such confusion and connection reflect Japan's domestic politics. After land-sliding victory of the Liberal Democrat Party in January 1949, Shigeru Yoshida organized his third administration. The following summer saw nation-spread anticommunism such as Red Purge, unsolved murder cases in which Japan Communist Party and labor organization were alleged their involvement. On the other hand, the conflict between Koreans in Japan such as Edogawa Incident came up in gossip, spreading the image of Korean as violent threat to security. As the result, Korean League were forced to shut up as violent organization in September 1949. Irregular migration from Korea overlapped to the problematic status of Koreans in Japan, as well as political handling of the Korean League. Both issues had two things in common; they should be ethnically different from Japanese, and politically different from the allies.

4. Conclusion

In 1991, Japanese Government abolished fingerprinting to permanent residents, which provoked strong antipathy both Foreigners and Japanese. However, in 2005, Japan introduced photos and fingerprinting at the immigration counters. This time it was not anti-communism but the war against terror that became the leading ideology of immigration control.

This paper has analyzed the mechanisms that invent the borderline of citizenship in postwar Japan. In the first stage of controlling irregular migration from Korea, anticommunism and racism did not separate clearly. However, in practice, local military governments did not regard irregular migrants as communists; rather, the migrants tried to escape from politics/social instability in South Korea and the occupation forces recognized their situations. The migrants told their motives in accordance to anticommunist ideology in South Korea so that they could be treated not as communists but as refugees.

Anticommunist ideology and post-colonial racism overlapped because the notion of irregular migration mediated the threat of communism as well as Korean ethnic organizations that had close but controversial ties with Japan Communist Party. Koreans are now different from Japanese because their country is liberated from Japan Empire. Without connecting anticommunism and the assumption that Koreans are different from Japanese, racism toward Koreans cannot be authorized in postwar Japan. Irregular migration from Korea connected all the three ideas of difference, anticommunism and racism.

Moreover, in the light of Japan's independence, immigration control was being handled by Japanese Government. Such political situation enabled relatively freehand to Japanese side, who eventually succeeded in including people from former colonies, the holders of Japanese citizenship, main targets of immigration control policy. 28th April 1952, people from former colonies were deprived of their Japanese citizenship by circular notice of Director-General of the Civil Affairs Bureau. The policy that originally targeted irregular migration from Korea turned ethnic minority groups in postwar Japan into foreigners who do not have citizenship.

Legal identification is always the result of political/social categorization. Observing the birth of immigration control system in Japan clarifies the borderline of citizenship is drawn by the contingent notion of non-nationals; nationhood and citizenship are different but overlapping notions, and thus made academic debate over citizenship controversial. In the late 1940s, Japanese Government and the Allied Powers tried to suppress irregular migration to Japan and resulted in making a part of Japanese citizens aliens without citizenship. Anticommunist ideology, post-colonial racism, and the basic notion of difference that supported Korea's liberation from Japan paved the path.

Almost more than 30 years of the end of the Cold War, Japan's immigration control regime, especially its notorious discretion which often predominates basic human rights in Japanese Constitution and other international conventions, has not yet changed so much. This fact implicates that immigration control system in Japan has its basis on monitoring migrants, seeing them as possible danger to Japanese society.

¹ Ministry of Justice, 25 October 2019, "Reiwa gan-nen 6 gatsumatsu genzai ni okeruzairyu gaikokujinsu ni tsuite (about the population in Japan, June 2019)", http://www.moj.go.jp/nyuukokukanri/kouhou/nyuukokukanri04_00083.html, accessed in 22 November 2019.

² Bartram, David "Japan and Labor Migration: Theoretical and Methodological Implications of Negative Cases," *International Migration Review*, 34:1, 2000, pp.5-32.

³ Laura Hein, 2008, "The Cultural Career of the Japanese Economy: Developmental and Cultural Nationalisms in Historical Perspective", *Asia-Pacific Journal Japan Focus*, Vol. 6 (6), Article ID 2792: <https://apijf.org/-Laura-Hein/2792/article.html>, accessed 24th November 2019.

⁴ James W. Neuliep, Michelle Chaudoir & James C. McCroskey (2001) A cross - cultural comparison of ethnocentrism among Japanese and United States college students, *Communication Research Reports*, 18:2, 137-146, p.4.

⁵ Naoki Sudo, 2010, *Nihonjin no kaiso ishiki*, Kodansha.

⁶ Htun, T. T. (2012). Social identities of minority others in Japan: Listening to the narratives of Ainu, Buraku and Zainichi Koreans. *Japan Forum*, 24(1), pp. 1-22; Maruyama, H. (2012). Japan's post-war Ainu policy. Why the Japanese government has not recognised Ainu indigenous rights? *Polar Record*, 49(2), pp. 204-207.

⁷ Yasuaki Ohnuma, 1993, *Tan-itsu minzoku shakai no shinwa wo koete*, Toshindo, p.22.

⁸ Jochi Daigaku shakai seigi kenkyujo, 1996, *Tainichi gaikokujin to jinken*, AkashiShoten, p.68.

⁹ Today Hokyoto ed., 1971, *Kokuhatsu nyukantaisei*, Aki Shobo, p.63; Zainichi Chosenjin no jinken wo mamoru kai ed., 1971, *Zainichi chosenjin no chii*, p.87.

¹⁰ Sachi Takaya, 2017, *Tsuiho to teiko no politics*, Nakanishiya Shuppan, p.37. 7

¹¹ Morris=Suzuki, Tessa, 2006, *Invisible Immigrants: Undocumented Migration and Border Controls in Early Postwar Japan*, *The Asia-Pacific Journal*, vol.4 (8): 1-28

¹² Matthew Augustine, 'Ekkyo-sha to Senryo-ka Nihon no Kyokai Henbo: Eirenpo Shinchu-gun (BCOF) Shiryo wo Chushin ni' (Travellers and Japan under the occupation of

the Allied Powers: from the source of the British Commonwealth Occupational Forces), *Zainichi Chosenjin shi Kenkyu* 36 (2006), pp. 185–206.

¹³ Shinzo Araragi, 2009, *Chugoku zanryu nihonjin toiu keiken*, Bensei shuppan.

¹⁴ Ministry of Justice, 1975, “”, p.87

¹⁵ Central Liaison Office 1186, 13 March 1946, “Illicit Acts of Koreans”.

¹⁶ GHQ/SCAP, 1947, ‘Clarifications on the status of Koreans, Formosans, and Chinese in Japan’, National Archives and Record Administrations, ARC Identifier: 319436, NAIL Control Number: NWCTM-331-UD1180-893(24).

¹⁷ Yasuaki Ohnuma, 1978, “Shiryo to kaisetsu: shutsunyuokoku kanri hosei no seiritsu katei”, *Horitsu jiho*, vol.51 (5), pp.103-104.

¹⁸ Sara Park, “Who Are You?”: The Making of “Korean Illegal Entrants” in Occupied Japan 1945-1952’, *International Journal of Japanese Sociology*, vol. 25, pp. 150-163, March 2015.

¹⁹ GHQ/SCAP conference report, 15 July 1949. In GHQ/SCAP, Government Section, Administrative Division, 1949, Korean Illegal Entrants, NAIL Control Number: NWCTM-331-UD1387-2190(2)

²⁰ British Commonwealth Occupational Forces, 1949, "Control of Illegal Entry into Ehime Prefecture" (Australia War Memorial, Series No. AWM114, Control Symbol 423/10/8, DPI:300)

²¹ GHQ/FEC, G2, 15 Dec 1947, Civil intelligence section special report, Korean Smuggling Activities:4

Memory on the Korean ‘compatriots’ and defining the boundary of the Korean national community

Seung-Min Lee

I. Introduction

In the late 1980s, the Republic of Korea began to face the issue brought about by the incongruence between state, nation, and members who belong to it. It was the period when the coethnic compatriots, mostly *Joseonjŏk* in China and *Koryoin* from the former Soviet Union, and the Korean government became increasingly awakened to their ‘long-forgotten’ homeland and coethnic compatriots. This mutual recognition and the encounter spurred the Korean government and the society as a whole to embrace them within the Korean national community and rethink their relationships to the homeland state.

The Kim Yong-Sam administration (1993–1998) and its emphasis on “globalization (*segryehwa*) discourse” further accelerated government engagement with Korean compatriots. This resulted in the “Overseas Korean Act” (OKA) in 1999, which targeted both Korean citizens abroad and ethnic Koreans of foreign citizenship. The law granted them *de facto* quasi-citizenship rights, legally designating their status as “overseas Korean compatriots (*Jaeoe dongpo*),” a new form of national belonging that can best be described as “ethnizenship”.¹

The most significant aspect of the OKA is its definition of who should be included within the Korean national community. Initially, the OKA was established in a way that limits the inclusion of emigrants who migrated before the foundation of ROK in 1948, which left a large part of *Joseonjŏk* and *Koryoin* compatriots out of the category of “overseas Korean compatriots”. However, it was immediately controversial and generated severe backlash not only from the overseas compatriots themselves but also from the Korean society. In 2004, the OKA was amended, and the definition

of “overseas Korean compatriots” redefined, through a much-contested and painful process. The new, more inclusive definition included coethnic Koreans whose ancestors had left the Korean peninsula even before 1948.

The process of reconfiguring national boundaries involved questioning and defining “who is regarded as what?” It reflects the Korean states’ specific view on overseas compatriots and the boundary of the Korean national community. In this paper, I attempt to answer the following questions: What was the Korean state’s view on “overseas Koreans” and how did it develop? How did such views influence defining the relationship between homeland and overseas compatriots and ultimately defining the Korean nation?”

There have been numerous studies on the Korean government’s policy towards overseas Korean compatriots, and it tends to accentuate the economic aspect of the relationship between the Korean state and overseas Korean communities in the context of global capitalism². Another strand of study on overseas Korean compatriots sheds lights on the process of acculturation in their ethnic homeland, the formation of their communities and networks, and their identity politics which focuses on the side of co-ethnic compatriots as an agent³. However, most studies on this new form of national belonging neglect to see how homeland state’s memory on specific national past is linked with overseas Korean compatriots, how its narratives have been developed and finally how it is involved in broadening the scope of national belonging. This is partly because it has often been considered that the Korean government was indifferent to them and that therefore no significant relationship existed between the Korean state and overseas compatriots until the 1990s when the government started to institutionalize it. However, this overly presentist approach leads to an ahistorical view on the making and remaking of the national boundary of the Korean nation which reveals an important aspect of Korean nationalism.

This study, therefore, attempts to explore the previously neglected issue of national memory in the making of the Korean nation by examining how overseas Korean compatriots have been remembered and narrated by the Korean state over time, the attempt to reconnect with overseas

compatriots before the official institutionalization in the late 1990s, and finally it investigates how the views on overseas Korean compatriots are manifested during the process of defining “overseas Korean compatriots”.

To explore this question, I first examine how overseas Korean compatriots have been remembered and narrated by the Korean state over time, and also the attempt to reconnect with overseas compatriots before the official institutionalization of the late 1990s. Finally, I investigate how views on overseas Korean compatriots manifested during the process of defining “overseas Korean compatriots”.

II. Homeland Perception of ‘*dongpo* (compatriot)’

The last bastion of the Korean nation: The origin of ‘dongpo’

To understand the homeland view on its diasporic people outside, it is important to understand the term ‘*dongpo*’, which clearly defines the extent of the Korean nation. The term includes Koreans both inside and outside the homeland as well as North Koreans: in other words, it denotes all possible members of the Korean nation.⁴

Dongpo is a category used to represent the prototypical national community imagined to have existed in the Korean peninsula, since the transitional period after the collapse of *Chosen* dynasty, when people were freed from the status of subjects and were organized into the modern Korean nation (*minzŏk*). The term came into use widely and consistently from the 1890s without much change of the meaning⁵. Going through a stormy transitional between the late 19th century and the early 20th century, Korean *dongpo* started to migrate to China, Russian, Japan and the United States in a massive scale, and the category *dongpo* was divided into ‘*haeŏe dongpo* (overseas compatriots)’ and ‘*Naeji dongpo* (Internal compatriots)’. Later by the Korean War, *dongpo* in the peninsula was divided into the South and North. In this process, the term ‘*haeŏe dongpo*’ has become specifically associated with the notion of ‘historic dispersion’, the situation under which people were forced to leave their homeland and unable to return.⁶

In the early days of migration in the late 19th century, Koreans abroad were viewed as ambivalently since their cultural genuineness was often called into question. Also, outmigration was seen as dangerous and somewhat undesirable. However, this view was reversed at the beginning of the 20th century when Japan extended its imperial power over the Korean peninsula. As Japan brings the Korean peninsula under its imperial rule, the migration of Koreans and the formation of diasporic communities grew dramatically. In a massive role reversal, now it was the overseas compatriots and diasporic communities that functioned as outposts of the independence movement, or, to borrow an expression from Schmid, “custodian of the nation”.⁷

Schmid illustrates this shift by pointing to nationalist newspapers in overseas communities arguing that, out of reach of colonizing powers, Overseas Koreans could raise their voice against Japanese rule and gather forces for anti-Japanese movement, while maintaining genuine cultural characteristics as Koreans untainted by Japanese imperialism. Therefore, being away from homeland was not perceived as being severed from home, but more as ‘building’ home from the outside.⁸ This view also clearly appeared in the diasporic newspaper *Kwoneop Shinmun* in 1912 stating that there is no other way but to rely on *haeŏe dongpo* to take up the role of nationalist, for they are free to discuss, preach, publish, and to spread the nationalist thoughts. The leaders of diasporic community were also sharing this view. In 1914, a Korean anonymous contributor who traveled to the Maritime Province of Russia, where *Kwoneop Shinmun* was published, wrote a congratulatory message to commemorate the 2nd anniversary of the newspaper praising and complimenting how important the diasporic newspapers are for the homeland where press was severely controlled, emphasizing the diasporic community as important locus for spreading the Korean nationalistic thoughts and mobilizing independent movements.

In short, the image of and the perception toward the compatriots abroad (*haeŏe dongpo*) were tightly connected to their historic connotation as victims of an unfortunate fate and at the same time as outposts of the

independence movement and a last bastion of the Korean nation, the idea which transcends the territorial nation in imagining the ‘Korean nation’.

Symbolic representation of Overseas Koreans

While such views on *haeŏe dongpo* were commonly held throughout the colonial period, the making of ‘Korean citizen’ has begun with the establishment of the Republic of Korea in 1948, demarcating those inside and outside of Korea.

During this period, the urgent issue that the government had to address was how to deal with Koreans in Japan, who were being severely marginalized and stripped of their Japanese citizenship, as well as those returning from diasporic communities in China, Russians’ Maritime Provinces, and Japan. Since it was the initial stage of settling as a nation-state where the return migration of Koreans from diasporic communities was still an ongoing process, a set of policies and social discourses were focused on these immediate solutions for the movement of people and goods.

Although the government was incapable of developing all-encompassing policies for the Koreans outside the peninsula, both due to all-out defense against the communism under the Cold war situation and the lack of ‘bureaucratic infrastructural capacity’⁹ as a newly-independent state, the Korean state’s view and perception toward their compatriots abroad was occasionally manifested in the presidential speeches and newspaper articles. On May 31st, 1948, the chairman Syngman Rhee, in the opening address at the National Assembly, showed a glimpse of how ‘*haeŏe dongpo*’ has been seen in the process of building the Korean state:

“I, as a representative of this assembly, proclaim the rebirth of the Republic of Korea and that this National assembly is the only legitimate representation of our nation. The ROK was founded on the basis of democracy through the March 1st independent movement by leaders of 13 provinces and the establishment of the Provisional Government. Unfortunately, we could not complete our revolution due to the international circumstances at the time; however, our patriotic

men and women both inside and outside the peninsula have supported our [provisional] government and devoted their lives to defend this spirit. Therefore, the National Assembly that we are holding today is the succession of the March 1st movement, and the government we are setting up today through this assembly is the succession and revival of the provisional government which represents the entire Korean people.” (Opening address of the National Assembly 1948)¹⁰

In his speech, Rhee, then the chairman of the assembly and later the President, addresses all Koreans—both on and off the peninsula—as the foundation of the nation and as legitimate members of the ROK, acknowledging their national liberation movement as a primary force of the state-building.

This perception of overseas Koreans as the nation’s supporters were reinforced as diasporic communities, particularly in Japan and the United States, continued to send relief funds and goods to their war-torn homeland. Expressions of gratitude frequently appeared in the major newspapers and presidential addresses throughout the 1950s and continued well into the 1960s. For example, the 1953 National Assembly meeting discussed the issue of a congratulatory message to the diasporic community in Hawaii to commemorate the 50th anniversary of their migration. During the assembly, members agreed that, despite the fact that the ROK was currently at war, the Korean government should not forget to commemorate the anniversary in order to remember the Korean compatriots as a cradle of the independence movement. Eventually, the commemoration of the 50th anniversary led to the establishment of In-ha (Incheon-Hawaii) University, founded in honor of emigrants’ first departure from Incheon and their constant independence movement for the homeland (June 4, 1953, “*On the establishment of Inha University*” Syngman Rhee’s presidential speech)¹¹, which epitomizes the view of the Korean state toward their overseas Korean community. Moreover, the annual address of March 1st independence movement and the New Year’s address of major media press continuously elaborated the national independence and nation-building

history in connection with overseas compatriots. In March 1st 1953, an article commemorating the history of Independence struggle appeared in the *KyungHyang Shinmun*.¹² In the article, the history of national struggle for independence was elaborated in connection with overseas compatriots' movement in China, Russia, and the US, explaining how the nationalist leaders of each diasporic community have been working toward the independence clandestinely. Listing numbers of nationalist leaders, such as Syngman Rhee, Changho Ahn, Kwang-Soo Lee and many more, and also their secretive transnational activities, the article placed overseas Korean compatriots at the front and center of Korean nation commemorating their struggle for the liberation of homeland from each of their diasporic community.

In this way, in the mid-20th century the Korean government continued to represent overseas compatriots symbolically, if not institutionally, recognizing the past and present role as nation-builders and supporters of the homeland. However, it was not until the 1970s that the government began to more broadly recognize overseas Korean compatriots, bringing their past into the forefront of the narrative surrounding them.

The rise of memory

As early as the end of the 1960s, Korean society gradually started to become aware of Korean compatriots in China and Russia who remained and were detained under the communist regimes. These groups gradually became more visible throughout the 1970s. As the issue of repatriation of Koreans in Sakhalin arises, President Park Chung-Hee began to mention the Korean compatriots in the communist states and his view is well manifested in his New Year's address in 1968:

It is deeply deplorable that our 12million compatriots in the North are still living under slave-like conditions in the communist puppet regime and that they cannot share the joy of new morning with our brethren in the Republic of Korea. Moreover, I cannot help but feel indignation when I think of our Korean compatriots who had to leave their

homeland during our nation's past time of tribulation and who are now detained in Manchuria, Siberia and Sakhalin under the communist regime living as stateless people (January 1st, 1968, "A message to Korean compatriots in North Korea and the communist states," President Park Chung-Hee).¹³

As Korean compatriots in the communist states became more recognized, memories of migration history connected with the nation's past predicaments and their image as national victims started to fill up the socio-cultural landscape. This was furthered by the Far East Broadcasting Company (FEBC) and Korean Broadcasting System (KBS) broadcasts of shortwave radio programs targeting Korean compatriots in this region from the 1970s to the 1990s. Through the radio programs, numerous Koreans in the region started to send letters in an attempt to find and reconnect with their families and relatives in Korea. Over time, major newspapers and other media highlighted this project as well, thus increasing social recognition of the national past associated with Korean compatriots abroad.

In such a way, the 1970s marked a time of broadening memory regarding Korean compatriots abroad. Korea gradually engaged with hitherto unnoticed groups like Koreans in China and Russia and even in Japan, where Korean compatriots were often affiliated with the *Chosen Soren* (pro-North Korean association), particularly by initiating "Visiting Homeland Program" that brought hundreds of thousands of Korean compatriots to their homeland.

The gradual appearance of the Korean compatriots in the public eye and the broader recognition by the government virtually led to the rise of memories and created the terrain of memory throughout the 1980s. Particularly, as Perestroika policy in the Soviet Union opens a door for freedom of the press, the history of deportation of Koreans from the Maritime province to the Central Asian region by Stalin in 1937 was excavated and introduced into the Korean society, igniting heated discussion on the migration history and Korea's national past. The media presented the issue as one of the most tragic events in Korean history, in

many cases comparing it to Jews under Nazi Germany.¹⁴ Coupled with the nations' tragic past, the Korean compatriots in the communist states were symbolized as the victimized nation, and the history of dispersion, deportation, and detainment was narrated rather sympathetically, stirring up the ethnonational sentiments in the sociopolitical realm.

Throughout the process of modern state-building and its consolidation, Korean compatriots abroad and the diasporic communities have primarily been perceived as outposts of the independence movement and supporters of the new nation. Such a portrayal is strongly connected to Korea's national memory of liberation and foundation. However, over time Korean compatriots also became understood as victims of the nation, which the government holds a sense of duty toward them. While it was expressed symbolically through president addresses, media representation, social discourses and also the call to establish the "Overseas Koreans Day" to commemorate the migration of Korean compatriots, the rise of memory in the 1980s provided the foundation for bringing the issue of national belonging into the institutional realm.

III. How memory shapes national belonging

Korean compatriots in Sakhalin: The return of the "victimized nation"

One of the most visible examples of the increased role of memory in the institutional approach toward Korean compatriots was the March 1989 resolution for the 'Visit and return of Korean compatriots in Sakhalin to their homeland'. With the approval of the Soviet Union in June 1989, Korean compatriots permanently returned to their homeland for the first time, and in the same year, the first official 'Visit homeland program' invited 23 compatriots.¹⁵

The return of Korean compatriots from Sakhalin was continued under the 'permanent return program' overseen by the Red Cross in Korea and Japan with the agreement of both governments. The program is primarily directed at the first generation of Korean compatriots born in Sakhalin before August 15th of 1945, the day of liberation, including those who were

already residing there by that time. The program included them regardless of their nationality (except for DPRK nationality). Because these people spent four decades—the majority of their lives—as forced laborers under Japanese imperial rule and later as detainees under the communist region, the program is meant to make reparations for their suffering as victims of this tragic history. Since most are elderly people who hope to spend the rest of their life in their homeland, the Korean government provided measures to help their settlement, from a special procedure to reinstate their Korean nationality to the support fund for housing and living expenses. Throughout this process of bringing the victimized nation back to their homeland, their history of migration and the tragic past has often surfaced through documentary, TV dramas, and media which also helped attracting public eye and support from civil society as well.

Descendants of national heroes and patriots

Another instance of how national memory on the past has influenced defining the national belonging is the extension of citizenship rights to overseas Koreans and their descendants. Particularly, the descendants of the Korean Chinese compatriots have benefitted from recognition as descendants of national heroes who fought for Korean independence during the colonial period. Even before the establishment of diplomatic relations with China in 1992, at which point Chinese citizens began to enter Korean on a large scale, the Korean government granted Korean Chinese compatriots the right to permanent return and the restoration of Korean nationality if their ancestors are verified by the Ministry of Patriots and Veterans Affairs as national heroes and patriots who fought for national independence. In other words, purely based on their ancestors past linked with the national memory, the government has extended a set of rights to Korean Chinese compatriots irrespective of their citizenship. This program has brought thousands of Korean Chinese compatriots into the Korean state as legitimate members of Korean national community and the ROK.

The revision of ‘Overseas Korean Act’: Memory as a strong appeal to shaping the national boundary

The most striking example of how memory defines national belonging is the 2004 revision of the OKA, described briefly in the Introduction. The OKA, the first comprehensive policy regarding Korean compatriots abroad, was initially enacted in 1999 amid growing interest toward overseas Korean compatriots. It guaranteed overseas Koreans “quasi-citizenship rights”¹⁶ and offered them the opportunity to work and engage in various economic activities while staying in the country almost indefinitely. The act also granted Korean compatriots property ownership by granting special status as ‘*Jaeŏe dongpo*’. The act was seen as an innovative legal measure that guaranteed Korean compatriots almost the same level of rights and benefits as Korean nationals in Korea enjoy. However, controversy emerged over the definition of an “overseas Korean.”

According to the Act, overseas Koreans can be divided into two groups; *Jaeŏe Kungmin* (Korean nationals residing abroad) and *Oegukkukchŏk dongpo* (ethnic Koreans of foreign citizenship). Since Korean nationals abroad are the citizen of the ROK, it falls under the realm of national sovereignty to entitle them with the rights and privileges. The controversy, however, regarded the definition of the latter group, ethnic Koreans of foreign citizenship. The original OKA stipulated its definition as follows:

Article 2 (Definitions)¹⁷

The term “overseas Korean” in this Act means a person who falls under any of the following subparagraphs:

- (1) A national of the Republic of Korea who has acquired the right of permanent residence in a foreign country or is residing in a foreign country with a view to living there permanently; and
- (2) A person prescribed by Presidential Decree from among those who, having held the nationality of the Republic of Korea or as their lineal descendants, have acquired the nationality of a foreign country.

The second clause of the above means that if a person of ethnic Korean with foreign nationality is to be eligible for the quasi-citizen status as *Jaeŏe dongpo*, he or she has to have a “legal” relation with the Republic of Korea, which was founded in 1948. Here, controversy arises over the inclusion of this date as criteria for defining *Jaeŏe dongpo*: the Korean nationality did not exist until the establishment of the ROK in 1948, thus a significant proportion of emigrants during the late Chosen era or Japanese colonial period were automatically excluded because they were unable to officially prove their legal relationship with the ROK. This excluded the majority of ethnic Koreans in China and the Central Asian states, more than half of overseas Koreans today.

There was an immediate reaction to this definition as soon as the OKA was promulgated. It aroused strong opposition not only from *Joseonjŏk dongpo* and *Koryoin dongpo* community, but also from the Korean society, including activists, academics, and the media. Numerous groups held public hearings and press conferences, issued statements, and staged protests to call for the revision of OKA.

Amid escalating tension and ongoing debates, the politicization of the issue culminated in the constitutional appeal of three Korean Chinese. With the support of civil societies, they petitioned the Constitutional Court to review the OKA. In November 2001, the Constitutional Court determined that excluding these ethnic Koreans in China and Russia from the *Jaeŏe dongpo* category, thereby excluding them from being legitimate beneficiaries of the quasi-citizenship status, does not agree with ROK’s principle of equality. They ordered that the law be revised by the end of 2003.

Table 1: OKA definition of “overseas Korean” before and after the revision

Pre-Revision	Post-Revision ¹⁸
<p>Article 2</p> <p>The term “overseas Korean” in this Act means a person who falls under any of the following subparagraphs:</p> <p>(1) A national of the Republic of Korea who has acquired the right of permanent residence in a foreign country or is residing in a foreign country with a view to living there permanently; and</p> <p>(2) A person prescribed by Presidential Decree from among those who, having held the nationality of Republic of Korea or as their lineal descendants, have acquired the nationality of a foreign country.</p>	<p>Article 2</p> <p>The term “overseas Korean” in this Act means a person who falls under any of the following subparagraphs: <Amended by Act No. 7173, Mar. 5, 2004></p> <p>(1) A national of the Republic of Korea who obtains the right of permanent residence in a foreign country or is residing in a foreign country with a view to living permanently there (hereinafter referred to as a “Korean national residing abroad”); and</p> <p>(2) A person prescribed by the Presidential Decree of those who have held the nationality of the Republic of Korea (including Koreans who had emigrated to foreign countries before the Government of the Republic of Korea was established) or of their lineal descendants, who obtains the nationality of a foreign country (hereinafter referred to as a “Korean with a foreign nationality”).</p> <p><Subparagraph 2 above is amended by Act No. 7173, on March 5, 2004, pursuant to the decision of its inconformity with the Constitution which is made by the Constitutional Court on November 29, 2001></p>

Here, the justification taken by the Court should be given careful consideration, which corresponds with the resentful arguments raised not only by three petitioners but also by those of the broader *Joseonjŏk* and *Koryoin dongpo* community.

(C) As we have seen previously (Section 4(A)(3)), ethnic Koreans who emigrated before the establishment of the Korean Government are excluded and denied the privileges under the Act not because the State adopted the "Past Nationality Principle" from the beginning. The State adopted the "Past Nationality Principle", a somewhat neutral term, in the Overseas Korean Act in defining ethnic Koreans with foreign nationalities, while through the Enforcement Decree, requiring those ethnic Koreans who emigrated before the establishment of the Korean Government, mostly ethnic Koreans living in China or the former Soviet Union who were forced to leave their motherland to join the independence movement, or to avoid military conscription or forced labor by the Japanese imperialist force, to prove that they were explicitly recognized as Korean nationals before obtaining foreign citizenship, thereby making it virtually impossible for these ethnic Koreans to receive benefits bestowed under the Act. Legislation of an act discriminating ethnic Koreans who were involuntarily displaced due to historical turmoil sweeping over the Korean peninsula cannot be justified from a humanitarian perspective, let alone from a national perspective, in the sense that no country on earth has legislated an act to discriminate against such compatriots, when it seems only appropriate to assist them.¹⁹

This view coincides with the strong arguments of the excluded *Joseonjŏk* and *Koryoin* communities that the cause of emigration was not derived from the goal of individual prosperity but rather from the tragic fate of the homeland under the colonial rule. Indeed, those who fled to

Manchuria and Russia's maritime province often became fervent independence fighters for their own nation. Such a view presents their connectedness to their homeland as a constitutive and constructive part of the nation.

In this case, the memory of the historical predicament that led people to reluctantly leave their homeland drove the appeal and compelled the Court to recognize the petitioners as part of the Korean national community. Although *nation-state* is a legal term, this case shows that the politics of belonging or the readjustment of national boundary is, in many cases, also influenced and shaped by the national memory and certain historical perception attached to its people.

IV. Conclusion

Korea serves as an intriguing example of the interactions between nation, state, and memory. At each historical juncture, the ROK has shown its understanding of the boundaries of ethnonational community *vis-à-vis* political community and the role of the memory in it.

As a 'stateless' nation under Japanese colonial rule, Korean compatriots abroad were seen as hope to restore its sovereignty, and even as a true Korean nation, the idea which transcends the territorial notion in imagining the 'Korean nation'. The development of the perception toward the Korean compatriots abroad has been attached to the national memory of the tragic history and of the independence movement which generated strong images of 'nation-builder' or 'nation's supporter' and also the victims of the unfortunate fate of homeland. With the rise of memory throughout the 1980s and up to the 1990s, the national memory linked with its compatriots abroad has led to the broadening of the national community through the new form of national belonging. A series of cases above demonstrate how strongly the memory can influence defining the nation and the belonging to it. The memory politics does not end with these three cases. In fact, the role of memory in making and remaking of the national boundary can still be found in the process of the recent extension of the

Jaeŏe dongpo category up to 4th generation *Koryoin*. In the commemoration of the 80th year of deportation of *Koryoin* in 2017, again the memory on their tragic as well as heroic past began to emerge from the political arena as well as the social organizations, arousing the awareness of 4th generation membership issue. With a strong appeal of the national memory linked with *Koryoin*, eventually, the enforcement ordinance of the Overseas Korean Act was revised to extend the *Jaeŏe dongpo* category up to the 4th generation *Koryoin* in 2019, the year of the centenary commemoration for the establishment of the Provisional Government of the Republic of Korea.

This study is an attempt to highlight the important aspect of memory in the politics of national membership to overcome the limits of existing discourses on the OKA and the national belonging in the Korean state which tend to accentuate the economic motivation of the state by taking the 1990s as the point of observation, and to overcome the tendency of criticizing the policy for not going far enough without even touching upon the essential issue of a sense of duty that the ROK holds for its compatriots abroad.

¹ Rainer Bauböck, Stakeholder Citizenship and Transnational Political Participation: A Normative Evaluation of External Voting, *Fordham Law Review* 75(5), 2007, p.2396

² Hye-Kyung Lee, The Korean Diaspora and its impact on Korea's Development, *Asian and Pacific Migration Journal* 14(1-2), 2005, pp.149-168; Inbom Choi, Korean Diaspora in the Making: Its current status and impact on the Korean economy, *Institute for International Economics*, 2003, pp.9-29; Jae-Seok Kwak, Dongpo'do oegukinryuk ida (Korean compatriots are also foreign labor force), Journal of Migration & Diaspora Research Institute, Vol2, 2010, pp.18-25; Skrentny, John D., Stephanie Chan, Jon Fox and Denis Kim (2007) Defining Nations in Asia and Europe: A Comparative Analysis of Ethnic Return Migration Policy, *International Migration Review* 41(4): 793-825.

³ Chun-Ho Lee, A Study of Identity Politics of Korean-Chinese in South Korea: Focusing on the organizations and their activities, *Journal of Asia-Pacific Studies*, 21(3), 2014, pp.143-180; Jung-Eun Lee, The Cultural Politics of Communication and the difference in the Korean-Chinese Society: Structure and Exchanges in the Korean-Chinese Community in Korea, *Journal of Democracy and Human Rights*, 11(3), 2011, pp.213-247; Hyun-Joon Shin, Transnational Mobility and Transcultural Practices of Koryosaram (CIS Korean) in the Post-Soviet Space -The Lifeworld and Negotiations of Koryosaram in South Korea, *SAI*, vol.12, 2012, pp.167-214

⁴ Bongiu Koo, Representations of Overseas Koreans and Their Home Country Participation Practices in Records from Presidential Archives, *Journal of Asia-Pacific Studies*, 22(3), 2015, p.22

⁵ Bodue-Rae Kwon, The Rhetoric of 'Brotherhood' and the Significance of 'History', *Theses on Korean Literature*, vol.41, 2005, p.2

⁶ Bongiu Koo, *ibid.*, pp.22-23

⁷ Andre Schmid, *Korea Between Empires 1895-1919* (Columbia University Press 2002),

p.246

⁸ Andre Schmid, *ibid.*, pp.236-252; Richard S. Kim, *The Quest for Statehood: Korean Immigrant Nationalism and U.S Sovereignty 1905-1945*(Oxford University Press 2011), pp.46-65

⁹ Jaeeun Kim, *Contested Embrace: Transborder Membership Politics in Twentieth-Century Korea* (Studies of the Walter H. Shorenstein Asia-Pacific Research Center 2016)

¹⁰ National Assembly Minutes (<http://likms.assembly.go.kr/record/mhs-40-010.do#none>)

¹¹ Presidential Archives, President Rhee Seung-Man speech
(<http://pa.go.kr/research/contents/speech/index.jsp>)

¹² *Kyung-Hyang Shinmun*, March 1st, 1953

¹³ Presidential Archives, President Park Chung-Hee speech
(<http://pa.go.kr/research/contents/speech/index.jsp>)

¹⁴ *Chosun Ilbo*, Oct. 17, 1989

¹⁵ *Kyung-Hyang Shinmun*, December 19th 1989

¹⁶ Jung-Sun Park, Paul Y. Chang, Contention in the Construction of a Global Korean Community: The Case of the Overseas Korean Act, *Journal of Korean Studies*, 10(1), 2005, p.3

¹⁷ National Law Information Center,
(<http://www.law.go.kr/eng/engLsSc.do?menuId=2§ion=lawNm&query=Overseas+Korean+Act&x=0&y=0#liBgcolor10>)

¹⁸ National Law Information Center,
(<http://www.law.go.kr/eng/engLsSc.do?menuId=2§ion=lawNm&query=Overseas+Korean+Act&x=0&y=0#liBgcolor10>)

¹⁹ Constitutional Court of Korea, Act on the Immigration and Legal Status of Overseas Koreans Case (13-2 KCCR 714, 99Hun-Ma494, November 29, 2001)
(<https://search.court.go.kr/ths/ep/selectThsEp0101List.do>)

History, “Christian Nationalism,” and Neoliberal Politics in Hungary

Yudai Anegawa

The purpose of this paper is to place memory politics, especially based upon their “European” characteristics, in the context of political development amid European universalism (liberal values) and citizenship in contemporary Hungary. I use the term “politics of citizenship” to refer to politics concerned with inclusion and exclusion as related to a community in which equal social rights are legally and institutionally guaranteed, or, alternatively, as politics against “the others.” As Hungarian political scientist András Bozóki pointed out, “populist and ethno-nationalist rhetoric overshadow the ongoing neoliberal economic policy processes.”¹ Thus, we will eventually deal with memory politics in relation to neoliberal policies.

1. Citizenship Policies of Viktor Orbán's Government

Remarkable features of citizenship policies in Hungary since 2010 can be found in two different but inseparable areas: policies regarding welfare and refugees. The welfare policies of the Hungarian government have widened the economic gap between the “poor” and the strata above them. For example, the government has reduced the standards for and the eligible terms of unemployment benefits, but also introduced a flat tax system. Further, the government either physically excludes the homeless from public spaces and imprisons them. Zsuzsa Ferge, a Hungarian sociologist, points out that Hungary “became the first state in Europe that punished the poor by means of police violence and imprisonment, owing only to their poverty.”² The poor in Hungary currently not only continue to become poorer, but are also treated as if they are criminals.

There is a rumor among the Hungarian public that the poor or homeless receive welfare illegally or, more directly, they are making their living by stealing from others. Prime Minister Viktor Orbán and his government

propagate this rumor, asserting that those who depend on welfare benefits have no will to work and are immoral criminals, stealing the national resources that belong to “normal Hungarians.”³ The poor are excluded from the community of citizens who have legitimate rights to welfare receipt. In fact, a Hungarian sociologist Dorottya Szikra points out, through the “workfare” policies of Orbán’s government, “citizens are entitled to social rights only if they fulfill their work responsibilities,” and “the ‘idle poor’ are increasingly deprived from social rights to any financial assistance.”⁴ The labels of “criminal” and “idle” have been used to justify and hide racism, most notably directed towards Roma people. All the poor, including the Roma, are excluded as racial “others” and immoral criminals.

We can place Hungarian refugee policies since 2015 in the context of these kinds of politics. The government justifies its construction of border fences and its refusal to comply with refugee quotas as “defending European Christianity” against “the ‘most Muslim’ refugees,”⁵ and this kind “of the rhetoric of the crisis relates Roma to migrants.”⁶ Through its “National Consultation” on the refugee policy and subsequent official announcement, Orbán and his cabinet labeled refugees as illegal immigrants, suggesting that they waste national property properly intended for Hungarian families and children. Islamophobia and related racism is veiled behind the pretext of countermeasures against crimes, and refugees, as with Roma or the homeless, are categorized as immoral criminals.⁷ Orbán and his government oppose Western criticism, regarding it as an interference by “moral imperialism.”

In short, we can understand Hungarian politics toward refugees, the poor and Roma, using such dichotomy as “Christian Europe” and “Hungarian traditional families and children” on the one side, and racial “others” cast as criminals, European universalism, and global capitalism on the other. We can comprehend the significance of the Constitutional Amendment (the 2011 Fundamental Law of Hungary) in this context. Western politicians, jurists and intellectuals note that the regime of Fundamental Law and related legislations weakens the idea of social rights, gives precedence to Christian traditional values over the wills of individuals (making it possible to govern the country on the grounds of national moral, tradition, and culture), limits freedom of the

press, and weakens independent judicial power.⁸ In short, this Hungarian Fundamental Law regime challenges the liberal social values of European universalism.

2. The Fundamental Law of Hungary and Memory Politics

These characteristics of the Fundamental Law regime (the Law) are closely connected with the regime's view of national history. We can discern three key elements of Hungary's official history: 1) The belief of the Holy Crown as a symbol of a Christian Kingdom; 2) That the Trianon Treaty is the center of national tragedy; and 3) there occurred two totalitarianism occupations. First, the Fundamental Law refers to the Holy Crown as "embod[ying] the constitutional continuity of Hungary's statehood and the unity of the nation," establishing the "Hungarian State" as having been "built" by "Saint Stephen" (the 1st king of Arpad dynasty), and signifying "the role of Christianity in preserving nationhood." Notably, the Law rejects such words as "constitution" and "republic," which would reflect the people's will and acknowledge revolutions in Hungary's history. The Law suggests that the Hungarian nation-state is constructed on neither the notion of individual people nor even of a community of citizens, but rather, on the tradition of the millennium Christian kingdom embodied by the Holy Crown, which had defended Europe from foreign assaults.

Second, as the Holy Crown idea includes a concept of the Kingdom as a sustained entity, it became a theoretical core for territorial revisionism after WWI and the signing of the Trianon Treaty. If the existence and continuity of the kingdom were a presupposed formulation required for national justice, the Trianon Treaty and the countries associated thereto would have been defined as evil. According to the "Christian nation" idea that grounded interbellum Hungarian irredentism, the nation had a unique tradition of defending Christian civilization against the "uncivilized East," in which its "middle class" (an amalgam of the nobility and bourgeois) had played major roles. However, not only was the "uncivilized East" seen as an enemy, but also included in this definition were western universalist/liberal powers that divided the kingdom,

the philosophy of communism, and also Jewish people in the country, seen as agents of both western and eastern enemies.⁹ Though very few Hungarians today believe in the real possibility of irredentism, some phrases in the Law may evoke a suspicion of Hungarian irredentist ambition among neighboring nations. The phrases include reference to “the Carpatian Basin,” the state’s “responsibility for the fate of Hungarians living beyond its borders,” and the nation’s role to “support the preservation of Hungarian identity and collective rights among them.” Orbán’s cabinet addressed the policy of nationality/citizenship for co-patriots beyond the state’s borders as its first mandate soon after taking power. When the citizenship law was amended, right-wing “political parties legitimized the law as a measure that would ‘heal spiritual Trianon.’”¹⁰

Third, policies similar to those in the interwar period must be explained and justified somehow, and one manner is through manipulation of the past. The most obvious example is the Memorial for the Victims of the German Invasion, which many people consider to be camouflage for past crimes, including the Holocaust, engaged in by the Hungarian nation from the interbellum to WWII, because the Memorial suggests the representation of Germans as evil and Hungarians as innocent.¹¹ In addition, the government restored street and place names in use before the 1944 German occupation and communist regime. For the current government, therefore, Hungary’s racist policies enacted during the interwar period should be revisited. The Law declares that the years from 1944, when Hungary lost its sovereignty, to 1990, when it regained it, was an exceptional age for Hungary. The acquittal of Hungary’s interbellum regime is firmly connected with its identification with fascism and communism.

This kind of official state-sponsored “understanding” of the past, consisting of three different but inseparable elements, affected policy-makers even before Orbán’s ascension to power in 2010, especially in the period of the first Orbán’s government from 1998 to 2002. The Status Law in 2001 served as a prehistory for the current nationality/citizenship policy. At the Millennium of the Hungarian Kingdom in 2000, the Holy Crown of Hungary was relocated from the Hungarian National Museum to the Hungarian Parliament building, which altered its significance from “cultural property” to “political symbol for the

state.”¹² The House of Terror Museum opened in 2002, exhibiting the stories of the “Two Occupations (by the totalitarian powers),” the concept which makes the interbellum Hungarian history innocent.¹³ We should examine the further development of history politics in the last decade so that we can understand the connection between memory and citizenship politics more clearly.

3. Anti-Neoliberalism and a History of “Internal Enemies”

Both the politics of citizenship and the politics of history of Orbán's government are closely related to anti-neoliberal politics. Hungary's regime change in 1989 and its accession to the European Union (EU) in 2004 were steps towards neo-liberalization. In particular, leftist governments (i.e., the Socialist Party and Liberal Democrat League) were eager to carry out marketization and privatization of Hungary's economy and reduce its state budgets. Their neo-liberal policies included the reduction of welfare budgets and the introduction of partial privatization of pension funds, greatly impacting the middle class. Orbán was able to succeed in the 2010 general election primarily due to his criticism of these neo-liberal policies. Bozóki pointed out that “middle class populism jockeyed around hand-in-hand with the exclusion of lower classes and the unemployed from the nation.”¹⁴ Orbán's government's policies toward the poor have been intimately connected with policies that favor the middle class, such as improved supports for families with children and the shift of the welfare system from benefit-based to tax deduction-based. As Szikra points out, there has occurred a “redistribution from poor to rich families.”¹⁵

The neo-liberal policies of the previous leftist governments (before 2010) were closely associated with Hungary's accession to the EU. Based on recommendations from both the IMF and the World Bank, the EU requires candidate countries to introduce not a European, but an American system of welfare.¹⁶ Hungary's accession was legitimized by the retrospective narrative that it had traditionally developed European-oriented reforms and achieved progress, which would culminate in its joining the EU. Hungarian history, from the building of the Kingdom by St. Stephen the First, through Imre Nagy in 1956, the Kadar Era, and especially including the regime transition in 1989 and

subsequent EU accession, can be explained through this kind of narrative. The Socialist Party could regard itself as a successor of a reform-oriented political power, i.e. social democrats, since the 1980's in this framework¹⁷. This is how the left connected “Hungarian nation” and “European-ness.”

Orbán's government has devised another kind of historical narrative, developing its original ideas based on the concept of being a “Christian nation,” which is used to seemingly exclude elements such as the poor, Roma people, the European Union, European liberal universalism, “reform and progress” Social-Democrats, and Neo-liberalism from Hungary's national identity. He emphasizes the historical formulation that Hungarians have always been threatened by the risk of “internal enemies” and “traitors” acting as the agents of western liberals and the communist Soviet Union. The regime change in 1989 is also considered to have been a result of Socialist betrayal of the Hungarian people's expectations. Those “internal enemies” (i.e., Soviet agents) who had deprived the nation of its private properties by way of “nationalization” in the past, have been turned into “red capitalists,” privatizing the national properties today as if they are agents of the EU, IMF, or global capitalism.¹⁸ From this right-wing viewpoint, liberal parties and intellectuals who criticize the government and protest the labeling of refugees, Roma and the poor as “criminals,” are in turn labeled “traitors” as well as “former communists.” They are convinced that the Central European University is an agent of George Soros, a symbol of global capitalism and a “supporter” of the refugees who “invade” Hungary. Obviously, the politics that fabricated “internal enemies” and assault them as political targets are closely associated with racism. This is the very junction at which memory politics and citizenship policies converge.

4 . Conclusion

In conclusion, we have examined the role played by the narratives, produced in the last decade, of Hungarian national history, along with citizenship politics in Hungary. These narratives were made for/along criticism against neoliberal policies that have seriously impacted the country's middle classes. At the same time, however, they are combined with Orbán's neoliberal

politics in which the redistribution from the poor to the rich is justified by criminalizing and racializing the poor and the “others.” In other words, memory politics in Hungary have played a decisive role in legitimizing the critical but contradictory attitudes toward neoliberalism.

Interestingly enough, not only historical narratives, but also recent citizenship politics in contemporary Hungary, share common features with those in the interwar period. At that time, morality on the ground of the normative family image and the ethics of labor was identified as the basis for “usefulness” and “security” in civil society: the poor were classified, hierarchically arranged, and excluded on the ground of this standard. The government also promoted the principle of “work instead of welfare,” while at the same time also connecting these policies to its racist and anti-Semitic policies. This similar connection of the history and citizenship politics in these two periods suggests that we should study memory politics not as an independent topic, but as an aspect of politics regarding inclusion and exclusion in civil society as well as at national levels. We must of course be thoughtful, and not exaggerate continuity or recurrence. However, I think that our attention to such connections will enrich the comparative studies of memory politics.

¹ András Bozóki, The illusion of inclusion: configurations of populism in Hungary, In: Michal Kopeček and Piotr Wciślik eds., *Thinking Through Transition: Liberal Democracy, Authoritarian Pasts, and Intellectual History in East Central Europe After 1989*, CEU Press, 2015, p. 307.

² Ferge Zsuzsa, *Vágányok és vakvágányok a társadalompolitikában: válogatott tanulmányok*, Budapest: L'Harmattan Kiadó, 2012, p. 235.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 234.

⁴ Dorottya Szikra, Democracy and welfare in hard times: the social policy of the Orbán Government in Hungary between 2010 and 2014, *Journal of European Social History*, 24(5), 2014, pp. 492-493.

⁵ Miklós Haraszti, Behind Viktor Orbán's war on refugee in Hungary, *New Perspective Quarterly*, 32(4), October 2015, pp. 37-38.

⁶ Annastiina Kallius, Daniel Monterescu & Prem Kumer Rajarama, Immobilizing mobility: border ethnography, illiberal democracy, and the politics of the “refugee crisis” in Hungary, *American Ethnologist*, 43(1), 2016, p. 8.

⁷ Haraszti, op. cit.; Kallius, Monterescu & Rajarama, op. cit.

⁸ Gábor Attila Tóth ed., *Constitution for a Disunited Nation: On Hungary's 2011 Fundamental Law*, Budapest and New York: Central European University Press, 2012.

⁹ Gergely Jenő, A „keresztény-nemzet” ideológia (1919-1945), In: *Egy letűnt korszakról 1919-1945*, Budapest: Kossuth Kiadó, 1987, pp. 71-92.

¹⁰ Bartek Pytlas, Radical-right narratives in Slovakia and Hungary: historical legacies, mythic overlaying and contemporary politics, *Patterns of Prejudice*, 47(2), 2013, p. 164.

¹¹ Kovács Mónika, Globális és lokális holokausztemlékezetek, In: Randolph L. Braham és Kovács András sz., *A holokauszt Magyarországon hetven év múltán: történelem és emlékezet*, Budapest: Múlt és Jövő Könyvkiadó, 2015, pp. 198-219.

¹² Brigid Fowler, Nation, state, Europe and national revival in Hungarian party politics: the case of the millennial commemorations, *Europe-Asia Studies*, 56(1), 2004, pp. 57-83.

¹³ Kovács, op. cit.

¹⁴ Bozóki, op. cit., p. 307.

¹⁵ Szikra, op. cit., p. 488.

¹⁶ Zsuzsa Ferge, The changed welfare paradigm: The individualization of the social, *Social Policy & Administration*, 31(1), 1997, p. 36; Zsuzsa Ferge & Gábor Juhász, Accession and social policy: The case of Hungary, *Journal of European Social Policy*, 14(3), 2004, pp. 234-236.

¹⁷ James Mark, Muriel Blaive, Adam Hudek, Anna Saunder & Stanislaw Tyska, 1989 After 1989: remembering the end of communism in East-Central Europe, In: Michal Kopeček & Piotr Wciślik eds., *Thinking through Transition: Liberal Democracy, Authoritarian Pasts, and Intellectual History in East Central Europe after 1989*, Budapest – New York: CEU Press, 2015, pp. 463-503; Fowler, op. cit.

¹⁸ Anna Seleny, Revolutionary road: 1956 and the fracturing of Hungarian historical memory, In: Michael Bernhard and Jan Kubik eds., *Twenty Years After Communism: The Politics of Memory and Commemoration*, Oxford University Press, 2014, pp. 37-59; Andreas Pribersky, The fight for the national legacy becomes a fight for political legitimacy: Hungary 2006 as a (Central) European example, *Politická Misao*, 45(5), 2008, pp. 219-234.

Citizenship and Memory in Eastern Europe and East Asia: A Comparison

Carol Gluck

This group of papers underlines the importance of moving outside our respective national or regional contexts to understand the commonalities in the formation and maintenance of public memory. First, let me point out the striking commonalities in contemporary memories of the Second World War in East Asia and Eastern Europe. These commonalities emerged clearly in the years after the end of the Cold War, when a combination of geopolitical and domestic change unleashed new waves of war memory in both regions. The renewed memory surges followed decades of what in Eastern Europe might be called “national memories postponed,” similar to what I see as Japan’s “war memory finally unfrozen.”

Under the Cold War framework – Japan dominated by the United States, East and Central Europe by the Soviet Union – the nations’ war narratives were not entirely of their own making. The Soviet version of the anti-fascist narrative even (and ironically) included East Germany in an allegedly united struggle against Nazism, omitting such episodes as wartime Soviet occupations, the Holocaust by bullets, and other war experiences. Japan was heir to the Pacific War narrative created by the United States, which ran from Pearl Harbor to Hiroshima, thus excluding the China War, which began in 1937 and was the reason for the attack on Pearl Harbor in the first place.

Liberated from the Cold War narratives in the 1990s, Eastern European nations returned to the 1940s and told the story of the war over again, but in their own terms, with the added perspective of the postwar decades of Soviet domination. The evocation of double occupation by Nazis and Soviets – and in the Baltics “triple occupation” by Soviets, Nazis, and Soviets again – emphasized both the Soviet and Nazi depredations of national independence. In Hungary and elsewhere, the new national narratives collapsed Nazi wartime actions with postwar communist rule. And the nationalistic tenor of these

Comment

narratives created geopolitical contention between Russia and Poland, Russia and the Baltics, Germany and the Czech Republic, Russia and Ukraine, and so on. The new geopolitics of war memory fed the heated hostility around the anniversaries of the end of the war in 1995, 2005, and 2015. In contrast with Western Europe, which by 1995 had come to enough of a consensus about the war that French, German, and other leaders could stand together on the same dais, the political choreography in Eastern Europe proved difficult in regard to which statesmen would be invited, or accept an invitation, to which national commemorations. From the Baltics to the Balkans war memory was central in the reframing of national history for the sake of national unity, national identity, and national stature, with ongoing international repercussions.

The same was true in East Asia. After the end of the Cold War, Chinese and South Koreans called on Japan to confront its wartime actions in Asia, so long absent from the U.S. sponsored narrative of the Pacific War. Japanese faced one memory issue after another: the so-“comfort women,” former sex slaves of the Japanese imperial army; the Nanjing Massacre; thirty-five years of oppressive colonial rule in Korea. A change in the name of the conflict to the Asia-Pacific War finally acknowledged the importance of Japanese aggression on the continent. But the politics of war memory only grew more heated with the years, as the war figured centrally in the nationalistic refiguring of national histories in each country, creating similar geopolitical tensions as in Eastern Europe. From demands for apology and compensation to victims to territorial claims over disputed islands, war memory continues to cloud relations between Japan and its neighboring countries. This commonality explains why some say that in East Asia and Eastern Europe, the postwar period truly began only in the 1990s.

That said, I agree with the previous comment that memory politics and the politics of citizenship in both East Asia and Eastern Europe are driven first and foremost by domestic political and economic factors in the context of a uncertain post-Cold-War international order. This combination helps to explain Xi Jinping in China, Abe Shinzō in Japan, Viktor Orban in Hungary, Law and Justice in Poland, Putin in Russia and others. And despite the vast differences

Comment

among these societies, I think it important to note the commonalities as we make comparative connections.

My second point has to do with citizenship and nationality, concerning, for example, the way these words are used differently in these papers. The term “citizenship” now includes a multiplicity of meanings. Nineteenth-century ideas of citizenship aligned citizenship with nationality. The imperatives of the modern nation-state in its nineteenth-century form demanded that citizens had to know and identify themselves as French, Danish, or Japanese nationals, speak a single national language, learn in national schools, and the rest. This was ethnic only in the sense that an identity was imputed to the people as a whole, for citizenship was in essence national. After World War I, ethnicization drove the policy of national self-determination and population exchanges: the Greeks out of Turkey to Greece; the Turks out of Greece to Turkey, and the like. This is also the background for Sara Park’s paper on “ideology or racism” in postwar Japanese immigration controls, which were indeed about ethnicity, distinguishing, deporting, and discriminating against Koreans and Chinese in the process of creating the new postwar myth of Japanese social homogeneity. One might see this as a transformation from the nation-state to the ethnic nation. Seung-Min Lee has suggested a nice term for this: ethnicizenship, which melds ethnicity and citizenship.

After the Second World War the deportation of Koreans, including those born in Japan as well as the repatriation of Japanese from Korea, was carried out under the aegis of the U.S. occupation authorities, and this was before the onset of anti-communist policies. Indeed, the Americans seem to have felt more strongly about the ethnic nation than did the Japanese, at least in the beginning. Of course, Japanese found the idea congenial, since they had long discriminated against Koreans. Nonetheless, it was the Americans who determined that only Japanese should live in the home islands and only Koreans in the Korean peninsula. The occupation even returned Okinawans from the mainland to Okinawa, despite the fact that Okinawa was an integral part of the Japanese empire and that many of those returned had never set foot on Okinawa. Twelve million ethnic Germans were expelled from Eastern

Comment

Europe after the war, and after independence, the Algerian French returned to France. Many such examples make clear how strong the idea of the ethnic nation had become by the late twentieth century.

Another phase that began during the same decades saw a growing emphasis on citizenship beyond borders. Germany had long made a legal link between citizenship and being German by blood and kinship. But the papers here show an expansion of citizenship to diasporas since the 1990s, which relaxed the earlier requirements for citizenship. If a person could speak Hungarian, that was good enough for citizenship according to the 2010 law. Or if individuals were descended from a Korean generation deemed heroic as exiles detained by the Soviets or Chinese, then as an “overseas Korean,” they were eligible for South Korean citizenship as stipulated by an 1899 law. Romanian laws date from 1991 and 1993; Hungarian from 2001 and 2010. In short, the category of diasporic citizenship expanded over the past thirty years. This is a legal category, based neither on blood nor residence: a new Hungarian citizen need not live in Hungary. Just as ideas of citizenship, nationality, and ethnicity were historically constructed, so, too, were these new categories of citizenship. And like the older ideas, they were being differently constructed around the world but in similar ways.

My third point relates to inclusion and exclusion, the terms used by Yudai Anegawa, which relate to all the papers. Citizens are always defined in terms of those who are aliens, who is included by who is excluded. Although the definition of internal others does change over time, there is also dispiritingly little change in many cases. In Eastern and Central Europe, Roma and Jews all too often remain the excluded internal others. Orban employs anti-Roma policies and rhetoric, evoking age-old stereotypes, which he now extends to refugees as well. Koreans in Japan still suffer discrimination, and then there are the non-citizens in Estonia. What Seung-Min Lee here calls the politics of citizenship forms the background for all the immigration restrictions, laws, policies directed at these others within. Economic factors often underlie this politics. When the middle classes feel aggrieved, immigrants and internal others become the target, whether it's Orban's Hungary or Trump's America.

Comment

Old discrimination gains renewed purchase in times of socio-economic change, while other axes of inclusion and exclusion run along geopolitical rather than socioeconomic lines.

Some hostilities are traditional, between Russia and Poland, for example. Others relate to the changing world. Professor Anegawa points out that Orban's rhetoric lumps "criminals" like the Roma, the poor, the homeless, together with liberal Europeans, the EU, global capitalists, and George Soros as undesirable others. These odd couplings derive in part from regional relations within the EU, a political entity of recent origin. In East Asia the main regional challenge is the rise of China. There is as yet only faint glimmers of a potential AU, Asian Community, so it is national hostilities that hold sway. The conflicts over war memory have created new generations of young South Koreans, Chinese, and Japanese who have learned to revile one another over the past twenty years, prey to what I call "hate nationalism," the node where the politics of memory and citizenship intersect.

As a fourth point, I'd like to suggest something on the order of a "global geometry of citizenship." What is the effect of creating citizens beyond borders? How does contemporary diasporic citizenship tie permanent emigrants who do not intend ever to return to, or live for the first time, in their nominal "home" country? There have been "overseas Chinese" for centuries, in greatest numbers in Southeast Asia – some fifty million today – and around the world. The Chinese government is now seeking to include more Chinese living abroad as "sons and daughters of the Chinese nation and descendants of the dragon." "Overseas Koreans, in contrast, are a recent phenomenon. Singapore, the home of many overseas Chinese, has established a "diaspora strategy" to make use of the capacities of Singaporeans abroad for development at home, and other countries in Latin America, Africa, Europe are doing the same. So-called hyphenated Americans increasingly engage in political and economic affairs in their countries of ancestral origin, as Indian-Americans, for example, do in India. Theirs is a different politics of memory that includes subsequent generations with no experiential ties to the home country in ethnic and

Comment

cultural identities that stress both sides of the hyphen (Indian and American) in new ways.

Today we have been discussing how memory affects citizenship, so that we have to think about what strengthened diasporic ties means for practices of citizenship. Then there is the fact that diasporas often hold stronger memory claims than the people they are remembering. Third-generation Armenians in Europe and North America have long been fierce advocates for international recognition of the Armenian genocide, sometimes to the detriment of existing Armenian communities in Turkey. Memory activists among Chinese- and Korean-Americans and Chinese- and Korean Canadians have contributed greatly to raising international demands for Japan to confront its wartime actions in Asia. They do so as citizens of the United States or Canada and participants in the identity politics of those countries, but also as bearers of a counter-memory in East Asia.

A relevant question here is why governments are reaching for citizens beyond borders. Motivations obviously differ. We can see why Erdogan wants Turks resident in Germany to vote (for him) in the Turkish election (which two-thirds of them did in 2018). Orban courted voters among overseas Hungarians, whose numbers had swelled since the expanded citizenship law of 2010, perhaps counting on the fact that diasporas frequently hold rather conservative views of the country they do not live in. Economics, of course, is another reason for government interest in diasporas: not only remittances, which are huge in global aggregate (India receives the most, China next), but also investment from abroad. Orban may not want Soros' money, but he doubtless would welcome support from politically like-minded wealthy émigrés. There are other reasons as well for expanding citizenship beyond borders, which affects notions of citizenship and practices of memory as well as the relationship between the two.

My fifth point has to do with memory itself and the commonalities among the narratives discussed in the papers. Overseas Koreans are presented as independence fighters and national victims of colonialism, two characteristics that form the basis for citizenship. China's national narrative juxtaposes five

Comment

thousand years of glorious history against the resilience after a “century and a half of humiliation” by imperial powers. Hungary harks back to the Treaty of Trianon as the moment of national betrayal, while the Baltics fasten on the Molotov–Ribbentrop Pact of 1940 as the peak of Soviet perfidy. These highly selective national narratives are woven into the discourse on citizenship, as we’ve seen in the quotations from the Romanian and Hungarian laws. In Eastern Europe all are victims of Nazism and Communism together, as exhibited in the House of Terror in Budapest. Poland has its heroes and martyrs, on the one hand, and its victims of Nazism and Communism on the other. All exemplify what Jie-Hyun Lim calls “victimhood nationalism.” The Chinese and Koreans are victims of Japanese imperialism, and the Japanese are victims of the atomic bomb. Another question then is why countries, including those as strong as China, are so drawn to victimhood nationalism. It isn’t necessarily either obvious or commonsensical that victimization should have become the common coin of national memory. It certainly was not the case in nineteenth-century nation-states, and is likely not to remain the case forever. So why this historical commonality at this time?

The constructed narratives of victimhood nationalism often share a retro nostalgia for a better, if not a golden, age. For Putin, it is the Russian empire – and Stalin. For Hungary, Professor Anegawa tell us, the interwar years are seen as good, before the arrival of Nazism. Like the narratives of victimhood, these evocations of earlier periods are selective fairy-tales of memory rather than factual renderings of history. One might call this esteem of interwar Hungary “illiberal memory,” which fits with Orban’s embrace of “illiberal democracy.” These uses of the past I see as a problem in the politics of memory rather more than in the politics of citizenship.

The politics of memory has many uses: it can create national unity, it can address past grievances; it can pursue justice; and it can foster reconciliation. Much of the work on memory since the 1990s has recognized the beneficial aspects of memory. But we also know how divisive and negative memory can be, as these papers show so well, in that it is clear that people within and across societies do not all agree to tell – or to believe in – these selective stories of

Comment

inclusion and exclusion, of national and nationalistic identity. Societies have divided memories internally and of course geopolitically, as Professor Hashimoto has shown in his book, national memories can be both divisive and dangerous. The right wing feeds off the backlash against what the French call the “duty to remember.” You hear it in the assertion that Hungarians are all Christians together and in the negative remarks in Eastern Europe on the emphasis on Holocaust memory as a Western European obsession. The papers today show that memory is both beneficial and dangerous in national, regional, and global terms, and that it is our responsibility as scholars and as citizens to practice as informed and complex a memory politics as we possibly can.

Citizenship as moral capital in Eastern Europe and East Asia: comment

Zuzanna Bogumił

I would like to start with a quick general remark on all three papers. They show that it is far too early to declare the end of national citizenship and proclaim the arrival of global, transnational, or post-national citizenship. All papers argue that national citizenship holds merit and is strengthened by the enactment of newer and newer laws. The papers also confirm that the discussion is not about national citizenship, but rather ethno-citizenship, for new regulations do not concern the migrants but the ethnic kin.

Sara Park's paper is a historical one. The paper presents the process of how Koreans as an ethnic group was understood and how the statuses of Koreans were legalized in postwar Japan. However, in the last sentence of her paper, Park claims that "the category of Korean is still used today". Does the statement imply that the manner in which the image of "Koreans" was constructed in postwar Japan has come to affect the manner in which the Koreans are perceived nowadays in Japan? Where there some other laws, later adopted, which changed the understanding of Korean? As shown by Park, these questions are highly pertinent for if the legislation adopted in the postwar period was very strongly inspired by the Alien forces, changing the law would mean de-colonialization or de-westernization of the understanding of citizenship.

Seung-Min Lee's paper is a fascinating study on the way the Korean citizens abroad and ethnic Koreans of foreign citizenship become members of the national community, and how later owing to new legislations, some amongst them are excluded from this community. However, Seung-Min Lee does not explain the manner in which he understands this exclusion. She does not explain why Koreans of foreign citizenship were excluded from the national community. A question that arises is whether these changes in legislations

provoked by changes in memory about this particular ethnic-kin or by some economic reasons?

Yudai Anegawa in his paper provides a detailed picture of contemporary Hungarian citizenship politics. He presents how the enactment of a new legislation law instigates the exclusion of more and more groups, or to put it in other words, marginalized in the society. This paper primarily deals with the internal Hungarian politics and perfectly fulfills the objective of the Constantin Iordachi paper on dual citizenship and reimagined national communities in post-communist Hungary. The key concept that Anegawa uses in explaining Hungarian politics is “Christian Nationalism,” mentioned in the title of his paper. While this idea is seductive, however, it requires some clarification. The point to be noted is that what Anegawa calls Christian nationalism is rather, a manifestation of national heritage. The uses of past described by him are uses of “religious symbols and narratives as Hungarian” one rather than Christian. After Geneviève Zubrzycki, one may describe this process as ‘the secularization of religion and religious symbols through their political instrumentalization and then their re-sacralization as national symbols’¹.

The last paper by Constantin Iordachi dealt with the problem of using citizenship as a “toll” for nation building across state borders. This phenomenon is highly problematic and such legislations are opposed by the neighboring states. Constantin Iordachi in his paper shows how enactment of such a legislation ignites a reaction and enactment of a similar legislation by the neighboring countries.

The Status Law enacted by Hungary resembles the Overseas Korean Act. The laws represent the same process, namely trans-sovereign nationalism, which aims to reconstitute the nation across borders and achieve “national reunification” without changing the borders². We also see similar processes

¹ Zubrzycki, Geneviève, *The Crosses of Auschwitz: Nationalism and Religion in Post-Communist Poland* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006, p. 220).

² Edith Oltay, “Concepts of Citizenship in Eastern and Western Europe,” *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae, European and Regional Studies*, 11.1 (2017), 43–62
<<https://doi.org/10.1515/auseur-2017-0003>>.

Comment

taking place in Eastern Europe and East Asia. However, this trans-sovereign nationalism is dealt differently in Europe and Asia. Europe has supranational legislation concerning the EU citizenship. For instance, the European convention on Nationality, adopted in 1997, accepts multiple citizenship and promotes de-ethnicization of citizenship. While countries may enact their own laws (Hungary serves as a great example), however, the national laws should correspond with the European law. The case of East Asia is different, for there is no such supranational, global, or transnational legislation, which regulate national regulations.

My last comment, perhaps the most important comment is on the uses of memory and history in the understanding of citizenship. Having read all four papers, I argue that it is not the memory itself, but rather the history politics, which is crucial in understanding this process. If the memory is considered seriously in the construction of citizenship, memory would rather construct a global or de-nationalized citizenship. Such citizenship would be fragile and inclusive of the different voices in the past. However, as all the four authors showed, the past is used in the construction of the citizenship not only to provide voice to certain groups, but also to help acquire moral capital for the state. To explain my arguments, I refer to the book written by Polish sociologists, Michał Łuczewski titled “Historical politics: moral capital in the time of late modernity”³. Łuczewski claims that in the period of late modernity, economic capital becomes less and less important and the significance of the moral capital increases. The birth of history politics refers to the uses of different memory media for the construction and reconstruction of moral capital of the national community. Łuczewski analyzed modern museums in Germany, Poland and Russia as the result of the respective states’ historical politics. I would like to argue that the legislation of citizenship is an important medium in acquiring such a moral capital. This is necessary to be discussed together with other manifestations visible today that talk about returning to

³ Michał Łuczewski, *Kapitał Moralny. Polityki Historyczne w Późnej Nowoczesności* (Kraków: Ośrodek Myśli Politycznej, 2017).

Comment

the past. By defining the citizenship, the state constructs story about its ancestors, which carries strong moral power.

Based on such a perspective, citizenship can be perceived as a historical compensation for the injustices ethnic kin experienced in the neighboring countries in the past. As the ethnic kin suffered at the hands of the other, their story carried strong moral component; thus, the current state that remembers this story becomes a moral subject. It is through such ways that a nation acquires a strong moral capital, which may be used in its political fights, both at the internal and international level.