

Are North Korean Compatriots “Korean”?

The Ramification of Ethnic Nationalism in South Korea during the Syngman Rhee Era (1948-1960)

I. Introduction

Following the Liberation of Korea from the Japanese colonial rule on August 15, 1945, the United States (the US) and the Soviet Union (the USSR.) occupied the southern and the northern part of the Korean peninsula respectively along the 38th parallel, which led to the establishment of the Republic of Korea (the ROK; South Korea) on August 15, 1948, and of the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (the DPRK; North Korea) on September 9, 1948. As a result, *Chosŏn minjok* (the Korean nation), who had “imagined”¹ to share a common bloodline, language, culture, and history for more than thousands of years, was virtually divided into two separate states. Borrowing Gellner’s famous phrase, this means that the “nationalist principle” which holds that “the political and the national unit should be congruent” was “violated” in the Korean peninsula with “one nation, two states.”²

Then, after the division of Korea, how was South Koreans’ notion of “we, the people of Korea (*uri taehan kungmin*)” who “imagined,” or were socially recognized, to share a common national identity?³ Who was included into, and was excluded from, “we, the people of Korea”? Especially, did South Koreans’ notion of “we, the people of Korea” include North Korean compatriots (*pukhan tongp’o* or *ibuk tongp’o*), residing in North Korea which the constitution of the ROK stipulated as a part of the ROK’s territory but over which the ROK was not able to exert its jurisdiction, or exclude them? Focusing on these questions, this study examines the ramification of ethnic nationalism in South Korea during the Syngman Rhee era (1948-1960).

For data collection, it searched columns and editorials of three Korean newspapers, *Chosŏn-ilbo*, *Tongailbo* and *Kyŏnghyangsinmun*, using newspaper search engines – *Chosŏn-ilbo* at <http://kiss.kstudy.com> and *Tongailbo* and *Kyŏnghyangsinmun* at <http://newslibrary.naver.com> – from the establishment of the ROK on August 15, 1948, to the resignation of the President Syngman Rhee on April 26, 1960, with such keywords as “*pukhan tongp’o* (North Korean compatriots),” “*ibuk tongp’o* (compatriots of the North),” “*kungmin* (nationals or the people),” “*minjok* (nation or ethnic),” “*kyŏre* (nationals or the people),” etc.⁴

Analyzing these newspaper columns and editorials,⁵ this study demonstrates that, following the division of Korea in 1948, Korean nationalism ramified, at least in South Korea, into three different but closely related variants, each of which did not deny that historically all Koreans belonged to one nation on the basis of a common bloodline and shared ancestry, but defined the current boundaries of “we, the people of Korea” differently: 1) “*Tanilminjok* (one homogeneous nation) nationalism” which included not only South Koreans but also North Korean compatriots into “we, the people of Korea,” 2) “anticommunist nationalism” which included South Koreans and “patriotic compatriots (*aeguk tongp’o*)” of North Korea into “we, the people of Korea” while excluding North Korean “commies (*kongsan tobae*),” and 3) “*Taehanmin’guk* (the great ROK) nationalism” which included South Koreans only into “we, the people of Korea.” In doing so, this study suggests that though the three variants coexisting in those days, the balance among them shifted gradually from *Tanilminjok* nationalism to *Taehanmin’guk* nationalism as the division of Korea solidified, in particular, after the Korean War (1950-1953).

Previous studies on Korean nationalism emphasize its ethnic nature, and argue that Koreans have developed an ethnic notion of the nation which assumes the Korean nation as an

ethnically homogeneous *Tanilminjok* and treats all Koreans (including not only South Koreans but also North Korean compatriots) as descendants of *Tan 'gun* (the mythic progenitor of the Korean nation) belonging to the same ethnic nation regardless of their place of residence, legal citizenship, and ideology.⁶ For example, Andre Schmid demonstrates that since the early 20th century, Korean nationalists like Sin Ch'aeho, Chŏng Inbo, and Ch'oi Namsŏn have envisioned the Korean nation (*minjok*) as an ethnically defined “transcendent entity,” which existed through a common bloodline independently from the rise and fall of individual states, and argues that “ethnic nationalism” as such continues to prevail in South and North Korea even today.⁷ According to him, “The definition of the *minjok* as a subjectivity that transcends the ephemeral existence of states remains poignant in a period when two rival states continue to vie for legitimacy” and, as a result, “[though] two state, one *minjok*, describes the current condition of the peninsula,” “the *minjok* united as a single state remains the ideal [on both sides of the Korean peninsula].”⁸ That is, despite the division of Korea in reality, Schmid suggests, South Koreans still maintain that all Koreans of South and North Korea belong to the same ethnic nation sharing a common bloodline.

Similarly, Gi-Wook Shin also defines Korean nationalism as “ethnic nationalism” and argues that, under the influence of ethnic nationalism which first emerged in the early 20th century, South Koreans have developed “national identity based on shared bloodline and ancestry.” According to him, South Koreans “consider ‘blood’ the most important criterion of defining the Korean nation,” and believe that “[because] our nation has a single bloodline” “Koreans are all brothers and sisters regardless of residence and ideology.” Citing a survey which he conducted in the fall of 2000 in South Korea, Shin even points out that South Koreans regard “North Korean people” as belonging to “the same ethnic nation.”⁹

Emphasizing the ethnic nature of Korean nationalism, these studies reveal that bloodline and descent have played the most significant role in defining the boundaries of “we, the people of Korea,” and suggest that Korea’s ethnic nationalism which assumes the Korean nation as an ethnically homogeneous *Tanilminjok* and treats all Koreans as belonging to the same ethnic nation has remained intact since the early 20th century. To be sure, it is undeniably true that ethnic nationalism as such has prevailed in South Korea even after the division of Korea and “has provided the rationale underlying most arguments for reunification.”¹⁰ Following the division of Korea, however, different versions of ethnic nationalism emerged in South Korea. That is, experiencing the reality of the division of Korean, many South Koreans begun to “imagine” the current boundaries of “we, the people of Korea” differently though acknowledging that historically all Koreans of South and North Korea, regardless of their place of residence, belong to the same ethnic nation.

Paying insufficient attention to this ramification of ethnic nationalism in South Korea, previous studies often describe Korean nationalism as a static one, the core of which has remained intact since the early 20th century. They usually argue that, despite the division of Korea into two states, Korea’s ethnic nationalism, that is, *Tanilminjok* nationalism, which treats all Koreans of South and North Korea as descendants of *Tan’gun* belonging to the same *Tanilminjok* continues to prevail both in South and North Korea. To criticize these studies, this study will demonstrates that, after the division of Korea, Korea’s ethnic nationalism ramified, at least in South Korea, into three different but closely related variants: *Tanilminjok* nationalism, anticommunist nationalism, and *Taehanmin’guk* nationalism, and that the balance among them gradually shifted from *Tanilminjok* nationalism to *Taehanmin’guk* nationalism as the division of Korea solidified, in particular, after the Korean War.

In the next section, this study will first examine the origins and developments of *Tanilminjok* nationalism. In section III, it will demonstrate that this version of nationalism continued to persist in South Korea even after the division of Korea. Then, in section IV, it will show that under the influence of anticommunism which functioned as a governing ideology of the Syngman Rhee government in those days, a new version of ethnic nationalism, that is, anticommunist nationalism, which distinguished “commies” from “patriotic compatriots” of North Korea, and excluded the former from “we, the people of Korea” by otherizing them as “anti-nationalists,” emerged in South Korea. In section V, it will also demonstrate that, as the division of Korea solidified gradually, another version of ethnic nationalism, that is, *Taehanmin’guk* nationalism, which included South Koreans only into “we, the people of Korea,” emerged in South Korea as an effort to make the “national” boundaries congruent with the “political” ones of the ROK. In conclusion, it will provide a summary and discuss implications of this study. Let us first examine the origins and developments of *Tanilminjok* nationalism.

II. The Origins and Development of *Tanilminjok* Nationalism

Korea’s ethnic nationalism which assumes the Korean nation as an ethnically homogeneous *Tanilminjok* (one nation) and treats all Koreans as descendants of *Tan’gun* belonging to the same ethnic nation first emerged in the early 20th century. According to Em, in order to understand the reason why this kind of nationalism emerged in Korea in the early 20th century, we should pay attention to the “great enterprise” of Korean nationalist historians (like Sin Ch’aeho, Chŏng Inbo, and Ch’oi Namsŏn) in the early 20th century. In reaction to Japanese colonial discourses on Korea, argues Em, Korean nationalist historians in the early

20th imagined the Korean nation as an “autonomous and sovereign subject of history” which has existed continuously since the very beginning of the history, i.e., since the time of *Tan’gun*, and thereby sought “to achieve political independence and to reclaim dignity and ‘authentic’ identity” of Koreans.¹¹ That is, when Japan had captured both state and territory, they sought to provide Koreans with “an alternative locus for autonomy” by arousing, uniting, and mobilizing the entire Korean population into the Korean nation, which has existed continuously since the beginning of the history and independently from the state.¹²

For example, faced with Japanese colonialism especially after the imposition of the Protectorate (1905), Sin Ch’aeho, in his serialized article entitled “A New Reading of History (*Toksa Sillon*)” published in 1908, depicted the *minjok* (nation) as a transcendent entity which existed through history regardless of the changes of dynasties or courts, or without the state, since *Tan’gun*. As Schmid writes, “Sin believed that the *minjok* was an objective entity that had existed throughout history, regardless of whether people were aware of it.”¹³ Sin thus argued that “national history should not be confused, as it had been by so many of his predecessors, with the history of the state. In his narrative, the *minjok* was not only central but also transcendent, existing – though at times precariously – from the beginning of the history to the present, rising above such temporal phenomena as states. Ephemeral and historic, states were ‘organic bodies composed of the spirit of the *minjok*.’ History was not one of the state, but of a more fundamental matter, the *minjok*.”¹⁴

“Since the time of *Tan’gun*, Sin bemoaned, the *minjok* had never again been unified into a single state. But even while the many states composed of the *minjok* rose and fell, divided and unified, the *minjok* itself remained untouched by the fortunes of these individual states. Thus, for Sin, Koguryŏ was linked to its southern neighbors, Silla and Paekche, through their

common descent from Tan'gun. Despite their internecine wars, the three kingdoms were of the same minjok and, consequently, of the same history. Parhae and Koryŏ, too, were in Sin's eyes two parts of the same whole. In this sense, Sin's conception of the ethnic nation superseded state boundaries. The state, although important to locating and tracing the minjok, was not the repository of Sin's nationalist ideals. Ideally, the state and minjok should be united, although Sin's vision of the ethnically defined national community was independent of the state. Significantly, for an era when Korea was under a Japanese protectorate, the minjok was seen as able to exist on its own without a supporting state structure."¹⁵

During the Japanese Occupation of Korea, however, the influence of this narrative which assumes the Korean nation as an ethnically homogeneous *Tanilminjok*, as descendants of *Tan'gun*, sharing common bloodline, language, culture, and history was limited because Japanese Government-General of Korea prevented this narrative from propagating in Korean society. In particular, from the 1930s, taking a policy of "forced assimilation," it emphasized that "the Japanese and Koreans come from the same ancestors (*Ilŏndongjoron*)" and that "Japan and Korea are one body (*Naesŏnilch'eron*)."¹⁶

It was after the Liberation of Korea that this narrative became a dominant discourse of nationalism in Korean society. Especially, the right wing nationalists made use of this narrative to legitimize their political positions.¹⁷ For example, at the rally for welcoming "the repatriation of the Korean Provisional Government" held on December 19, 1945, Premier Kim Ku emphasized that "the sacred blood of *Tangun* is flowing through blood vessels of all individuals of our nation ... [so] in order to create our sovereign independence and to get rid of the 38th parallel ... all Korean compatriots should unite together like one person."¹⁸ Similarly, following the news that the Foreign Ministers of the United States, the United Kingdom, and

the Soviet Union proposed at the Moscow Conference (December 27, 1945) to have a five-year trusteeship over Korea, the right wing nationalists including Syngman Rhee and Kim Ku, to mobilize opposition against the trusteeship, argued that “given that *Hanminjok* as a homogeneous nation has maintained its independence for more than five thousand years, the proposal to have a trusteeship over Korea is an insult to our nation.” With the nationwide spread of the Anti-trusteeship movement, the narrative that “*Hanminjok* is a homogeneous nation,” which was used as a logical basis for opposing the trusteeship, was also proliferated into Korean society.¹⁹

As a result, during the period of the US Military Government in South Korea, the narrative that “all Koreans, as descendants of *Tangun*, belong to *Hanminjok* regardless of their residence” became a taken-for-granted “myth” of Korean society.²⁰ Under the influence of this “myth,” most of political leaders in South Korea in those days, except some extreme leftists, shared the perception that “North Korean compatriots, as members of *Hanminjok*, belong to ‘we, the people of Korea,’ and South and North Korea should unite together to establish a unified government.”²¹ Even Syngman Rhee, who starting from the *Chǒngŭp* rally on June 3, 1946, continuously insisted the need to establish an independent South Korean government, did not deny that “all Koreans of South and North Korea, as members of *Hanminjok*, belong to one nation.” He just argued that the establishment of an independent South Korean government was required as a means to achieve a unified Korean government in the end.²²

Meanwhile, with the failure of the US-Soviet Joint Commission in October 1947, the United States brought “the Korean issue” to the United Nations (hereafter the UN), which decided on November 14, 1947, to conduct a general election in Korea in accordance with the population ratio of South and North Korea under the supervision of the UN Temporary

Commission on Korea (UNTCOK). The opposition from the Soviet Union, however, made it impossible to realize this decision. The Little Assembly of the UN thus re-decided on February 26, 1948, to conduct a general election only in the region where the UNTCOK could exert its supervision, that is, only in South Korea.

With these changes, a cleavage emerged among political factions in South Korea regarding the question of whether the constituents should include South Korean residents only or both South and North Korean residents together. For example, on the grounds that all Koreans of South and North Korea were to be members of “we, the people of Korea,” Kim Ku, Kim Kyusik, and their supporters demanded that South and North Korea should conduct “a nationwide general election” and thereby establish a unified Korean government.²³ Especially, in his opinion report to the UNTCOK, Kim Ku strongly opposed to the idea of establishing an independent South Korean government and demanded to conduct “a nationwide general election” both in South and in North Korea for establishing a unified Korean government.²⁴

In contrast, though admitting that all Koreans of South and North Korea belonged to one nation, Syngman Rhee and his supporters demanded a step-by-step approach, that is, the establishment of an independent South Korean government first and the establishment of a unified Korean government later. For example, Syngman Rhee announced the following on January 6, 1948, a few days before the arrival of the UNTCOK.

Now the only goal of all parties and societies of South and North Korea is to achieve independence through establishing a unified government. ... At this time, [however] we insist to conduct a transitional election [in South Korea] in a few weeks and days, and then to accomplish the great work through the

cooperation between our representatives and the UN representatives.²⁵

While the debate continued mainly between the above two factions, the domestic and international situations gradually made it inevitable to establish an independent South Korean government through a general election in South Korea only. In accordance with the decision by the Little Assembly of the UN, the US Military Government announced on March 1, 1948, the plan to conduct a general election on May 10, 1948, in South Korea only. As a result, the Constitutional Assembly was formed in South Korea, which eventually led to the establishment of the ROK on August 15, 1948. Finally, with the establishment of the DPRK on September 9, 1948, Korea was officially divided into two separate states. In the following sections, then, let us examine how North Korean compatriots were represented in South Korean newspapers after the division of Korea, with a special focus on the question of whether they were included into “we, the people of Korea,” or excluded from “we, the people of Korea.”

III. *Tanilminjok* Nationalism after the Division of Korea

As mentioned above, with the establishment of the ROK on August 15, 1948 and of the DPRK on September 9, 1948, Korea was virtually divided into two states. Despite the division of Korea, however, *Tanilminjok* nationalism continues to prevail in South Korea. This was partly because the President Rhee and the government, assuming North Korea as an illegitimate state which occupied the Korea’s territory illegally, continued to treat North Korean compatriots as nationals of the ROK. They often justified this notion by arguing that “the UN General Assembly recognized the ROK, the constitution of which stipulated North Korea as a part of its territory, as the only lawful government in the Korean peninsula.” For

them, it was self-evident that the North Korean puppet government (*pukhan koeroe*) occupied the ROK's territory illegally while violating the UN resolutions.

As an example of this notion, in his first administrative policy speech conducted at the National Assembly on September 30, 1948, the President Rhee made it clear that his speech was aimed at “thirty million compatriots (*samch'ŏnman tongp'o*)” which included not only “twenty million (*ich'ŏnman*)” *kungmin* of the ROK but also “ten million (*ilch'ŏnman*)” compatriots of North Korea, and thereby treated North Korean compatriots as nationals (*kungmin*) of the ROK.²⁶ In this speech he also hinted that this notion was based upon the myth of “*Hanminjok* as a homogeneous nation.” The following is an excerpt of the speech.

1. Introduction

... Our Republic of Korea, a homogeneous nation which has maintained a traditional history and a splendid culture since the progenitor *Tan'gun*, has just restored its sovereignty. ... As the President of the new-born ROK at this historical moment of glory, I am very pleased to announce the administrative policy of the government in front of thirty million compatriots within and without the country and of the members of the National Assembly. ...

2. The Characteristics of the ROK as a Nation-State

Our nation is an excellent nation which has maintained the same bloodline and territory while creating common culture and destiny throughout its five-thousand-year-long history. ... Sovereignty is located only in thirty million *minjok*. ...

3. The Policies of the Government

... The government will do its best to realize the unification of South and North Korea for achieving national unity and for controlling the whole territory, and eventually for the national and moral co-prosperity of thirty million compatriots who have had a glittering tradition of five-thousand-year-long history.²⁷

Similarly, Chang Myŏn, who led the delegation to the third UN General Assembly held in Paris, France, insisted in his speech at the First Committee of the UN General Assembly on December 7, 1948, that “the total number of nationals (*kungmin*) of the ROK” was thirty million, which reveals that the ROK government officially included North Korean compatriots as nationals (*kungmin*) of the ROK. The following is an excerpt of the speech.

As a representative of the ROK, I am honored to make a speech in front of the representatives of sovereign states of the world. ... Thirty million *kungmin* of the ROK regarded the UN as a source of the greatest hope.²⁸ ... As the UN Temporary Commission mentioned in its official report, the result of the May 10th election is an expression of the free will of the electorate of the regions of Korea where the Temporary Commission was able to exert its power and two thirds of all Korean nationals (*chŏn hanguk kungmin*) resided. More than two thirds of Korean people (*hanguk inmin*), that is, twenty million, are governing themselves by conducting an election under the supervision of the UN and by establishing a government. The reasonable people will not deny the establishment of our government on the grounds that [the Soviet Union] refused to make one third of

our people (*uri inmin*) participate in the election. ... It is true that one third of our nationals (*uri kungmin*) are still under the restraint. Our National Assembly left one third of seats vacant while waiting for the time when a general election is held in North Korea. ... The government is occupying a half of the Korea's territory and including more than two thirds of the Korea's population, that is, twenty million population.²⁹

Following Chang Myŏn's speech, the UN General Assembly adopted on December 12, 1948, <Resolution 195> with a 48:6:1 ratio of approval, opposition, and abstention. In particular, Article 2 of this resolution states as follows.

Declares that there has been established a lawful government (the Government of the ROK) having effective control and jurisdiction over that part of Korea where the Temporary Commission was able to observe and consult and in which the great majority of the people of all Korea reside; that the government is based on elections which were a called expression of the free will of the electorate of that part of Korea and which were observed by the Temporary Commission; and that this is the only such Government in Korea.³⁰

Though this resolution recognized the government of the ROK as the only “lawful government having effective control and jurisdiction over that part of Korea where the Temporary Commission was able to observe and consult,” that is, over South Korea, the President Rhee and the government interpreted this resolution as recognizing the government

of the ROK as “the only lawful government in the Korean peninsula,” and made use of this resolution to deny the legitimacy of the North Korean regime. Moreover, on the grounds of this resolution, the President Rhee and the government argued that “the North Korean puppet government occupied the ROK’s territory illegally,” and treated North Korea as a part of the ROK’s territory and North Korean compatriots as nationals of the ROK. For example, in the official statement announced on April 4, 1949, after the consultation with the UN Commission on Korea, Im Byöngjik, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, insisted the followings.

▲ Political Foundations of Unification = This government is the only lawful government in Korea [i.e., in the Korean peninsula] in terms that its constitution [stipulates North Korea as a part of its territory] and it has received the absolute support from the United Nations and the recognition from friendly allies of the world. It is a democratic polity established in accordance with the general trend of the world. So it is evident for the government to include North Korea [as its part].³¹

In a similar context, on April 16, 1949, after the consultation with the UN Commission on Korea, Kim Hyosök, the Minister of Domestic Affairs, announced the followings.

▲ The Issue of Korean Unification = Because the government of the ROK is the only lawful government in the whole Korea (*chöñ hanguk*), we do not need to argue any more that North Korea is a territory of the ROK. Korean nation (*hanminjok*) is a homogeneous pure blood nation. There are no religious strife, no

ethnic conflicts, and no antagonism between traditional cultures, which are appearing in foreign countries. We know we are one nation. Ten million compatriots of North Korea are now moaning under dictatorship and suppression. The government of the ROK leaves hundred seats vacant in the National Assembly for North Korean compatriots. We hope that a general election like the May 10th election will be conducted in North Korea as soon as possible.³²

After the outbreak of the Korean War on June 25, 1950, the President Rhee and the government continued to emphasize that North Korea was a part of the ROK and North Korean compatriots were nationals of the ROK. For example, in his “Presidential Instruction to the Compatriots of South and North” announced on October 23, 1950, after the “reclaim” of P’yŏngyang, the President Rhee argued that the government of the ROK would treat North Korean compatriots equally as nationals of the ROK “without any discrimination.”³³ Similarly, in his “Message to North Korean Compatriots” announced on November 23, 1950, the President Rhee also mentioned that the government of the ROK would treat North Korean compatriots as nationals of the ROK and “establish the sovereignty of the ROK in North Korea” by conducting a general election in North Korea.³⁴

As well known, however, the plan to conduct a general election in North Korea could not be realized. Chinese intervention in the Korean War in October, 1950, triggered a retreat of the UN Forces and the ROK army. The war then reached a stalemate in mid-1951 while the fighting continued around the 38th parallel. Accordingly, despite the opposition of the President Rhee, the United States and China began armistice negotiation on July 10, 1951, and came to an agreement on most issues in May, 1952, except the issue of repatriation of prisoners of war.

At that time, many prisoners of the Korean People’s Army (North Korean Army) refused to be “repatriated” to North Korea. Strongly opposing to “the repatriation of anticommunist prisoners,” the President Rhee and the ROK government argued that because North Korean compatriots were nationals of the ROK, these prisoners should be freed in South Korea instead of being “repatriated” to North Korea. For example, in the official statement announced on September 12, 1952, Pyŏn Yŏngt’ae, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, argued as follows.

It is certain that North Korea, like South Korea, is our territory we inherited from our ancestors. North Korean compatriots, who are abused by merciless Communists, are our people whom we should liberate soon. [By the same logic] we should liberate those [prisoners] who refuse to be repatriated and want to fight together with us. ... We should never treat them as foreigners. ... If we treat them as foreigners, this is to treat all our compatriots of North Korea as foreigners. If we approve such a depraved sin, our sovereignty and independence will erode from the inside of ourselves.³⁵

Similarly, in his Congratulatory Speech for Constitution Day, on July 17, 1953, Kim Pyŏngro, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, also argued that the ROK government’s policy to treat North Korean compatriots as nationals of the ROK was based upon “the basic principles of our Constitution.” The following is an excerpt of this speech.

2. Our territorial sovereignty covers the Korean peninsula and its adjacent islands, south of the Yalu and the Tumen, which the Constitution of the ROK

clearly stipulates and has been a historical fact for thousands of years. Any theories of international law cannot deny the fact that when Chinese forces crossing the Yalu River they invaded the ROK. It is the reason why we opposed to the armistice without unification and why we demand unification through advancing to the North on the grounds of territorial sovereignty.

3. The principle of popular sovereignty means that we have the responsibilities to punish communist rebels who are nationals (*kungmin*) of the ROK regardless of their thoughts and residences, to help patriotic compatriots of North Korea, and to protect their freedom and basic principles. If we leave the handling of [the prisoners' issue] to foreigners, this is to damage the principle of popular sovereignty. ... This is the reason why we insist the legitimacy of the release of anticommunist prisoners.³⁶

Despite the opposition of the President Rhee, the Armistice Agreement was finally signed on July 27, 1953, which virtually ended the Korean War. Regardless of this change, however, the President Rhee and the government of the ROK maintained that North Korean compatriots were nationals of the ROK. For example, in his "Announcement to the Whole Nation," released on July 28, 1953, the President Rhee made it clear that his announcement was aimed at "our compatriots of South and North" and, in this way, included North Korean compatriots into "the whole nation."³⁷ Similarly, in "Official Statement Regarding the Transfer of Jurisdiction over the Reclaimed Areas" released on August 12, 1954, Pyŏn Yŏngt'ae, the Prime Minister, argued that "Our government has treated North Korean compatriots, who are in the state of slave under the tyranny of communism, as nationals of the ROK without any discrimination, which

coincides with our national conscience while proving the sovereignty of the ROK.”³⁸

Under this situation, Korean society continued to “imagine” North Korean compatriots as members of “we, the people of Korea.” In particular, the fact that the terms such as “we, thirty million (*uri samch’ŏnman*),” “thirty million compatriots,” “thirty million *minjok*,” “thirty million *kungmin*” were commonly used in newspaper articles to refer to the members of the ROK reveals that not only “twenty million *kungmin*” of the ROK but also “ten million compatriots” of North Korea were included into “we, the people of Korea.” For example, *Tongailbo*’s editorial on August 15, 1948, titled “*Tongnip Chŏngbu Sŏnp’osik ūl Majihayŏ* (Welcoming the Proclamation Ceremony of an Independent Government)” reveals such an inclusive perception by mentioning that “We swear in the name of thirty million *minjok* that we will strive to unify South and North.” Similarly, *Tongailbo*’s editorial on December 31, 1948, titled “*Tananhan Ihae rŭl Ponaemyŏ* (Closing This Eventful Year)” also reveals such an inclusive perception as follows.

On New Year’s Day, the greatest wish of our nation (*uri kyŏre*) was to establish a unified government of South and North which was fully independent and self-reliant. ... The establishment of a unified government of South and North was a common wish of our thirty million Korean nation (*uri samch’ŏnman hanjok*) regardless of whether they reside in South, in North, or abroad, or regardless of age and sex. ... But it is true that the half of our territory is still under the control of foreign nation and a third of compatriots are moaning. ... On the last day of this year, we thirty million *kyŏre* feel the same feelings of joy and sorrow.

As a matter of fact, during the period from January 1, 1948, to December 31, 1960, a total of 172 editorials, 78 *Kyŏngnyangsinmun*'s editorials and 94 *Tongailbo*'s editorials (from August 15, 1948, to April 26, 1960, a total of 164 editorials, 78 *Kyŏngnyangsinmun*'s editorials and 86 *Tongailbo*'s editorials) used the terms, “thirty million,” “we thirty million,” “thirty million compatriots,” “thirty million *minjok*,” “thirty million *kyŏre*,” “thirty million *kungmin*,” “thirty million *hangungmin* (Korean people),” etc. to refer to the “imagined” members of the ROK. In particular, some of these editorials explicitly mentioned the terms “we, thirty million,” “we, thirty million *kyŏre*,” “we, thirty million *kungmin*,” and “we, thirty million *minjok*,” which reveals that despite the division of Korea in reality, Korean society’s “imagined” boundaries of “we, the people of Korea” continued to include not only South Koreans but also North Korean compatriots.³⁹ <Table 1> below shows the number of *Kyŏngnyangsinmun*'s and *Tongailbo*'s editorials which used “thirty million” to refer to the members of the ROK from 1948 to 1960.

<Table 1> The Number of Editorials Mentioning “Thirty Million”

Year	1948*	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954
Newspaper							
<i>Kyŏngnyangsinmun</i>	2	13	1**	0**	46	3	4
<i>Tongailbo</i>	18	27	9***	7	9	6	2
Total	20	40	10	7	55	9	6
Year	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960*	Total
Newspaper							
<i>Kyŏngnyangsinmun</i>	1	4	2	2	0	0	78
<i>Tongailbo</i>	3	6	1	5	0	1	94
Total	4	10	3	7	0	1	172

* From January 1 to December 31 of each year.

** Except the period from June 28, 1950, to December 31, 1951, in which the publication of newspapers was stopped by the Korean War and unavailable for searching.

*** Except the period from June 28, 1950, to October 3, 1950, in which the publication of newspapers was stopped by the Korean War and unavailable for searching.

To justify the inclusion of North Korean compatriots into “we, the people of Korea,” Korean society often relied on the myth of “*Hanminjok* as a homogenous nation,” the dominant discourse of nationalism in those days, which assumed that “all Koreans as descendants of *Tangun* belong to *Hanminjok* regardless of whether they resided in South or North Korea.”⁴⁰ For example, *Kyŏngnyangsinmun*’s editorial on October 3, 1949, titled “*Kaech’ŏn Kukkyŏngjŏl* (On the National Foundation Day)” writes as follows.

4,282 years ago today, *Tangun* founded this country in the Mount *Mani* of *Kanghwa* Island. ... Our history began about five thousand years ago today and [our nation], as a unified homogenous nation under one country, has maintained changeless blood and soul continuously under the same customs and norms, and within the same life zone. ... Korean nation (*hanjok*) has lived together for five thousand years with one blood and one soul. ... Our nation (*kyŏre*) is one. Blood is thicker than water. Commemorating today ... we wish the Communists, who are our compatriots but cannot enjoy the glory of compatriots while wandering in the mud hole, to become Korean nation (*hanjok*) again.

Similarly, *Tongailbo*’s editorial on April 5, 1951, titled “38 *Kyŏlchŏn ŭl Aptugo* (Before

the Fight at the 38th Parallel) published in the middle of the Korean War, mentioned the followings.

Since the Silla's unification, the Yalu and the Tumen River have been known as the boundaries of this territory for thousands of years. The people of this country have been a homogeneous nation sharing a language, customs, and historical destiny. These natural and cultural conditions make it difficult to divide this nation in any form. This nation hates to separate with each other.

The trend to include North Korean compatriots into “we, the people of Korea” on the grounds of the myth of “*Hanminjok* as a homogeneous nation” continued after the Korean War. For example, *Kyŏnghyangsinmun*'s editorial on October 4, 1954, titled “*Kaech'ŏnjŏl ŭl Kinyŏmhanŭn Ŭiŭi* (The Significance to Celebrate the National Foundation Day)” insisted the need of unification by arguing that “South and North Korea are one nation ... developed themselves as a homogeneous nation for about five thousand years while consolidating national solidarity.” Many other editorials in those days also reveal an inclusive perception on the grounds of the myth that “South and North Korea have been one nation for five thousand years since *Tangun*.”⁴¹

At the same time, under the influence of the President Rhee and the government which treated North Korean compatriots as nationals of the ROK on the grounds of the UN's recognition of the ROK, Korean society also made use of the UN's recognition to justify the inclusion of North Korean compatriots into “we, the people of Korea.” For example, *Kyŏnghyangsinmun*'s editorial on December 10, 1948, titled “*Hanguk Sŭngin kwa Kŭmhu ŭi*

Top'yo (The Recognition of the ROK and the Future Chart)" writes as follows.

At last, the Political Committee of the UN General Assembly recognized the ROK as the official central government of Korea with the ratio of 41 to 6. Now, as a result of the UN's recognition, the government of the ROK becomes the only government in Korea. ... But we cannot be satisfied here because there are many tasks left. ... The first is to join in the United Nations despite the opposition of the Soviet block and to become a legitimate member of international organization. The second is to reclaim North Korea, the half of our territory, from the puppet government by abolishing the 38th parallel. ... By restoring completely the territory and the people [we] have maintained for five thousand years, we can prove the full restoration of sovereignty objectively.

Similarly, *Kyŏngnyangsinmun*'s editorial on May 16, 1953, titled "*Pangong P'oro Munje riŭl Nonhaji Mala* (Do Not Discuss the Issue of Anticommunist Prisoners)" emphasized that North Korean compatriots "are a part of the nationals of the ROK," and argued that "anticommunist prisoners" should not be repatriated to North Korea. It writes as follows.

The remaining issue is how to deal with the forty eight thousand prisoners who are held in the ROK and do not want to be repatriated. It is obvious that we cannot repatriate them forcibly. ... Originally, the North Korean puppet government, an illegal group, was established when the Soviet puppets aggressively occupied a part of the territory of the ROK and a part of the nationals

of the ROK which was ... recognized by the United Nations as the only government [in the Korean peninsula]. ... The annexation of North Korean territory and residents has been a national policy of the ROK and what the United Nations originally intended to do. Before 6·25, or after 6·25 and 9·28, millions of North Korean residents returned to the ROK voluntarily against all odds. They are now treated as nationals of the ROK [without discrimination] and fight together with us for the fatherland, the ROK. ... The anticommunist prisoners, now held in the ROK, just returned to their fatherland while participating in the battle involuntarily. In principle, though their current conditions and environments are different, they are not so much different from those nationals of the ROK who were North Korean residents in the past.

In criticizing Menon's proposal to invite the representatives of both South and North Korea to the UN General Assembly, *Kyŏnghyangsinmun's* editorial on January 5, 1957, titled "*Hanguk Munje T'oron esŏ Yuen ūi Inyŏm ūl Palkira* (Clarify the Ideology of the UN When Discussing the Korean Questions)" also denied the statehood of North Korea on the grounds of the myth of "the ROK as the only lawful government." It writes as follows.

Surprisingly, when submitting a revised proposal, Mr. Menon, the representative of India, mentioned that "India recognizes neither South nor North Korea as a government." This is an unforgivable misstatement. ... The government of South Korea, that is, the ROK, was established in accordance with the decision of the UN General Assembly. ... He neglected entirely the fact that

the UN General Assembly recognized the ROK as the only lawful government in the Korean territory (*hanguk p'ando*). ... The Iraq's representative refuted [Mr. Menon] by saying that "Korea is only one and I believe the ROK is representing the whole Korea" and the Philippines's representative mentioned that "historically Korea is only one and, if we invite North Korean representative, this would result in approving the illegal activity [of North Korea], that is, the division of Korea." These remarks express the reality honestly. It is not an exaggeration that Mr. Menon acts like a puppet of the Soviet, though he argues [his proposal] is the most realist one.

Many other editorials and columns of those days also denied the statehood of North Korea on the grounds of the myth of "the ROK as the only lawful government," and treated North Korean compatriots as nationals of the ROK, that is, as members of "we, the people of Korea."⁴² All these reveal that despite the division of Korea in reality, Korean society continued to include North Korean compatriots into "we, the people of Korea" on the grounds of the myths that "all Koreans belong to *Hanminjok* regardless of their residence" and that "the ROK is the only lawful government in the Korean peninsula." In particular, the fact that such terms as "we, thirty-million," "we, thirty-million *kyöre*," "we, thirty-million *kungmin*," and "we, thirty-million *minjok*" were commonly used in newspapers to refer to the members of the ROK reveals that, despite the division of Korea in reality, Korean society's "imagined" boundaries of "we, the people of Korea" continued to include not only South Koreans but also North Korean compatriots.

IV. Anticommunist Nationalism

As examined above, during the Syngman Rhee era, Korean society continued to include North Korean compatriots into “we, the people of Korea” on the grounds of the myth of “*Hanminjok* as a homogeneous nation” and of the myth of “the ROK as the only lawful government.” At the same time, however, under the influence of anticommunism which functioned as a governing ideology of the Syngman Rhee government in those days, Korean society distinguished North Korean compatriots into “commies” and “patriotic compatriots,” and excluded the former from “we, the people of Korea” by otherizing them as “traitors of the nation (*minjok ūi paesinja*) who betray the fatherland and the nation,” “enemies of the nation (*minjok ūi wŏnsu*),” “anti-nationalist elements (*panminjok punja*),” or “obstructors of the unification (*t’ongil ūl panghaehanŭn cha*).”

In particular, Syngman Rhee, who inaugurated as the first president of the ROK on July 24, 1948, led public opinion to this direction.⁴³ For example, in his inaugural speech, the President Rhee distinguished “the communist North Korean compatriots” from other North Korean compatriots by defining the former as “those who intend to destruct national sovereignty” and as “enemies of our whole nation.”⁴⁴ In a similar vein, in his “Message to North Korean Compatriots” released on May 6, 1950, the President Rhee defined “communist elements (*kongsan punja*)” as those “who sell the country to others and try to enslave the nation,” or as “those who cannot be called the same nation,” and announced that the government would “subdue these [communist] elements” and “make it impossible for them to live in the [national] territory.”⁴⁵ The President Rhee also distinguished “patriotic compatriots” who “support the ROK” from “communist leaders” who “blindly follow the Soviet Union” in his “Special Message to the Nation” released on November 25, 1953, “A New Year’s Message

to North Korean Compatriots” released on January 1, 1955, and so on.⁴⁶ Especially, in his “Special Message to Celebrate the Constitution Day” released on July 17, 1956, the President Rhee mentioned the followings.

Even the world knows that the majority of North Korean population support the free ROK. This is the only reason why communist leaders refuse to conduct a fair and open election in North Korea. ... Today we declare again to our patriotic compatriots detained in North Korea that we will welcome [patriotic compatriots] with two arms outstretching. ... What I want to say to North Korean communist leaders today is that they need to change their minds. ... In order to allow [patriotic compatriots of North Korea] to enjoy the rights of equal and free citizens of the ROK, now I am proposing a special amnesty to those communist elements who dominate [patriotic compatriots]. We are now suggesting a way for all North Korean compatriots to return to us and to live a great, dignified, happy, and free life as citizens of the free government which truly represents our whole people.⁴⁷

Under the situation where the President Rhee played the most significant role in forming public opinion, Korean society, following Rhee’s position, also distinguished North Korean compatriots into “commies” and “patriotic compatriots,” and excluded the former from “we, the people of Korea” by otherizing them as “anti-nationalists.” For example, *Tongailbo*’s editorial on May 13, 1949, titled “*Chaju Nosŏn ūi Sŭngni* (The Triumph of the Policy of Self-Reliance)” distinguished ordinary “North Korean compatriots” from “a number of anti-

nationalists who are forming the puppet government of North Korea,” and defined the latter as “those who opposed to the independence [of the nation] and intended to join the Soviet federation.”

Similarly, *Kyŏnghyangsinmun*’s editorial on September 22, 1949, titled “*Kukche Yŏnhap ũn Ch’aekim Tahara* (The United Nations Should Take Its Full Responsibility)” also defined “a group of North Korean puppets” as “those who betrayed the nation, instigated directly or indirectly by the Soviet Union,” or as “a destructive gang, founded illegally by the puppets of North Korea and the Soviet Union.” In the same context, *Kyŏnghyangsinmun*’s editorial on October 8, 1949, titled “*Pangong T’ujaeng kwa Minjok ũi Chillo* (Struggles for Anticommunism and the Way for the Nation)” defined “the Communists” of North Korea as “obstructors of the unification” who “betrayed the fatherland and the nation” “blindly following the Soviet Union” and who “found a wrong way for the nation.” *Tongailbo*’s editorial on November 22, 1949, titled “*Sillyŏk Kuch’ul ũi Tangye* (The Time to Save by Force)” also defined “a gang of commies” as those who “are brothers in terms of bloodline” but “act like a bitter enemy” “supporting the Kremlin,” “killing the nation,” “depriving freedom from the compatriots,” “destroying the fatherland and selling the nation [to the Soviet Union].” *Chosŏnilbo*’s editorial on May 31, 1950, the day after the second general election, titled “*Ch’ongsŏngŏ wa Pukhan Tongp’o* (The General Election and North Korean Compatriots)” also defined Communists as “traitors of the nation.” It writes as follows.

The second general election was held in the whole regions of South Korea yesterday. ... Do North Korea’s millions of patriotic compatriots know this fact! ... Blood is thicker than water. Moreover, North cannot live without South and

vice versa. ... Among the Koreans, however, who betrayed the nation and the fatherland? Who volunteered to be slaves of a foreign country or to be a member of foreign federation? It is needless to say that Kim Il-Sung's and Pak Hŏnyŏng's factions do [this betrayal]. They broke the spirit of unity flowing in the minds of the nation after the liberation. They also supported the trusteeship of foreign nations. Finally, they refused to conduct a nationwide general election, which the UN ordered ... They are refusing the unification of South and North because of their lust for power. This is an act of traitors of the nation.

The trend to distinguish “commies” from “patriotic compatriots” of North Korea and to otherize the former as “anti-nationalists” continued after the Korean War. For example, *Tongailbo*'s editorial on September 12, 1956, titled “*Minjok T'ongil ūl Panghaehanŭn Cha nŭn Nugunya* (Who Obstruct the Unification of the Nation)” distinguished “the communist party, the puppet of the Soviet Union,” from “genuine Koreans (*chinjunghan hanin*),” and defined the former as “enemies of the unification,” “those who denied the sovereignty of the ROK blindly following the Soviet Union,” or “those who obstruct the unification of the nation.” Similarly, *Chosŏnilbo*'s editorial on November 15, 1957, titled “*Nambuk T'ongil ūn Pukhan Chayu Sŏngŏ ro* (The Unification of South and North by Conducting a Free Election in North Korea)” also distinguished “a group of puppets” from “freedom-loving compatriots,” and defined the former as “prisoners controlled by communist parties of the Soviet Union and Communist China.”

Meanwhile, *Kyŏnghyangsinmun*'s editorial on October 23, 1956, titled “*Pukhan Chayu Tongp'odŭl ūn Chujŏ Malgo Kwŏlgihara* (The Free Compatriots of North Korea, Stand Up

without Hesitation)” asked “free compatriots” of North Korea to stand up following the Eastern European Anticommunist Insurgency. It writes as follows.

Dear free compatriots of North Korea! Have you heard the support we sent in the morning of 29th from the City Hall Square to ask you to stand up? Even though the red tyranny of Kim Il-Sung’s faction tried their best to close your ears and eyes, we believe that you might hear the soaring shouting of anti-Soviet, anticommunist movements which started from the night of 20th and spread out to all Eastern Europe. ... If you stand up desperately, the communist stooges may point a merciless gun at your heart. But how many [North Korean compatriots] would devote themselves to the Kim Il-Sung’s communist regime? ... Dear free compatriots of North Korea, not only we but also the people all around the free world are waiting for your stand up.

The examination above reveals that, under the influence of anticommunism which functioned as a governing ideology of the Syngman Rhee government in those days, Korean society distinguished North Korean compatriots into “commies who support the Soviet Union and Communist China” and “patriotic compatriots who support the ROK,” and excluded the former from “we, the people of Korea” by otherizing them as “traitors of the nation,” “enemies of the nation,” “anti-nationalist elements,” or “obstructers of the unification.” In particular, by defining North Korean Communists as “anti-nationalists,” Korean society tried to prove that the ROK was more legitimate than the DPRK not only in terms that the ROK was “the only UN-recognized lawful government in the Korean peninsula” but also in terms that it was “the

only nationalist government” of the whole Korean nation.

V. *Taehanmin'guk* Nationalism

During the Syngman Rhee era, Korean society included North Korean compatriots into “we, the people of Korea” on the grounds of the myths of “*Hanminjok* as a homogeneous nation” and of “the ROK as the only lawful government,” though excluding “commies” of North Korea from “we, the people of Korea” under the influence of anticommunism. As the division of Korea solidified gradually, however, Korean society began to distinguish “twenty million *kungmin*” of South Korea from “ten million compatriots” of North Korea and to include the former only into “we, the people of Korea.” For example, *Kyŏnghyangsinmun*’s editorial on August 15, 1948, titled “*Tongnip ūi Sŏnpo wa Uri ūi Kako* (Declaration of Independence and Our Determination)” distinguished “we twenty million (*uri ich’ŏnman*)” from “the other ten-million compatriots” of North Korea, though acknowledging that “thirty million compatriots” of South and North Korea belonged to “one nation (*hankyŏre*).” The following is an excerpt of this editorial.

We declare today that we are nationals (*kungmin*) of a self-reliant independent [state]. While others are showing off with their massive ship, we are now beginning a difficult voyage in a stormy weather with a tiny little boat of “the great ROK” loaded with a heavy burden of twenty million. ... We are very pleased to have independence ... but sorrow is hidden behind this pleasure. We cannot fully enjoy this pleasure because we twenty million (*uri ich’ŏnman*) are now hearing the other ten million compatriots (*namŏji ilch’ŏnman tongp’o*), who

are left behind us, crying and shouting for help and rescue. ... With eyes closed, the compatriots who are separated with each other in South and North examine themselves ... Now, taking the helm firmly and doing our best, we are rowing out for the final course of the unification of South and North. There is only one sun. There is only one country (nara). There is only one way to go. One nation (hankyöre) living under the same sunshine is going through the same way ...

Replacing the congratulatory speech of independence with this, now we appeal to thirty million compatriots.

In a similar context, *Tongailbo*'s editorial on December 22, 1948, titled “*Kūnbonchök Sijōng ūl Yomangham* (Fundamental Correction Required)” distinguished “twenty million compatriots of South Korea” from “thirty million compatriots” of South and North Korea, and argued that “the unification of South and North Korea requires the iron-like unity of twenty million compatriots of South Korea.” *Tongailbo*'s editorial on December 26, 1948, titled “*Munhwain ūi Ch'onggwōlgi* (A General Rally of Culture-Engaged Persons)” also distinguished “twenty million compatriots of South Korea” from “ten million compatriots” of North Korea, and argued that “twenty million compatriots of South Korea should unite democratically to achieve the unification of South and North.” Moreover, Yi Hōngu's column titled “*Ibuk Tongp'o e Ponaē nŭn Kŭl* (A Letter to North Korean Compatriots)” appearing in *Tongailbo* on January 4, 1949, distinguished “we of the South” from “you, ten million compatriots of North Korea,” though calling North Koreans “compatriots, brothers, and sisters.” It writes as follows.

Welcoming a new year, I would like to thank for having a glorious chance to send a message of blessing to ten million compatriots of North Korea whom I have loved in my heart. ... When I looking back, you (*kŭdaedŭl*) and we of the south (*inam ũi uridŭl*) were on the same path of destiny. The only difference has been that we come to receive the absolute recognition from forty eight friend nations while struggling desperately under the reign of the US Military government to restore independence of our fatherland, but you, swept away by the Soviet policy of satellite state, have destroyed the spirit of independence which have dominated all your blood vessels, all your nerves, and all your consciousness. ... [I would like to] give a strong support to ten million compatriots of North Korea until the time when we accomplish the most shining, immortal achievement for the peace of the world and humanity. Compatriots, brothers, sisters, and the mountains and rivers of my hometown, be brave in front of the unification. Be alive and well.

Mainly dealing with the issues of economy and everyday life, many other editorials and columns of those days also distinguished “twenty million *kungmin* of South Korea” from “thirty million compatriots” of South and North Korea, and included the former only into “we, the people of Korea.”⁴⁸ For example, while arguing for the need of economic independence of South Korea from North Korea, Yi Kŏnhyŏk’s column titled “*Wŏnjo Mulcha ũi Hwaryong* (The Use of Aided Supplies)” appearing in *Tongailbo* on July 25, 1949, writes as follows.

After North Korea cut off the power transmission, the situation of South

Korea became really miserable. Everyone complains that nothing is left. No machinery. No furniture. No electricity. No raw materials. What can be done with nothing? Under this situation, nothing is left except a total destruction. At this time, the aids from the ECA help us solve the problems. ... The Soviet Union and their puppets are insulting us by arguing that these aids make South Korea an economic colony of the United States. Then, we will ask back again that twenty million [population] of South Korea should die with doing nothing sitting on the sofa when [North Korea] bisects the national territory and cuts off the electric power transmission. Those who want to insult, insult us. [But] we should survive. To survive, [we should] become independent economically from [North Korea].

The above reveals that, as the economic exchanges between South and North Korea ceased with the division of Korea (especially after North Korea cut off the power transmission to South Korea on May 14, 1948), Korean society, mainly in the areas of economy and everyday life, gradually began to “imagine” a new nation which included only “twenty million *kungmin*” of South Korea while excluding “ten million compatriots” of North Korea.

After the Korean War, this trend seems to spread more widely in Korean society. In particular, dealing with the issues of rice problem, public health and nutrition, taxation, prices, money supply, coal supply, fishery, etc. many editorials and columns in the 1950s explicitly mentioned that the total population of “our country (*uri nara*)” was approximately “twenty million” while excluding North Korean compatriots from this category.⁴⁹ For example, Yi Chonghak’s column titled “Five Year Policy Plan for Tuberculosis (*Kyölhaek Sich’aek 5-kaenyön An*)” appearing in *Kyöngnyangsinmun* on April 25, 1954, writes as follows.

The number of Korean nationals (*hanguk kungmin*) who died of tuberculosis is about sixty thousands per every year, which accounts for the largest portion of the total deaths. [About] 6.5% of all nationals (*kungmin chǒnbu*) have tuberculosis, which is a national cancer in public health. ... The statistics of group medical examination proves that 2.5% [of the examinees] have active tuberculosis. ... This means that, when all twenty million nationals (*ich'ŏnman kungmin chǒnbu*) are examined, about five hundred thousands are tuberculosis patients who need medical treatment and convalescence.

Similarly, *Tongailbo*'s article on May 22, 1956, titled “*Yŏngyang kaw Singnyang Taech'aek* (Nutrition and Measures for Food)” also writes as follows.

In preparing measures for food, we need to begin with numerical evidence on how much nutrition the nationals of our country (*uri nara kungmin*) require. ... For reference, if we count the total population of our country (*uri nara ch'ongingu*) as approximately twenty million adults ... the daily requirement of carbohydrate for twenty million population is 2,400,000 *kwan* [1 *kwan* = 3.75 kg] and that of protein is 420,000 *kwan*.

As the division of Korea solidified gradually after the Korean War, a similar trend emerged even when dealing with the issues of politics and international relations. For example, Kim Chŏngho's column titled “*Paengmangun Yuji ūi Chaegŏmt'o* [Reexamining the Policy to

Keep Million Soldiers]” appearing in *Tongailbo* on January 18, 1956, explicitly mentioned that “we,” “the ROK,” had “twenty million *kungmin*,” and excluded “ten million compatriots” of North Korea from “we, the people of Korea.” Similarly, Hwang Chonghyŏn’s column titled “*Hŏnpŏp Che 19-cho wa Sahoe Pojang* (Article 19 of the Constitution and Social Security)” appearing in *Kyŏnghyangsinmun* on August 22, 1956, also mentioned that the ROK was composed of “twenty million *kungmin*.” In a similar context, *Tongailbo*’s editorial on August 18, 1957, titled “*Ilch’esŏng ūi Insik kwa Punhwasŏng ūi Hwakpo* (The Perception of Unity and the Securement of Diversity)” also used the term “twenty million *kungmin*” to refer to “the people [of the ROK] as a whole (*chŏnch’e rosŏ ūi kungmin*).”

Many other editorials and columns of those days also used the terms, “we, twenty million *kungmin*,” “the whole *kungmin* of over twenty million population,” “we, twenty million,” “the twenty million sovereign,” etc. to refer to the “imagined” members of the ROK while excluding North Korean compatriots from “we, the people of Korea.”⁵⁰ This reveals that, as the division of Korea solidified gradually, a new nationalism, that is, *Taehanminguk* nationalism, which included “twenty million *kungmin*” of South Korea only into “we, the people of Korea,” emerged in Korean society as an alternative to *Hanminjok* nationalism, which included “all thirty million compatriots of South and North Korea,” and to anticommunist nationalism, which included South Koreans and “patriotic compatriots” of North Korea into “we, the people of Korea.”

VI. Conclusion

Analyzing columns and editorials of *Chosŏnilbo*, *Tongailbo* and *Kyŏnghyangsinmun*, this study has demonstrated that, during the Syngman Rhee era, Korean society included North

Korean compatriots into “we, the people of Korea” on the grounds of the myths 1) that “all Koreans, as descendants of *Tangun*, belong to *Hanminjok* regardless of their residence” and 2) that “the ROK is the only UN-recognized lawful government in the Korean peninsula while North Korea illegally occupying the ROK’s territory.” In particular, the fact that such terms as “we, thirty-million,” “we, thirty-million *kyöre*,” “we, thirty-million *kungmin*,” and “we, thirty-million *minjok*” were commonly used in newspapers to refer to the members of the ROK reveals that Korean society’ “imagined” boundaries of “we, the people of Korea” included not only “twenty million” South Koreans but also “ten million” North Korean compatriots.

At the same time, this study has also shown that, under the influence of anticommunism which virtually functioned as a governing ideology of the Syngman Rhee government in those days, Korean society distinguished North Korean compatriots into “commies who support the Soviet Union and Communist China” and “patriotic compatriots who support the ROK,” and excluded the former from “we, the people of Korea” by otherizing them as “anti-nationalists.” That is, by defining the North Korean Communists as “anti-nationalists,” Korean society tried to prove that the ROK was more legitimate than the DPRK not only in terms of the UN’s recognition but also in terms of nationalist justification.

Finally, this study has demonstrated that, as the division of Korea solidified gradually, in particular, after the Korean War, Korean society began to “imagine” a new nation, which included “twenty million *kungmin*” of South Korea only. As a result, this study shows, in perceiving and representing North Korean compatriots, three different nationalisms coexisted and competed with each other in Korean society in those days: 1) “*Hanminjok* nationalism” which included not only South Koreans but also North Korean compatriots into “we, the people of Korea” 2) “anticommunist nationalism” which included South Koreans and

“patriotic compatriots” of North Korea into “we, the people of Korea” while excluding North Korean “commies,” and 3) “*Taehanminkuk* nationalism” which included South Koreans only into “we, the people of Korea.”

Of these three nationalisms, *Hanminjok* nationalism, initially developed during the Japanese colonial period to arouse a nationalist spirit against the Japanese imperialism, and anticommunist nationalism, initially developed during the US Military Government period mainly by the right wing nationalists under Syngman Rhee’s initiative, were more dominant than *Taehanminkuk* nationalism in those days as the President Rhee and the government made use of these two nationalisms to justify the legitimacy of the ROK. In particular, the President Rhee and the government tried to prove that the ROK was more legitimate than the DPRK by combining *Hanminjok* nationalism with anticommunism, that is, by including North Korean compatriots into “we, the people of Korea” but at the same time excluding North Korean Communists. As a result, under the influence of the President Rhee and the government, these two nationalisms continued to function during the whole Syngman Rhee era as a basic framework of Korean society in perceiving and representing North Korea and North Korean compatriots.

The above examination, however, suggests that, as the division of Korea solidified gradually, *Taehanminkuk* nationalism emerged in Korean society as an alternative nationalism. That is, in order to realize “the nationalist principle” which required “the congruence between the political and the national unit,” Korean society began to “imagine” a new nation which included South Koreans only to make the national boundaries congruent with the political ones of the ROK. In the following studies, I will examine the changes and developments of these three nationalisms in Korean society during the Park Chung Hee era and after, focusing on the

questions of which nationalism became a dominant nationalism in Korean society, and under what conditions and why it did so.

Notes

- ¹ As well known, in *Imagined Communities*, Benedict Anderson defines a nation as an “imagined community” which is socially constructed by the people who perceive themselves as belonging to that community, and examines the development and spread of nationalism in Latin America, Europe, and Asia. Applying his concept to the Korean context, this study examines the reformulation of nationalism in South Korea during the Syngman Rhee era (1948-1960).
- ² Ernest Gellner, *Nation and Nationalism*, 1; As Shin mentioned, however, this violation – “one nation, two states” is the opposite of most other cases in West European and African countries where multiple ethnic groups were contending for state power. See Shin, *Ethnic Nationalism in Korea*, 18-19.
- ³ This paper will use the term, “we, the people of Korea (*uri taehan kungmin*),” which appears in the preamble of the Constitution of the ROK as the constituents of the ROK who establish the ROK and its constitution, to refer to the constituents of the Korean nation who “imagined,” or were socially recognized, to share a common national identity, and will distinguish them from those Koreans who merely hold Korean nationality legally.
- ⁴ It is difficult to translate such Korean terms as *kungmin* (which, focusing on political or legal aspects, roughly refers to “a member of a state,” “a national,” “a citizen,” “the people,” etc.), *minjok* (which, focusing on emotional, cultural, or identity aspects, roughly refers to “a member of a nation,” “a national,” “nation,” etc.), and *kyōre* (which is a pure Korean word

meaning roughly “nation,” “the people,” etc.) into English, because these terms are used interchangeably both in Korean and in English. For this reason, when necessary, I will use the terms, *kungmin*, *minjok*, and *kyõre*, intactly without translating them into English.

⁵ Methodologically, this study may have a danger of overgeneralizing the opinions and expressions of these three newspapers. Though acknowledging this limit, I believe that the analysis of these three newspapers would reveal how South Koreans imagined, defined, and represented “we, the people of Korea.” In fact, as Andre Schmid mentioned when explaining the role of newspapers in forming national identity in Korea in the late 19th and the early 20th century, newspapers, as “a medium for producing national knowledge,” “gave voice to a variety of national visions that shaped, directed, and reflected” the nationalist movements of the Syngman Rhee era. Additionally, I also take into account the fact that only these three newspapers provide article search services covering the whole Syngman Rhee era. See Schmid, *Korea between Empires*, 6.

⁶ See Shin, *Ethnic Nationalism in Korea*; Schmid, *Korea between Empires 1895-1919*; Ha, “Hwangsae P’ipu, Paeksaek Kamyõn [Yellow Skin, White Mask].”

⁷ Schmid, *Korea between Empires*, 190.

⁸ Schmid, *Korea between Empires*, 277.

⁹ Shin, *Ethnic Nationalism in Korea*, 2-3.

¹⁰ Schmid, *Korea between Empires*, 277.

¹¹ Em, *The Great Enterprise*, 11, 82-83.

¹² Schmid, *Korea between Empires*, 175.

¹³ Schmid, *Korea between Empires*, 181-182.

¹⁴ Schmid, *Korea between Empires*, 190.

-
- ¹⁵ Schmid, *Korea between Empires*, 190.
- ¹⁶ Hŏ Donghyŏn, “Hanguk Kŭndae esŏ Tanil Minjok Sinhwa ũi Yŏksajŏk Hyŏngsŏng Kwajŏng [The Process of Historical Construction of the Myth of a Homogeneous Nation in Modern Korea], 21-25.
- ¹⁷ Kim Suja, “Haebang Ihu Uik Monjok Tamron ũi Koch’akhwa Kwajŏng [The Solidification Process of the Right Wing Discourse of Nation after the Liberation],” 95-98.
- ¹⁸ *Tongailbo*, “Kim Ku Chusŏk Tapsa [The Responding Speech of Premier Kim Ku],” December 20, 1945.
- ¹⁹ Kim Suja, “Haebang Ihu Uik Monjok Tamron ũi Koch’akhwa Kwajŏng [The Solidification Process of the Right Wing Discourse of Nation after the Liberation],” 95-98.
- ²⁰ Hŏ Donghyŏn, “Hanguk Kŭndae esŏ Tanil Minjok Sinhwa ũi Yŏksajŏk Hyŏngsŏng Kwajŏng [The Process of Historical Construction of the Myth of a Homogeneous Nation in Modern Korea], 25-26.
- ²¹ Kim Suja, “Haebang Ihu Uik Monjok Tamron ũi Koch’akhwa Kwajŏng [The Solidification Process of the Right Wing Discourse of Nation after the Liberation],” 99.
- ²² See Yang Tongan, “I Sŭngman kwa Taehanminguk Kŏnguk [Syngman Rhee and the Establishment of the ROK],” 45-46; and Kim Suja and Oh Hyangmi, “Kŭndae Kukka Kŏnsŏlgi Minjokchuŭi ũi Pyŏnhyŏng kwa Kulchŏl [The Modification and Distortion of Nationalism during the Modern-State Building Period],” 80-81.
- ²³ Kim Suja, “Taehanminguk Surip Chikhu Minjokchuŭi wa Pangongjuŭi ũi Hyŏngsŏng Kwajŏng [The Forming Process of Nationalism and Anticommunism after the Establishment of the ROK],” 369-70.
- ²⁴ *Tongailbo*, “Ch’ŏlbyŏng hu Sŏngŏ Silsi Kim Ku ssi Ŭigyŏnsŏ Chech’ul [Mr. Kim Ku

-
- Submitted an Opinion Report to Conduct an Election after the Withdrawal of the Army],”
January 30, 1948.
- ²⁵ *Tongailbo*, “Myöngmokchök Haptong Chungjiko Silchilchögin Haengdong T’ongillo [Stop Nominal Cooperation, Take Real Unified Actions],” January 7, 1948.
- ²⁶ According to the statistical data of the Korean Statistical Information Service, the total population of South Korea as of the end of 1946 was 19,369,270, which increased to 20,167,000 in 1949, and that of North Korea was estimated as 9,740,000 in 1949. These data indicate that “thirty million (*samch’önman*),” “thirty million compatriots (*samch’önman tongp’o*),” “thirty million nationals (*samch’önman minjok*),” or “thirty million people of the ROK (*samch’önman kungmin*),” which were most commonly used in those days to refer to the members of the ROK, included not only “twenty million *kungmin*” of the ROK but also “ten million compatriots” of North Korea into “we, the people of Korea.”
- ²⁷ *Kyöngnyangsinmun*, “Taet’ongryöng Sijöng Pangch’im Chönmun [The Whole Texts of the Administrative Policy Speech of the President],” October 2, 1948.
- ²⁸ *Tongailbo*, “Hanminjok üi Chölgyu Yuen Chöngwi Söksang Chang Myön ssi Yönsöl Sang [The Scream of Korean Nation, Chang Myön’s Speech at the Political Committee of the UN, Part I],” December 21, 1948.
- ²⁹ *Tongailbo*, “Hanminjok üi Chölgyu Yuen Chöngwi Söksang Chang Myön ssi Yönsöl Chung [The Scream of Korean Nation, Chang Myön’s Speech at the Political Committee of the UN, Part II],” December 22, 1948.
- ³⁰ Wikisource, “United Nations General Assembly Resolution 195.”
https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/United_Nations_General_Assembly_Resolution_195 (Accessed August 2, 2016).

-
- ³¹ *Tongailbo*, “Hanguk Chǒngbu Kich’o Konggo 38-sǒn Ch’ǒlp’ye nūn Hanwi Samǒng [The Foundation of the Korean Government Is Stable; The Mission of the UN Commission on Korea Is to Get Rid of the 38th Parallel],” April 5, 1949.
- ³² *Tongailbo*, “Ibuk Sǒngǒ Yomang [Election Is Required in North Korea],” April 16, 1949.
- ³³ *Tongailbo*, “Nambuk Tongp’o nūn Hyǒpchohara Mungch’imyǒn Salgo Hǒtǒjimyǒn Manghanda [The Compatriots of South and North, Cooperate. If Gathering Together, We Will Survive, If Scattering, We Will Perish],” October 24, 1950.
- ³⁴ *Chosǒnilbo*, “Minūi e ūihan T’ongil Wansǒng Yi Taet’ongryǒng Pukhan Tongp’o e Metseji [The President Rhee’s Message to North Korean Compatriots: The Completion of Unification through the Will of the People],” October 24, 1950.
- ³⁵ *Chosǒnilbo*, “Pukhan Tongp’o to Uri Kyǒre Oegugin Ch’wigūp ūn Chǒltae Hal Su Őpta [North Korean Compatriots are Our Nation, We Will Never Treat Them as Foreigners],” September 14, 1952.
- ³⁶ *Tongailbo*, “Hǒnpǒp ūi Kibon Chǒngsin ūl Suho Kim Taebǒpwǒnjang Chehǒnil Kyǒngchuksa [Protect the Basic Principles of the Constitution, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court Made a Congratulatory Speech for Constitution Day],” July 18, 1953.
- ³⁷ *Kyǒnghyangsinmun*, “Taemi Hapchak ūro T’ongil Tals’ong [Achieve the Unification through Cooperating with the United States],” July 30, 1953.
- ³⁸ *Tongailbo*, “Subok Chigu Haengjǒngkwǒn Iyang [The Transfer of Administrative Jurisdiction over the Reclaimed Areas],” August 13, 1954.
- ³⁹ For example, see *Tongailbo*’s editorials such as “3·1 chǒl e Chehayǒ [On the Day of March 1]” on March 1, 1949; “Kuguk Inyǒm kwa Chisigin [The Ideology to Save the Country and Intellectuals]” on March 5, 1949; “T’ongil Pangan kwa Sǒnjǒng [The Way for Unification and

Good Governance]” on March 16, 1949; “Wijǒngja ũi Chaga Pip’an [Self-Criticism of Politicians]” on March 19, 1949; “Aju Panggong Kyehoek kwa Aju Kyǒngje [The Plan to Defend Asia and Asian Economy]” on November 2, 1949; “Kǒnsǒlchǒk Ŏnron kwa Pagoejǒk Ŏnron [Constructive Media and Destructive Media]” on December 29, 1949; “Minjujuŭi nŭn Ilsinusin [Democracy Changed Again and Again]” on May 31, 1951; “Minkwǒn Ch’imhae ũi Tu Yuhyǒng [Two Types of Violating People’s Rights]” on June 17, 1955; and “Kwangbokchǒl ũi Kamgyǒk kwa Chǒngbut’ongryǒng Ch’wiim [The Joy of Independence Day and the Inauguration of President and Vice President]” on August 15, 1956. See also *Kyǒnghyangsinmun*’s editorials such as “Kim Ku Sǒnsaeng ũl Aedoham [Mourning the Death of Mr. Kim Ku]” on June 28, 1949; “Arittaun Minjujuŭi ũi Kkot [The Beautiful Flower of Democracy]” on June 15, 1952; “Pusanyǒk Yǒlch’a Sago ũi Kyohun [The Instructions of Train Fire Accident in *Pusan* Station]” on March 4, 1955; and “T’ongil Chaegǒn ũl Wihan Punwigi ũi Chosǒng [Making an Atmosphere for Unification and Reconstruction]” on August 17, 1956.

⁴⁰ As mentioned above, the myth that “all Koreans, as descendants of *Tangun*, belong to *Hanminjok*” emerged in the early 20th century to arouse a national spirit against the Japanese imperialism.” For details, see Hǒ Donghyǒn, “Hanguk Kŭndae esǒ Tanil Minjok Sinhwa ũi Yǒksajǒk Hyǒngsǒng Kwajǒng [The Process of Historical Construction of the Myth of a Homogeneous Nation in Modern Korea], 13-22.

⁴¹ For example, see *Tongailbo*’s editorials such as “Tananhhan Ihae rŭl Ponaemyǒ [Closing This Eventful Year]” on December 31, 1948; “Yuen Hanwi ũi Immu [The Duty of the UN Commission on Korea]” on February 2, 1949; “8·15 Chǒngsin ũi Chaehwagin Chaech’ulbal [The Reconfirmation and Restart of the Spirit of August 15]” on August 15, 1956; “8·15 Nal ũl Majihamyǒnsǒ [On the Day of August 15]” on August 15, 1959; “Hanguk Munje ũi Yuen

Sangjǒng [Bringing the Korean Questions to the United Nations]” on November 23, 1959; and “Yuen Ch’onghoe ūi T’onghan Kyǒlŭian Ch’aet’aek [The UN General Assembly’s Adoption of Resolution Concerning the Korean Unification]” on November 29, 1959. See also *Kyǒnghyangsinmun*’s editorials such as “Yuen Ch’onghoe wa 38 sǒn Ch’ǒlp’ye [The UN General Assembly and the Abolition of the 38th Parallel]” on September 30, 1949; and “Onŭl e Tǒuk Soch’i nŭn T’ongil ūi Maengsǒ [A Pledge of Unification, Surging More Today]” on October 4, 1957. See also *Chosǒnilbo*’s editorials such as “Kaech’ǒnjǒl e Chehayǒ [On the National Foundation Day]” on October 3, 1951; “Kaech’ǒnjǒl kwa Minjok Chǒngsin ūi Kwil [The National Foundation Day and the Unification of National Spirit]” on October 3, 1952; and “Kaech’ǒnjǒl kwa Paedal ūi Hon [The National Foundation Day and the Soul of *Paedal*]” on October 3, 1953.

⁴² For example, see *Tongailbo*’s editorials such as “Yuen Wiwǒndan ūi Ŏmmu Kaesi [The Commence of the UN Commission’s Task]” on February 13, 1949; “Yuen Hanwi e Chǒkkŭk Hyǒpryǒkhaja [Let Us Cooperate with the UN Commission on Korea Actively]” on June 17, 1949; “Nambuk T’ongil Pangan Chosok Kyǒlchǒng Kimang [Hope to Decide the Way of the Unification of South and North as Soon as Possible]” on August 16, 1949; “Sin Hanguk Wiwǒndan Naehan e Chehayǒ [Regarding the Arrival of the New Commission on Korea]” on November 19, 1949; “Yuen Sŭngin Ilchunyǒn ūl Maja [On the First Anniversary Day of the UN’s Recognition]” on December 13, 1949; “Yuen Sin Hanwi e Chǒkkŭk Hyǒpryǒkhaja [Let Us Cooperate with the New UN Commission on Korea Actively]” on December 14, 1949; “Hanguk Munje Haekyǒl Sian Naeyong Kǒmt’o [The Examination of the Temporary Proposal to Solve the Korean Questions]” on November 1, 1953; and “Hanguk Ch’ongsǒngǒan ūl Pandaehanda [Opposing to the Proposal of Conducting a General Election in Korea]” on

November 13, 1954. See also *Kyŏnghyangsinmun*'s editorials such as “Hanguk Yuen Kaip e So tto Kōbukwŏn Chaheang [The Soviet Exercised Veto Again to the ROK's Joining in the United Nations]” on September 11, 1957; and “Hanguk Kaiban e taehan Chijip'yo e Kwansimitta [Interested in the Votes of Support to the ROK's Joining in the United Nations]” on October 13, 1957.

⁴³ During the early period of the ROK, by defining communists as anti-nationalists, the President Rhee successfully combined nationalism with anticommunism, and made use of anticommunist nationalism to strengthen his power and to weaken the leftists' influence. See Kim Suja, “Taehanminguk Surip Chikhu Minjokchu'i wa Pangongju'i ūi Hyōngsōng Kwajōng [The Forming Process of Nationalism and Anticommunism after the Establishment of the ROK],” 376-80 and Chŏn Chaeho, “Hanguk Minjokchu'i ūi Pangong Kukkaju'ijōk Sōngkyōk e kwanhan Yōngu [A Study on the Anticommunist Statist Characteristics of Korean Nationalism],” 135-38.

⁴⁴ *Tongailbo*, “Kukkwŏn Hoebok ūi Yōksajōk Sōngjŏn [A Historical Holy War to Restore National Sovereignty],” July 25, 1948.

⁴⁵ *Tongailbo*, “Yi Taetongryōng tae Ibuk Pangsong [The President Rhee Had a Broadcasting to North Korea],” May 7, 1950.

⁴⁶ *Tongailbo*, “Yi Taetongryōng Chŏnban Sōngmyōng ūl Puyŏn [The President Rhee Elaborated His Former Announcement],” November 27, 1953; May 7, 1950; *Tongailbo*, “T'ongil ūl Chosok Sōngch'wi [Accomplish the Unification as Soon as Possible],” January 3, 1955.

⁴⁷ *Tongailbo*, “Ŏje Che 8-hoe Chehŏnjŏl Chungangch'ōng Kwangjang sŏ Kinyōmsik [Yesterday, the Eight Anniversary of the Constitution Day, Ceremony at the Capitol Plaza],” July 18, 1956.

⁴⁸ For example, see Han Ohyōk's column appearing in *Tongailbo* on September 12, 1948, titled

“Migok T’ongje ūi Sibi [The Right and Wrong in Controlling the Rice]”; *Tongailbo*’s editorial on October 30, 1948, titled “Paegŭp Kigu Ilwŏnhwa [Unification of Distribution Organization]”; Kim Chaesin’s column appearing in *Kyŏnghyangsinmun* on February 19, 1949, titled “Chŏngi Kugyŏngron [The Argument for Nationalizing the Management of Electricity]”; Yi Sangdŏk’s column appearing in *Kyŏnghyangsinmun* on November 10, 1949, titled “Charip Kyŏngje ūi Che Kwaje [The Tasks for Self-Supporting Economy]”; *Tongailbo*’s editorial on March 12, 1950, titled “Kŏrukhada! Minjokchŏk Saeng ūi Yaktong [A Holy Movement of National Lives!]”; and Yuk Chisu’s column appearing in *Tongailbo* on May 8, 1950, titled “Seje Kaehyŏk ūi Panghyang [The Direction of Tax Reforms].”

⁴⁹ For example, see *Tongailbo*’s editorial on March 12, 1952, titled “Ssal ūl Akkija [Let Us Save the Rice]”; Chu Sŏkkyun’s column appearing in *Kyŏnghyangsinmun* on March 31, 1952, titled “Ssal ūi Saengt’ae wa Yangjŏng ūi Maengchŏm [Ecology of Rice and Blind Spots of Rice Policy]”; *Tongailbo*’s editorial on April 6, 1953, titled “Mika Isang [Abnormal Price of Rice]”; Chu Sŏkkyun’s column appearing in *Kyŏnghyangsinmun* on September 18, 1955, titled “Ssal kwa Piryo, Kyŏngje Anjŏng Munje ūi Ch’ochŏm [Rice and Fertilizer, the Core of Economic Stability Problems]”; Yi Wanyŏng’s column appearing in *Kyŏnghyangsinmun* on April 24, 1952, titled “Sinyak kwa Kyŏlhaek [A New Medicine and Tuberculosis]”; *Tongailbo*’s editorial on August 27, 1953, titled “Kyŏlhaek kwa Nabyŏng [Tuberculosis and Leprosy]”; Yi Ch’aeho’s column appearing in *Kyŏnghyangsinmun* on August 21, 1952, titled “Susanŏp Puhŭngch’aek [The Policy for the Revival of Fishing Industry]”; *Tongailbo*’s editorial on February 18, 1953, titled “T’onghwa Choch’i ūi Sŏnggongch’aek [A Successful Policy in Managing Money Supply]”; *Kyŏnghyangsinmun*’s editorial on February 29, 1953, titled “Saengp’ilp’um Kakyŏk ūl Chŏlhahara [Lower the Prices of Daily Necessities]”;

Kyŏnghyangsinmun's editorial on August 18, 1953, titled "Saengsanchuŭi wa T'onghwachuŭi [Productivism and Currencyism]"; Yi Yŏlmo's column appearing in *Tongailbo* on April 4, 1954, titled "Seje Kaehyŏk kwa Kungmin Pudam [Tax Reforms and National Burdens]"; and Chŏng Yŏnggi's column appearing in *Tongailbo* on September 27, 1954, titled "Wŏldong Yŏnryo Taech'aek [Measures to Prepare Fuels for Winter]."

⁵⁰ For example, see *Kyŏnghyangsinmun*'s editorial on October 28, 1955, titled "Ŏnron, Chiphoe Chayu ŭi Tto Hana ŭi Isang [One More Ideal for the Freedom of Media and Association]"; *Tongailbo*'s editorial on March 25, 1956, titled "Myŏngrang Sŏngŏ ro Chinilbo ki rŭl [A Progress through a Clear Election]"; Na Ikchin's column appearing in *Tongailbo* on April 30, 1956, titled "Ibŏn Sŏngŏ nŭn Irŏke Yukwŏnja rosŏ ŭi Yomang [As Constituents, What We Expect for This Election]"; Ŏm Sangsŏp's column appearing in *Kyŏnghyangsinmun* on May 1, 1956, titled "Kongp'o Sŏngŏ [An Election of Terror]"; *Kyŏnghyangsinmun*'s editorial on September 28, 1956, titled "9·28 Kamkŏk ŭl Saeropke Haja [Let Us Refresh the Impressive Feelings of 9·28]"; *Kyŏnghyangsinmun*'s editorial on July 20, 1957, titled "Kukkun ŭn Kwayŏn Kamch'ukhal Su Ŏpnŭnga? [Is It Impossible to Reduce the National Armed Forces?]"; *Kyŏnghyangsinmun*'s editorial on December 26, 1958, titled "Minkwŏn Sinjang Wihae Hangjaenghaja [Let Us Struggle for Promoting the People's Rights]"; and *Tongailbo*'s editorial on April 14, 1960, titled "*Masan Simin ŭl Kongsandang ŭro Molji Mala* [Do Not Treat *Masan*'s Citizens as a Communist Party]."

Bibliography

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 1983.

Chŏn Chaeho. "Hanguk Minjokchuŭi ŭi Pangong Kukkaŭjuŭijŏk Sŏngkyŏk e kwanhan Yŏngu [A Study on the Anticommunist Statist Characteristics of Korean Nationalism]." *Sahoe Kwahak Yŏngu* 35, no. 2 (2011): 117-44.

Chŏng Insŏp. "Uri Kukchŏkpŏpsang Ch'oich'o Kungmin Hwakchŏng Kijun e kwanhan Kŏmt'o [An Examination of Criteria to Determine the First Koreans in Accordance with Our Nationality Act]." *Kukchepŏp Hakhoe Nonch'ong* 43, no. 2 (1998): 235-48.

Chosŏnilbo. <http://kiss.kstudy.com> (Accessed September 1, 2016).

Em, Henry H. *The Great Enterprise: Sovereignty and Historiography in Modern Korea*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2013.

Gellner, Ernest. *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.

Ha, Sangbok. "Hwangsae P'ipu, Paeksaek Kamyŏn: Hanguk ŭi Naemyŏnhwadoen Injongjuŭi ŭi Yŏksajŏk Koch'al kwa Tamunhwajuŭi [Yellow Skin, White Mask: Historical Examination of Internalized Racism in Korea and Multiculturalism]." *Inmun Kwahak Yŏngu* 33 (2012): 525-556.

Hŏ Donghyŏn. "Hanguk Kŭndae esŏ Tanil Minjok Sinhwa ŭi Yŏksajŏk Hyŏngsŏng Kwajŏng [The Process of Historical Construction of the Myth of a Homogeneous Nation in Modern Korea]." *Tongbuga Yŏksa Nonch'ong* 23 (2009): 7-35.

Kim Kyŏngje. "Hŏnpŏp Che Icho ŭi Kungmin [The People in the Article 2 of the Constitution]." *Kongpŏphak Yŏngu* 9, no. 2 (2008): 69-89.

Kim Sŏnggho and Ch'oi Myŏnggho. "1948 nyŏn Kŏnguk Hŏnpŏp Chŏnmun e Natanan 'Uridŭl Taehankungmin' ŭi Chŏngch'esŏng kwa Chŏngdangsŏng [The Identity and Legitimacy of 'We, the People of the ROK' Appearing in Preamble of the 1948 Constitution]." *Hanguk Chŏngch'i Hakhoebo [Korean Political Science Review]* 42, no. 4 (2008): 87-112.

Kim Suja. “Taehanminguk Surip Chikhu Minjokchuŭi wa Pangongjuŭi ŭi Hyŏngsŏng Kwajŏng [The Forming Process of Nationalism and Anticommunism after the Establishment of the ROK].” *Hanguk Sasang Sahak* 25 (2005): 365-84.

----- . “Haebang Ihu Uik Monjok Tamron ŭi Koch’akhwa Kwajŏng 1945-1953 [The Solidification Process of the Right Wing Discourse of Nation after the Liberation from 1945 to 1953].” *Yŏksahakpo* no. 198 (2008): 89-114.

Kim Suja and Oh Hyangmi. “Kŭndae Kukka Kŏnsŏlgi Minjokchuŭi ŭi Pyŏnhyŏng kwa Kulchŏl [The Modification and Distortion of Nationalism during the Modern-State Building Period].” *Ihwa Sahak Yŏngu* 36 (2008): 71-99.

Korean Statistical Information Service. “Ingu Ch’use [The Population Trend].”

http://kosis.kr/statisticsList/statisticsList_01List.jsp?vwcd=MT_CHOSUN_TITLE&parmTabId=M_01_03_01#SubCont (Accessed March 15, 2016).

----- . “Ingu Tongt’ae [The Movement of Population].”

http://kosis.kr/statisticsList/statisticsList_01List.jsp?vwcd=MT_CHOSUN_TITLE&parmTabId=M_01_03_01#SubCont (Accessed March 15, 2016).

Kyŏnghyangsinmun. <http://newslibrary.naver.com> (Accessed September 1, 2016).

Kwŏn Yŏngsŏl. “Hŏnpŏp ŭi Kungmin Chohang kwa Kukchŏkpŏp [The Nationality Article of the Constitution and the Nationality Act].” *Kosigye* 42, no. 7 (1997): 88-100.

No Yŏngdon. “Uri Nara Kukchŏkpŏp ŭi Myŏtkaji Munje e kwanhan Koch’al [A Consideration of Some Problems of the Nationality Act of Our Country].” *Kukchepŏp Hakhoe Nonch’ong* 41, no. 2 (1997): 49-64.

Pŏpchech’ŏ. “Kukchŏkpŏp [Nationality Act] (Effective on December 20, 1948.”

<http://www.law.go.kr/lsSc.do?menuId=0&subMenu=2&query=%ED%97%8C%EB%B2%9>

5#liBgcOLOR10 (Accessed March 15, 2016).

Shin, Gi-Wook. *Ethnic Nationalism in Korea: Genealogy, Politics, and Legacy*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Tongailbo. <http://newslibrary.naver.com> (Accessed September 1, 2016).

Wikisource. "United Nations General Assembly Resolution 195."

https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/United_Nations_General_Assembly_Resolution_195

(Accessed August 2, 2016).

Yang Tongan. "I Sŭngman kwa Taehanminguk Kŏnguk [Syngman Rhee and the Establishment of the ROK]." *Chŏngsin Munhwa Yŏngu* 31, no 3 (2008): 41-70.

Yi Chuyun. "Kukchepŏpchŏk Sigak esŏ Pon Taehanminguk ŭi Kukchŏk Munje [A Nationality Problem of the Republic of Korea Seen from a Perspective of International Law]." *Pŏphak Yŏngu* 29 (2008): 375-96.

Yi Pyŏnghun. "Han'gugin ũn Nuguinga? Pukhan kwa Chaeoe Tongp'o ŭi Kukchŏk Munje [Who Is Korean? A Nationality Problem of North Korean Compatriots and Overseas Koreans]." *Hŏnpŏphak Yŏngu* 10, no. 2 (2004): 153-77.