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ABSTRACT

This study examines theoretical propositions regarding the relationship between identity of diaspora and choice of citizenship, specifically through study of a formerly unified nation divided into two separate countries. Today, only two divided countries—Korea and China—remain. Utilizing the qualitative comparative analysis of two case studies, this article examines the impact of diplomatic normalization after division on the citizenship preference of the diasporas. The analysis scrutinizes factors that affect the decision of diasporas on the choice of national membership. The study concludes that three factors—ethnic school education, national pride, and practical benefit—better explain the citizenship preferences of the two diasporas than other interpretations suggested by the existing literature. This study contributes to the literature of politics of diaspora identity and sheds light on policy considerations and its implication for future society beyond the nation-state.
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I. INTRODUCTION

1.1 A Puzzle of Two States, One Nation

In the last few decades, diasporas\(^1\) have increasingly become a significant subject within the field of social science. Even though there is no consensus on the specific definition of a diaspora, most diaspora scholars seem to agree upon triadic elements which constitute the nature of a diaspora: homeland, host state, and diaspora organizations.\(^2\) A vast majority of diaspora studies use a single homeland as the unit of analysis. That being the case, the literature lacks study on diasporas with two homelands.

Although geographical and political division restricts or limits free migration and flow of information, the existence of two divided homelands closely affect the daily lives of the diasporas. Specifically, there is a tendency that the proximity between the host state and homeland, the more diasporas are affected both politically and socially. In addition, the first generation of diasporas—those who left their homeland before the division face a relatively complicated set of decisions in determining homeland identification. They have a closer and more direct connection to their homelands, such as family, relatives, national consciousness and nostalgias, compared to later generations.

Although these are rare situations, there are several examples of countries that divided from a single unified nation into two, such as Germany, Vietnam, Korea, and China.\(^3\) These divided states have commonalities in that not only did they become

---

\(^1\) The word ‘diaspora’ is commonly used in a noun, verb, and adjective. In this article, I use diasporas as a noun to denote groups with specified characters. The definition of diaspora will be further developed in later section.

\(^2\) Homeland refers to diasporas’ country of origin or migrants-sending states; host state means to migrants-receiving states; diaspora organizations refer to organizations migrants involved in.

\(^3\) Germany divided into Federal Republic of Germany (West) and German Democratic Republic (East); Vietnam split into Democratic Republic of Vietnam (North) and Republic of Vietnam (South); Korea was divided into Republic of Korea and Democratic People’s Republic of Korea; China split into People’s Republic of China and Republic of China.
divided after the World War II but they also were divided by geopolitical tensions and competing ideologies: communism and democracy. As a result of Vietnam and Germany reunifying in, respectively, 1975 and 1990, only two divided countries from the preceding list maintain their divided status, Korea and China. The Korean peninsula was divided into Republic of Korea (ROK, South Korea) and Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK, North Korea) in 1948, while China split into People’s Republic of China (PRC, mainland China) and Republic of China (ROC, Taiwan) in 1949. Before the divisions, the diaspora of Korea largely settled in Japan and some of Chinese diasporas resided in South Korea.

In the event of homeland dividing into two distinct countries, to which of the two countries do diasporas that left their homeland before the separation identify with? Do they identify as being from one of the two divided homelands rather than the other (either homeland A or B)? This is the major question in this study. I will examine if there is a shift of membership or not, over time, and delve into what factors affect the preference of membership.

Intuitively, to this question of what factors affect diaspora’s preference of national identity, one might argue that diasporas choose their homeland membership depending on where they came from regionally. For example, if members of the diaspora were from the southern part of the Korean peninsula, then they would identify South Korea as their countries. In this case, their hometown is an indicator of their national membership. Such cognition can be explained by the concept of primordialism in ethnic studies. Generally, primordialists argue that ethnic identity is largely fixed and permanent. Hence, an identity of a diaspora would rely on primordial elements such as one’s hometown. However, this
has not been the case for the Korean and Chinese diasporas. (Chapter V: Analysis explores this situation in further detail.) The observed divergence from the primordial theory denotes that there must be other variables that affect the decisions of diasporas.

This study argues that ethnic school education in a host state, the pride of homeland and practical benefits from the citizenship best explain the national membership of both cases. Before delving into two cases, the following section explores the terminologies of Korean diasporas in Japan and Chinese diasporas in South Korea and determine which terminology to use to refer to the two diaspora groups examined by this study. Furthermore, it reviews the definitions of diaspora and examines whether two groups belong to diasporas or not.

1.2 Terminologies and Definition
1.2.1 Terminologies
(1) Ethnic Korean in Japan: Zainichi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Romanization</th>
<th>English Translations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>在日朝鮮人</td>
<td>Zainichi chosenjin</td>
<td>Koreans in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>在日韓国人</td>
<td>Zainichi Kankokujin</td>
<td>South Koreans in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>재일조선인</td>
<td>Jaeil Joseonin</td>
<td>Koreans in Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>재일한국인</td>
<td>Jaeil Hanguokin</td>
<td>South Koreans in Japan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 Terminologies of Ethnic Korean in Japan

The Japanese word *zainichi* (在日), literally means “resident in Japan,” with a connotation of impermanence. It could be *zainichi* Chinese or *zainichi* Philippines. However, the term almost exclusively refers to members of the Korean ethnic minority in

---

Japan. Specifically, most scholars define that zainichi is (1) an ethnic Korean migrant who came to Japan and settled in around the time of colonial era and (2) their descendants who have been born and raised in Japan and regard Japan as their place of permanent residence. Mentioned before, the term zainichi itself implies temporary residence, but “zainichi Korean” is used to describe settled permanent residents of Japan and refer to both those who have retained either their Joseon or South/North Korean nationalities.

One might designate Korean population in Japan as “Korean-Japanese”. Of the question that where you come from, people customarily answer with two elements, ethnicity, and nationality. For instance, Chinese American or African American, the first word of the label means ethnicity and the second one refer to nationality. However, the term, Korean-Japanese cannot fully capture the Japanese word zainichi for the following reasons.

First, generally, the connotation of immigrant-citizens of other countries guarantees legally equal inclusion in immigrants-receiving states. For example, Chinese Americans refer to ethnically Chinese but their nationality is the United States. Chinese American also has the same legal rights and duties with other Americans regardless of their ethnicities. However, the status of zainichi Korean is the different from example of Chinese-American in that zainich have suffered discrimination by Japanese state and society both legally and socially.

---

7 ibid.,xxxiv.
8 ibid.,xxxiv.
Second, the term Korean Japanese does not always include all zainichi cases. Sometimes, among zainichi, they were born and raised in Japan, but they do not have Japanese citizenship. In this case, how should we call them? Perhaps they could be called as Korean-Korean in Japan because they are ethnic Koreans with Korean nationality based on the connotation of immigrant-nationality. However, we cannot call them “Korean-Korean.” Although some zainichi hold (South/North) Korean citizenships, they are still different from ethnic Korean living in the Korean peninsula. Additionally, zainichi are ethnically Korean but culturally closer to Japan. It is controversial but I argue that only the naturalized zainichi or Korean can be called Korean Japanese.

Third, the term Korean Japanese make difficult to distinguish between Korean migrants in Japan around the time of World War two or earlier and other groups that came to Japan and settle in after Japan-ROK diplomatic normalization in 1965. Since two groups have different historical contexts and legal status, their experiences also are different. To distinguish them and above reasons, I used zainichi to refer to the Korean population in Japan.

(2) Overseas Chinese in South Korea : Hanhwa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Romanization</th>
<th>English Translations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>華僑</td>
<td>Huaqiao</td>
<td>Overseas Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>화교</td>
<td>Hwagyo</td>
<td>Overseas Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>한화</td>
<td>Hanhwa</td>
<td>Overseas Chinese in South Korea</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 Terminologies of Overseas Chinese in South Korea
Scholars use a number of different terms to refer to Chinese people living in Korea. Some scholars call them *huaqiao* (華僑),\(^{10}\) meaning Overseas Chinese, while other scholars use *hwagyo*, or *hanhwa*, meaning Overseas Chinese in South Korea. Among the existing terms, I use *hanhwa* to refer to the Chinese diaspora in South Korea for the following reasons.

The Korean word *hwagyo* literally means Chinese population residing abroad, namely, overseas Chinese. “*hwa*(華)” signifies China and “*gyo*(僑)” refers displaced and usually residence, or sojourn. Indeed, since the term *hwagyo* is originated from Chinese character 華僑, there is no difference between *huaqiao* and *hwagyo* in terms of meaning. While *hwagyo* is the Romanized version in *hwagyo* (화교) in Korean, *huaqiao* is the Romanized version in *huaqiao* (華僑) in Mandarin. Since *huaqiao* is Mandarin version of overseas Chinese, many scholars commonly use the term *huaqiao*. However, sometimes, it is confusing to use the term *huaqiao* because *huaqiao* refer to overseas Chinese in any country, not just Korea. A qualifier is supposed to be added, for example, Korean *huaqiao*.\(^{11}\) Also, literally *huaqiao* and *hwagyo* have the same meaning, thus Korean word *huaqiao* also encounters the same problem. But, in the term *hanhwa* since “*han*(韓)” signifies South Korea, we do not need to add “Korea.” Simply, we can call a Chinese population living in South Korea as *hanhwa*.

However, *hanhwa* is divided into two groups. One is old *hwagyo* (老華僑) who had moved to Korea over a century ago. The other is the new *hwagyo* (新華僑), those

---


who migrated to Korea after a new immigration wave after Sino-ROK diplomatic Relations in 1992. But, the term hanhwa has still commonly referred to the Chinese immigrant who came to Korean Peninsula around the time of the early 1990s. Specifically, hanhwa refers to primarily 3 or 4th generation overseas Chinese who originate from the Shandong province of mainland China. Hanhwa is distinguished with new huagyo historically because hanhwa have experienced discrimination because of ethnically based thoughts of membership in South Korea at both the policy and public’s perception. Although there are some scholars who argue that the range of hanhwa should expand to the new immigrants from China\(^{12}\), the term hanhwa almost exclusively refers to members of Chinese ethnic minority who came to Korea around 1990s or earlier and their descendants who are born and raised in South Korea, just like above mentioned zainichi Korean.

### 1.2.2 Definition of Diaspora

**1) Literature of diaspora definition**

The term “diaspora” is Greek for the scattering or sowing of seeds.\(^{13}\) Mentioned before, there is no consensus on the specific definition of diaspora. In this section, I will review the various definitions of the term and examine whether zainichi and hanhwa are diasporas or not based on our own definition.


Figure 3 Definitions of Diaspora Population

According to Conner (1986), a diaspora refers to “a segment of a people living outside the homeland.” However, Safran (1991) suggests that Conner’s definition is extended and that the concept of the diaspora is applied to expatriate minority communities whose members share several of the following characteristics: first, they are dispersal to two or more location. Second, they retain a collective memory of homeland. Third, they fell partly alienated from their host society. Fourth, they have an ideal home that would eventually return. Fifth, they should collectively, be committed to the maintenance of their original homeland. Six, they continue to relate to that homeland.

In the article Defining Diaspora, Refining a Discourse, Bluter (2001) stated that diaspora should be dispersal at least two destinations with maintaining relationship to homelands. Moreover, they have self-awareness of group identity and exist over at least two generations.

---

14 Conner, Walker. 1986. ‘The impact of homelands upon diasporas’ in Gabriel Sheffer (ed.) Modern diasporas in international politics, London: Croom Helm, 16–45
Based on Brubaker (2005), there are three core criteria that defines a diaspora: the first is dispersion in space; the second is homeland orientation to a real or imagined “homeland” as an authoritative source of value, identity, and loyalty; the third one is the importance of boundaries for collectives that do not have their own territorial polity.17

Shain (2007) also defines a diaspora as “a people with a common origin who reside outside their perceived homeland.”18 They regard themselves, or are regarded by others, as members or potential members of the national community of their homeland, a standing retained regardless of the actual status of their citizenship inside or outside their homeland.19 In addition, he insisted that diasporas need the ability to exert pressure in homeland’s domestic politics. 20 He emphasized the political relationship between diasporas and their homeland.

(2) Definition of diaspora in this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Dispersal at least two locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland</td>
<td>No necessary to return to homeland, but diasporas can be mobilized politically for homeland (self-awareness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinct culture</td>
<td>Language, food, holiday, collective memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status in host state</td>
<td>Troubled relationship with majority in host state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence</td>
<td>Over at least two generations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 Definition of Diasporas in the Study

Referring to the above scholars’ literature in diaspora studies, I define a diaspora as having five elements: geography, homeland, distinct culture, status in host state and

---

18 Shain, Yossi. 2007. Kinship and diasporas in International affairs: The University of Michigan press, II
19 ibid.,II.
generations of existence. First, geographically, a diaspora is a scattered population living outside of the homeland. Second, a diasporic group should have a country of origin to which members would like to return. However, today they are not obligated to return but still have self-awareness about the homeland. Third, a diaspora community is supposed to have their own culture such as language, food and national holidays, while also sharing a collective memory. Fourth, the status of the diaspora in the host state is relatively marginalized compared to a majority of society, and have felt frustrated. Last, diasporic groups have existed for at least two generations.

(3) Examination of zainichi and hanhwa based on definition of diaspora

We have examined the various definitions of a diaspora and have advanced our own for the purposes of this study. Furthermore, according to the above five elements, we will examine whether zainichi and hanhwa are diasporas or not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Zainichi</th>
<th>Hanhwa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>Two location (Korea-Japan)</td>
<td>Two location (China-Korea)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinct culture</td>
<td>Relatively well</td>
<td>Relatively well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status in host state</td>
<td>Marginalized in Japan</td>
<td>Marginalized in South Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence</td>
<td>First-fourth (fifth)</td>
<td>First-fourth (fifth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement of Homeland</td>
<td>-Financial aid for South/North Korea ;</td>
<td>-Protest the PRC-ROK normalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>protests against South Korean military regime</td>
<td>-Protests against Taiwan ruling power, DPP in 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Involved in abduction of Kim Daejung in Japan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5 Examination of Zainichi and Hanhwa based on Definition of Diasporas

As shown in [Figure 5], both groups meet all the criteria for being diasporas. Both zainichi and hanhwa lived outside of their homelands while still preserving their own culture and language, as well as sharing collective memories. In addition, not only are they economically and socially marginalized from their host state and today, they have
fourth or fifth generation. Last but not least, we also need to examine their political behavior and involvement in the homeland. Since political involvement is a critical factor for a diaspora, we will explain two groups’ involvement in detail compared to general political behavior between diasporas and homeland.

First, the political behavior of the diaspora toward the homeland is that the diaspora influences the homeland’s politics in order to influence the behavior of the homeland. Some scholars argue that diasporas attempt to change the domestic politics of the homeland because the sentiment of the diaspora may be manipulated by the government of the host country. For instance, United States government officials attempted on several occasions, particularly during the presidency of Jimmy Carter, to have American Jews exert pressure on Israel. However, in the case of the zainichi and the hanhwa, there does not appear to be an active habit of attempting to influence or effect change in the homeland’s domestic politics. This is because, both diasporic groups were not only marginalized by discriminatory policies of their respective host states but they were also not particularly influential within the host states themselves. Even if the homeland government was able to influence the diasporic community, the host state effectively kept the diasporic community marginalized to the degree that they were unable to exert their influence, and thereby their homeland’s influence, within the host state.

The second political behavior of the diaspora is that a diaspora can promote democracy in the homeland. If the diaspora communities are socialized with the democratic values of Western societies, they could be expected to be sympathetic to the

---

democratization of their home countries. One might argue that zainichi or hanhwa may try to propagate the host state’s political ideology, democracy, because both host states, Japan and South Korea, are democratic countries. However, it is hard to find evidence that zainichi promoted democracy in both North and South Korea, and hanhwa as well in PRC and ROC. There are, though, a few examples of zainichi becoming involved in South Korean domestic politics. For instance, in Japan they demonstrated against the kidnapping of former president Kim DaeJung and also against the Korean military regime to promote democracy during the 1970s and the 1980s. But under the divided homeland context, the zainichi quickly became targeted by attacks from their homeland, accusing them of spying or subversion and some zainichi were arrested in South Korea such as Suh Sung and Suh Jun-sik. These were not ideal circumstances under which to promote a friendly political agenda toward the homeland. Similar to the zainichi, the hanhwa in Korea did not actively become involved with democratization in Taiwan or mainland China. This is because Taiwan used to be a one-party military dictatorship dominated by the Kuomintang until the 1980s and hanhwa did not have enough power to promote democracy in their homeland as well.

The third political behavior of the diaspora toward the homeland involves its potential influence on the foreign policy of the homeland. The diaspora sometimes does not support the homeland’s foreign policy and tries to change it to align with their interests. For example, for zainichi, peaceful relations between Japan and Korea are one

---

23 In April 1971, Suh brothers were arrested while they were students at Seoul National University in South Korea. Suh Sung and Suh Jun-sik were second-generation Korean residents in Japan but had been active in students demonstrations during the bitterly fought 1971 presidential election between Park Chung Hee and Kim DaeJung. (Suh 1994)
of the most important issues. Therefore, the position of the diaspora group on the same topic could differ from the people in Korea. Comfort women issues, Dokdo Island (Takeshima) disputes, the statue of comfort women, controversial history textbooks (distortions or perceptions of history). It is hard to say that the diaspora has managed to change foreign policy, but they try to build and maintain a relationship between the host state and their homeland.

1.3 Structure of the Study

Given both zainichi and hanhwa, which have the divided two homelands, this study raises a question: What factors affect the decision for diasporas to claim membership in one homeland over the other? To answer this question, this study examines the factors that influence the decision of the diaspora through an analytical framework under the existing theories in social science discussions. The research methods for this project will be a combination of a literature review, analytical framework and an analysis of two case studies: the Korean and Chinese diasporas. The following chapter will be literature review. In order to show what factors lead to their decisions of national membership, I will conduct case studies on zainichi and hanhwa. The next section of the research will focus on the analytical framework. Based on hypotheses, this study examines which factors are applicable and which ones are not applicable for the same dilemma faced by two diasporic communities.
II. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Existing Literature on Zainichi Korean

From the 1950s to 1970s, scholarly works specifically addressing the zainichi Korean issues in Japan focused on macro-level approaches such as institutions, policies, and laws. The study on zainichi Korean has increased after the publication of *Koreans in Japan: Ethnic Conflict and Accommodation* (1981), using micro-level methodologies has increased. Lee and DeVos contributed for the discipline by using historical material with the insights of sociology, anthropology, and psychology to research for Korean minority in Japan. However, it mainly focused on socially and economically discrimination and marginalization of zainichi Korean in the Japanese society.

It was the early 1990s that start to examine actively the different forms of zainichi Korean identity.²⁵ Fukuyama and Tsujiyama divided zainichi identity into four groups: pluralists aim to live with Japanese without denying their Korean ethnic identities; nationalist live as overseas Korean regarding naturalization as traitor’s behavior; individualist more focus on their own success instead not thinking of their identity; assimilationists aims to become Japanese citizenship with and deny Korean roots. It made a contribution in that they captured the feature of shifting identity among zainichi Korean communities.

Suh (1997) studied what factors affected the zainichi Korean’s identities and he argued that divided homelands, exclusion of Japanese society, economic situation, democratization of homeland and social-psychological factors influence current

---

zainichi’s identity. It was a convincing argument in dealing with identity of diasporic group and covered dynamics between homeland and host state. However, it is hard to generalize about collective zainichi Korean’s identity because there are other factors that affect their identities such as diasporic organizations and geopolitical international environment and bilateral relationship between homeland and the host state.

Since the first half of 2000, many scholars focused on the puzzle that despite the assimilation, why still lack naturalization to Japanese. Also, Park (2005) studied how the identity of Korean diaspora have evolved over a generation, rather than disappearing. It reflects how zainichi Korean have developed their own zainichi identity with comparative methodology using Korean diaspora in China and Uzbekistan.

Moreover, Champman (2007) explored the discourse of zainichi intellectual and activist. He introduced the proponent of the third way that “encouraged participation in Japanese society while maintaining Korean ethnicity, and views of zainichi revisionists and zainichi liberal orthodoxy in terms of a future direction of zainichi identity. It well encapsulated the various discourse of zainichi’s identity among zainichi intellectuals. Additionally, Suzuki (2009) questioned that why the Japanese, who seem to belong to the same race, discriminated against Koreans. It contributed for the discipline by showing how ethnic minority became rationalized by the socio-political construct.

---

Recently, Kim (2016) tried to answer how historically evolving and mutually interlinked bureaucratic practices shape the contours of trans-border membership politics over time using Korean diasporas. It was novel and convincing in showing how geopolitics, bureaucratic techniques, and actor’s agency shape the construction of ethnonational populations beyond territorial boundary of the state with the comparative approach.

There is various literature on the zainichi Korean with different perspectives and methodologies. However, there are still a few pieces of research on the relations between diasporas’ identity and their citizenship choice between two divided homeland.

2.2 Existing Literature on Hanhwa

At the end of the 1990s, scholars increasingly became interested in issues of Chinese residing in South Korea. The normalization between Sino-ROK relationship in 1992, fueled the expansion of the literature. The majority of literature focused on the socio-economic marginalization of the ethnic Chinese due to structural and social discrimination. Specifically, most studies consisted of criticism and some policy suggestions for the South Korean government to improve the status of hanhwa. On the one hand, these studies on hanhwa contributed to shed light on the dark side of Korean society. On the other hand, these efforts broke the myth of ethnic homogeneity in Korea and helped citizen to realized the need to evolve into the multicultural and cooperative society.

---

Since 2000, studies on hanhwa have achieved fruitful results from a multi-layered framework that reflects social change of South Korea. Expanding from problems of discrimination, scholars also began to write about the roles of hanhwa in South Korea. For example, using methods of anthropological study, scholars delivered numerous voices of hanhwa regarding social relations and communal identity. Additionally, field researches dealt with various issues of hanhwa in cities such as Incheon, Busan, Daegu, Gwangju and Jejudo.

In the recent years, scholars are paying attention to the return of migrants to Taiwan and China and re-migration to other countries such as the United States and various European countries. Although studies on returning migration to PRC is still inchoate, the developing literature is crucial to understanding their membership-preference between Beijing and Taiwan. Along with evolving literature, scholars contended that definition of hanhwa should be expanded to account for the increase of overseas Chinese population.

However, literature does not pay sufficient attention to the small number of hanhwa members who changed their citizenship from ROC to PRC after the normalization of 1992. Although it is less than 3%, it is not clear if it marks the starting point of identity shift or a mere reflection of an insignificant outlier. There are only a few studies on the national membership of hanhwa because, in Korean society, people took for granted that all hanhwa members should hold Taiwan passport. After the Sino-ROK normalization, however, it is no longer true and once ethnic Chinese. Thus, a study on hanhwa’s national membership between two original homelands needs to be explored and examined thoroughly by an analytical framework.
2.3 Theoretical Literature

There are several approaches for understanding ethnic identity. Diaspora groups are usually consisting by ethnicity. Generally, ethnicity shares a common history and descent, common identity and culture traits. Diaspora group also usually are developed based on common ethnicity. Through theories of ethnic identity including primordialism and constructivism, the following section will explore the relations between diaspora’s identity and determination of nationality.

On the one hand, primordialist perspective is an objective theory or essentialist theory, which argued, ethnic groups exist because there are traditions of belief and action toward primordial objects such as biological factors and territorial location.”31 Since Donald Horowitz’s book, Ethnic Groups in Conflict (1985), social scientists have increasingly been debating what ethnic identity is.32 According to Isajiw, primordialist stated, “ethnicity is something given, ascribed at birth, deriving from the kin-and-clan-structure of human society, and hence something more or less fixed and permanent.”33 In this sense, membership of diaspora can be determined by birthplace, residence or a family’s place of origin. Moreover, in Sheffer’s book, Diaspora Politics (2003), he also mentioned that primordial and other ingredients determine loyalty patterns of the diaspora and their identity.34 Likewise, primordialism has long exercised a powerful influence on the way people understood identity.35 However, this approach is vulnerable

to explain the diaspora’s identity because their identity could be changeable depends on various situations or over times

One the other hand, there is a notion in constructivist approach is that ethnicity is something that is being negotiated and constructed in everyday living. In recent years, social scientists have realized that identity flexible and context-dependent.  

Constructionist insists that the nature of diasporic identity can shift significantly over time. Fredrik Barth’s collection *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries* (1969) contends that it is the group boundary, not the cultural context, that plays a critical role in the construction of ethnic identity. Norman Buchignani (1980) makes an argument for the interactionist model of ethnic identity. Dru Gladney (1996) argues that identity is constructed through a series of binaries (us/them) that are dependent on the context in which the question of ethnic identity is raised. Constructivists contend that diasporic identity is constructed by specific circumstance. Because of the fact that diasporas steadily interact with various situations, the constructivists argument seems more convincing.

However, although constructivist approaches can be divided by many theories, there are a few trials to explain relationship between diaspora identity and determination of citizenship by various constructivist theories. Later, this study will analyze both zainichi and hanhwa cases using several constructivist interpretations, and examine which explanation is applicable to zainichi and hanhwa cases.

---

36 Y. Nakasone, Ronald. 2002 *Okinawan Diaspora* University of Hawaii Press.
2.4 Significance of the Study

Despite the rich literature on discrimination and identity of diasporas, relatively little has been published on national membership of diasporas that have two homelands. While there is much literature in diaspora studies regarding the Korean and Chinese diasporas, respectively, there is seemingly little literature comparing the similarities and differences between the Korean diaspora and the Chinese diaspora.

In addition, for the divided homeland, the membership of the diaspora is an important indicator owing to the legitimacy of the current regime. This is why the two Koreas and the two Chinas have made an effort, through the offering and dispensation of a variety of enticements, to attain and retain the affection and loyalty of their respective diaspora communities. Thus, I still contend that the study of the selection of diaspora membership and self-identification within a divided country is meaningful and important to explore. Through this study, I hope to understand the diaspora mechanism of membership choices that change based on the relationship between the homeland and host-state.
III. THEORY AND HYPOTHESES

This study explores theories focusing on constructivist’s approaches. There are several following theories including instrumentalist theory, social identity theory, and rational choice theory. Based on three theories, hypotheses will be suggested in order to delve into the relationship between citizenship and diaspora’s identity in both zainichi and hanhwa cases.

3.1. Instrumentalist Theory

Instrumentalism is a sort of constructivist thought. Proponents of instrumentalist view ethnicity as something that can be changed, constructed or even manipulated to gain specific political and/or economic ends. From the instrumentalist’s perspective, elite theory, which argues that the leaders in a modern state (the elite) use and manipulate the perception of ethnic identity to further their own ends and stay in power is an approach advocated by scholars Abner Cohen, Paul Brass, and Ted Gurr.40 “Ethnicity is created in the dynamics of elite competition within the boundaries determined by political realities” and ethnic groups are to be seen as a product of political myths, created and manipulated by cultural elites in their pursuit of advantages and power.

Base on this theory, diaspora’s decision of nationality can be affected by host state and homeland’s exclusionary /inclusive policies to take advantages of diaspora groups for its own interest such as nation building project. Additionally, diasporic organizations and its leaders that were affiliated with each homeland can exploit the ethnic identity to expand their power. Homeland and host state’s policies and diasporic

organization are consistent with the elite theory of instrumentalism, not with social identity theories because instrumentalists view human or state action as rationally oriented toward practical goals.

Instrumentalists could suggest the following three hypotheses:

[Hypothesis 1] When host state adopts exclusionary policies toward diasporas who hold the nationality of homeland A for their political purpose, then the diasporas are more likely to choose citizenship from homeland B.

[Hypothesis 2] When homeland A adopts an inclusive policy toward diaspora for their political interest, then the diasporas are more likely to choose citizenship from homeland A.

[Hypothesis 3] When diasporic organizations that are affiliated with homeland A support diasporas more in order to expand their power, relative to those organizations in the other homeland, then the diasporas are more likely to choose the citizenship of homeland A.

3.2 Social Identity Theory

Tajfel (1979) proposed that pride and self-esteem are an important source of the groups that people belonged to.\(^{41}\) This theory contends that people identify with groups in such a way as to maximize positive distinctions remembering more negative information about the out-group. Based on this theory, there are two indicators: one is ethnic schools in the host state, which are affiliated with homelands because these schools instruct ethnic history and culture using their ethnic language to cultivate self-esteem toward the homeland.

The other is the national pride based on international reputation of homeland will be suggested as a significant role in choosing of diaspora’s nationality. National pride of an individual is a kind of favorable attitude toward one’s country in general, toward its

specific achievements, and toward one’s national identity. The opposite of national pride is a national embarrassment, which is kind of unfavorable attitude toward one’s country in general or toward its insufficient achievement in specific areas. While this concept of national pride was originally derived from the Tsuda’s study on Japanese diaspora in Brazil. Tsuda’s found that although Japanese diasporas are very well integrated into mainstream Brazilian Society, a majority of Japanese diaspora claimed that they feel more “Japanese” than “Brazilian.” Thus, we can contend that the national pride can be an influential element to choose diaspora.

Social Identity Theorist could suggest the following hypotheses:

[Hypothesis 1] Given the condition that the ethnic schools that are affiliated with homeland A are powerful, there is a higher chance that the diasporas will choose to hold the citizenship of homeland A.

[Hypothesis 2] When diasporas feel more national pride from homeland A based on international reputation, then the diasporas are more likely to want to hold the nationality of A homeland.

3.3 Rational Choice Theory

There is a notion that in general individuals act or react to satisfy their goals of own interest. It is true that the interest of individuals is one of the most crucial concepts in membership choice. Additionally, the rational choice approach is fundamental in human being's decision-making process. Duncan Snidal (1985) explained that actors behave balancing costs against benefits to arrive at an action that maximizes its advantage. Also, Almond and Verba (1965) placed national pride and its sources among

---

42 Marharyta Fabrykant, Vladimir Magun 2015. "Grounded and normative dimensions of national pride in comparative perspective" National Research University Higher School of Economics.
the key components of a political culture with values political trust and regime support. Based on interest and rational choice theory, we suggest that diaspora will consider economic factors in order to get more neo-liberal opportunities.

Rational Choice Theorists could suggest the following hypotheses:

[Hypothesis 1] When diasporas gain more practical benefits from homeland A, then diasporas are more likely to choose the citizenship of homeland A.

[Hypothesis 2] When homeland A has a better economic growth than homeland B, then the diasporas are more likely to want to hold the nationality of homeland A.

[Hypothesis 3] Given the condition that the economic relationship between homeland A and the host state is strong, there is a higher chance that the diasporas will choose to hold the citizenship of homeland A.

3.4 Primordialist Theory

In the above literature review session, since primordialism perspective is explained, this section will suggest hypothesis based on primordialism. (See the theoretical literature above).

[Hypothesis 1] Diasporas would choose the homeland from which they originated regionally before moving to the current state in which they reside.

---

IV. METHODOLOGY

4.1 Research Methodology

This study aims to gain an understanding of how diasporas who have a divided homeland identified themselves and how their identity has evolved over generations, chiefly through qualitative case studies. The independent variables in this study are the factors that potentially influence how the zainichi and hanhwa choose their nationality, which include both ethnic identity and rational choice factors. The dependent variable then is the population of diasporas who have the citizenship of either homeland A or homeland B. The following section will explain the methodology used to examine the relationship between these variables.

First, a list of all the significant factors that can influence the dependent variables was compiled. This was accomplished by deriving them from previously published materials on diaspora’s identity and national membership. Two major arguments were identified, centering on primordialist and constructivist (instrumentalist, social identity theorist, and rational choice theorist) views. Secondly, these approaches were applied to two different diaspora cases that resulted in different choices of diaspora’s nationality between the two divided homelands. Thirdly, all significant findings and trends were compiled and analyzed closely. This section examines the significance of these findings and what it means for the diaspora’s decision and behavior.

In order to understand the dynamic among two homelands, host states, and diasporic groups, this study examines diasporas with at least three generations who migrated to the host states in the early 1900s, focusing on the Korean diasporas and Chinese diasporas. As host states, I chose Japan for studying the Korean diaspora and
South Korea for the Chinese diaspora. Although the two cases have different diaspora groups and host states, they share important similarities.

4.2 Reasons for Comparison between Zainichi and Hanhwa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ethnic Korean in Japan</th>
<th>Overseas Chinese in South Korea</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>650,000 (Largest Foreign Group until 2007)</td>
<td>20,000 (Largest Foreign Group until 1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>First-fourth (fifth)</td>
<td>First-Fourth (fifth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period of immigration</td>
<td>Early 1900s</td>
<td>Early 1900s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Acculturation</td>
<td>Considerably high</td>
<td>Considerably high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propensity to Naturalization</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Affinity to Mainstream</td>
<td>Similar</td>
<td>Similar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic Status</td>
<td>Marginalized</td>
<td>Marginalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political system of Host State</td>
<td>Democracy</td>
<td>Democracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6 Similarities between Zainich and Hanhwa**

The two diasporic groups settled in the host states more than a century ago and have maintained the status as the largest foreign minorities for more than three generations. Moreover, two groups appear indistinguishable from the majority people in host states because they are similar racially. Diasporas’ cultural literacy and native fluency in the host state’s language allowed “passing” as a way of life, making them invisible minorities. However, despite the community’s high degree social and cultural

---


46 “Passing” is the ability of a person to be regarded as a member of an identity group or category different from their own, which may include racial identity, ethnicity, caste, social class, sexual orientation, gender, religion, age and/ or disability status. Ginsberg, Elaine K. 1996. *Passing and the Fictions of Identity*: Duke University Press.3.
assimilation to the host societies, two groups are socio-economically marginalized and the rate of naturalization to the host states is also considerably low.47

In terms of the two host states, they are geographically close to the homelands of the diaspora and influenced each other.48 Also, both Korea and Japan are known for having the most ethnically homogeneous communities in the world. And Japan and South Korea are strict *jus sanguinis* states, meaning that it attributes citizenship by blood and not by location of birth. Also, two home states have the democrat political system.

### 4.3 Limitation of the Study

There are still some limitations as follows: the first limitation concerns the lack of data on number of *hanhwa*’s citizenship in comparison to that of the *zainichi*. Based on existing literature, I use the percentage of *hanhwa*’s nationality (2-3%) but it is still unclear how many *hanhwa* exactly shifted their citizenship from Taiwan to mainland China after normalization.

Second, the multiple hypotheses that explain the preference of diaspora’s citizenship are not mutually exclusive. For example, the ethnic school education and power of diasporic organizations were largely influenced by the situation at the homeland.

Third, one may criticize that this study assumes that there are only two options in the decision of diaspora’s choice of citizenship, either homeland A or B. Their argument may suggest that there have been increasing number of naturalized *zainichi* and *hanhwa* or other diasporas who do not have affiliation to either homeland A or B. While I this

---

article is intentionally aimed exploring the behavior of diasporas that have two homelands. Furthermore, factors such as naturalization should not impede further study on the relationship between citizenship and diaspora. Their relativity to the literature still persists given the vastness of the population and unsolved diplomatic relationship of the two homelands.
V. ANALYSIS

5.1 Zainichi Korean

5.1.1 Background Knowledge of Zainichi Korean

![Figure 7 Demographic Change of Zainichi in Japan](image)

The emergence of the *zainichi* Korean can be traced back to the early twentieth century due to the Japan-Korean Treaty of 1910, under which Korean people became a nation of the Empire of Japan. Korean people and their descendants moved to and settled in Japan during the era under the colonial administration.\(^{49}\) It is estimated that there were 2 million Koreans living in Japan at the end of World War II. Some of *zainichi* moved to Japan from the Korean Peninsula to find jobs during the Japanese occupation period, but many of them were forced to go to Japan as laborers or combatants under the National

\(^{49}\) Annual Yearbook of Immigration office Ministry of Justice of Japan (1911-2015)

\(^{50}\) Lie, John. 2008. *Diasporic Nationalism and postcolonial identity*: University of California Press, p.x
Coalition Act of Japan after the outbreak of World War II in 1939.\textsuperscript{51}

After the end of WWII, approximately 1.5 million of them returned to Korea through the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers (SCAP) Repatriation Program. However, 600,000 Koreans settled in Japan for various reasons, not returning to Korea after December 1946, when the Repatriation Program of SCAP was officially concluded.\textsuperscript{52}

Later, in 1950, the Korean War broke out and lasted for three years. In the middle of the Korean War, the San Francisco Peace Treaty restored Japanese sovereignty in 1952 and the status of the zainichi Koreans changed from Japanese nationals to foreigners. Thus, zainichi made up Japan’s largest group of ethnic minorities and foreigners.

After the Korean War ended in 1953, the political division in the peninsula complicated what it meant to be “Korean.” The rate of naturalization from Korean to Japanese was considerably low. Only 233 Korean were naturalized in 1952.\textsuperscript{53} At that time, not only the way of naturalization as a Japanese citizen was difficult but also, naturalization was regarded as an act of ethnic betrayal in the zainichi communities. Under the difficulty of being a Japanese citizen and the context of the Cold War, the zainichi Korean felt compelled to choose one side—either North or South Korea.\textsuperscript{54}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{51} Kim, Bumsoo. 2016. "Whether is a Chae'ilkyopyo "korean"?: An Analysis of Newspaper Articles from the 5.16 Coup to the October Yushin" \textit{The Korean Journal of International Studies} 56 (2):163-206.
\textsuperscript{52} ibid.163-206.
\textsuperscript{54} Hirabayashi 1978,3-5, “8.15 Kaihogo no Zainichi Chosenjin no Seikatsu”, Zainichi Chosenjinshi Kenkyu 2:1-16.
\end{flushright}
As shown [Figure 8, 9] from 1945 to mid-1960s, most zainichi chose the North Korean nationality. However, since South Korean-Japanese diplomatic normalization in

56 ibid. 108.
1965, the population who chose the nationality of South Korean steadily has increased. Eventually, the number of *zainichi* with the South Korean nationality surpassed one of *zainichi* with North Korean nationality in 1969. As to the citizenship of *zainichi* Koreans, according to a report released by Japan’s Ministry of Justice, among foreigners living in Japan as of 2015, the number of North Koreans stands at 33,939\(^{57}\) and the number of South Korean citizens is 457,772.\(^{58}\) Interestingly, after the diplomatic normalization, the shift from North Korea to South Korea dramatically increased and now *zainichi* who has a South Korean citizenship is 93 percent out of the total population. In the following section, we will examine what factors affect the significant shift of nationality among *zainichi* groups. By dividing time into before and after the diplomatic normalization in 1965, we will examine whether these hypotheses mentioned before are applied to the nationality choice of *zainichi*.

5.1.2 Hypotheses Test

Through the hypotheses based on theories mentioned above, this section examines the relationship between suggested variables and diaspora’s citizenship.

(1) Instrumentalist Theory

| Hypothesis 1 | When host state adopts exclusionary policies toward diasporas who hold the nationality of homeland A for their political purpose, then the diasporas are more likely to choose citizenship from homeland B. |

This hypothesis could explain the *zainichi* case. At the end of the Pacific War,  

\(^{57}\) Considering that the Joseon national holders are usually affiliated with the General Federation of Korean Residents in Japan (Chongryon), this statistic shows that the influence of the Chongryon in Japan has been remarkably reduced.

Japan’s most urgent and important challenges were to unify and consolidate the divided Japanese society and restore the economy that had been destroyed by the war. For the consolidation of Japanese society, the Japanese government has repeatedly stated that Japan is a “homogeneous” society. However, this was not true, because communities of Burakumin 59, the Ainu 60, Okinawan 61 and the zainichi Koreans and Chinese lived in Japan. 62 Although the homogeneous society was not the reality, it remained a powerful myth with enduring influence over the identity-formation of Japanese people. 63 Due to the steady propaganda that Japanese society is made up of a single ethnic group from the government, this concept was generally taken for granted by Japanese nationals. 64 As a result, the zainichi Koreans became targets to be discriminated by the Japanese government and Japanese society. 65 However, Japanese society did not discriminate against zainichi groups based on which homeland zainichi groups exhibited support for. One might assume that because of the different political systems between North Korea and Japan, the Japanese government would adopt more discriminative policies toward zainichi who expressed support for North Korea or pro-North Korean diasporic organizations. But there were no significant differences between pro-North zainichi and pro-South zainichi. Rather, from the 1950s and mid-1960s, Japan had good economic

59 Burakumin refers to the descendants of people defined as outcasts during the feudal middle ages.
60 Ainu refers to the different ethnic group who lived Japan long before the formation of the Yamato
61 Okinawan people refer to formerly the nationals of an independent Ryukyu Kingdom, were subject to persecution by their Japanese conquerors. Today, more than 70% US military facilities are located in the Okinawan islands.
62 Zainichi Koreans and Chinese refer to people who migrated to Japan before or during the WWII and their descendant.
64 ibid. xxviii
65 The Japanese government adopted discriminate policies toward the ethnic Korean residing in Japan in general. Between 1952 and 1985, the Japanese government projected an ethnoracially homogeneous vision of Japanese society: one race, one ethnicity, and one nation. In general, citizenship, race, ethnicity, and nationality were all conflated: the obviousness of Japaneseness underscored monoethnic ideology.
relations with North Korea. At that time, the economy of North Korea was better than South Korea’s. Pyongyang sought to prevent the normalization of Japanese-South Korean relations through a cooperative attitude toward Tokyo and in an attempt to reduce its economic dependence on the Soviet Union.66

For the economic restoration of Japan, the Japanese government assisted the repatriation program to North Korea. At the end of WWII, since around 600,000 ethnic Koreans remained in Japan, the Japanese government faced the challenge that it should support the zainichi Koreans under Japan’s Livelihood Protection Law.67 According to Professor Morris-Sukuzi, the Japanese government and the Japanese Red Cross had begun to cooperate in lobbying the International Committee of the Red Cross to help undertake a mass repatriation of zainichi Korean to North Korea.68 The reasons behind the efforts of authorities for repatriation were to reduce Livelihood Protection payment to Koreans. As a result, from winter of 1959 to 1984, around 90,000 zainichi Korean repatriated to North Korea.

In Morris-Suzuki’s book, Exodus to North Korea: Shadows from Japan’s Cold War, it was written that “All [repatriation project] steps were taken by the Japanese authorities to prevent provocation on the part of pro-Synman Rhee elements. The repatriation has the support of Japanese society.” 69 Morris-Suzuki’s argues the repatriation program would be impossible without the cooperation of Japanese government. As seen from [Figure 8] above, between end of the 1950s and early 1970s,

68 ibid.
the populations who have DPRK nationality sharply decreased. It could be closely related to the repatriation program because people who identified with DPRK returned to North Korea.

The 1965 Normalization Treaty between Japan and South Korea was a turning point for zainichi in choosing their national membership from North to South Korea. In 1990, Tokyo attempted to normalize diplomatic ties with Pyongyang, but this attempt was unsuccessful. Zainichi in 1991 who have North Korean nationality gained the rights of Special Permanent Residency, like zainichi who have the South Korean nationality. However, although there was no special persecution to pro-North Korean zainichi, Japan adopted more beneficial policies toward the pro-South Korean zainichi. So zainichi who support the North Korea have gradually lost the power in Korean diasporic communities.

After North Korea’s launch of a two-stage Taepodong-1 missile in August 1998, which overflew Japanese territory without prior warning, Japan imposed sanctions on North Korea and temporarily froze its funding to the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO). The relations between Japan and North Korea were deteriorated by the acknowledgment of the abduction of Japanese citizens by Kim Jong-il in the summit with Koizumi. Additionally, the nuclear threat of North Korea toward Japan and human right issues, resulted in Japan joining the sanctions imposed by the global community and terminating the funding for pro-North Korean ethnic schools as mentioned above.

Looking at the relations between South Korea and Japan, there are many sensitive issues such as the territorial disputes, friction over distorted history textbooks and

---

continuing demands for Japan to deal with the issue of comfort women. Despite this, the Japanese government has not sanctioned South Korea or persecuted the zainichi who have identify with South Korean nationality for these issues. While the Japanese government adopted the exclusionary policy toward pro-DPRK zainichi, it did not apply specific exclusionary policies for pro-ROK zainichi. In other words, before normalization of 1965, since Japan adopted with cooperative policies toward the DPRK, the reason why the population of pro-North zainichi declined was that many of them returned to North Korea and because of Japanese economic sanctions toward DPRK, the fewer members of the zainichi group chose to identify with the DPRK.

[Hypothesis 2] When homeland A adopts an inclusive policy toward diaspora for their political or economic interest, then the diasporas are more likely to choose citizenship from homeland A.

The homeland’s inclusive policy affects the preferences of the zainichi’s citizenship. After the independence of the Korean peninsula, South and North Korea established separate governments in 1948. The South Korean nationality is awarded to individuals who are born to either a Korean national father or Korean national mother (Jus Sanguinis). However, in North Korea, if a child is born abroad to one North Korean citizen parent and one of mixed nationality, the citizenship is to be determined by the parents. Based on this nationality law, while the North Korean government was greatly interested in zainichi community, the South Korean regime did not care about the zainichi people at that time.

Because of financial assistance from North Korea, zainichi members thanked North Korea and were able to survive in the harsh Japanese society. Through this experience, the majority of zainichi Koreans retained their faith toward North Korea.
rather than South Korea. While North Korea initially funded the pro-North Korean organization, Chongryon, the Japanese Foreign Ministry reported the total North Korean contribution at 8.3 billion yen between 1957 and 1969. 

Support for zainichi community worked so that the majority of zainichi regarded North Korea as a legitimate regime. In contrast, Rhee’s regime in South Korea was not much concerned with zainichi, and there was almost zero assistance toward zainichi. In addition, in terms of diplomatic normalization, zainichi felt frustrated about permanent residency, which was given only to first and second generations who have South Korean nationality.

In the 1950s and 1960s, the North Korean government had supported the livelihood of the zainichi members in Japan, while from the 1970s zainichi began to help North Korea in return because North Korea was struggling from economic depression. On the other hand, during the 1950s, South Korea passively dealt with zainichi issues. However, after the normalization of 1965, the South Korean government was more interested in zainichi offering various benefits. Benefits of its main funding source, Mindan, a pro-South Korean zainichi organization, came to depend on the South Korean government and thereby became a favored South Korean organization.

Moreover, during the Kim Daejung administration, the Korean government proposed a bilateral negotiation with Japan for the local suffrage of non-naturalized residents based on a principle of reciprocity; President Kim Daejung raised the issue in his meeting with Prime Minister Obuchi Keizo in 1999. In this context, because of great financial and cultural support from North Korea, zainichi chose North Korea as their

72 ibid.
homeland. Thus, the instrumentalists’ argument is quite explainable.

| Hypothesis 3 | When diasporic organizations that are affiliated with homeland A support diasporas more in order to expand their power, relative to those organizations in the other homeland, then the diasporas are more likely to choose the citizenship of homeland A. |

Diasporic organizations influence the choice of the zainichi’s national membership. Postwar Korean diasporic organizations appeared to fight discrimination, aid fellow ethnics, and engage in politics. In 1954, Foreign Minister Nam Il of North Korea proclaimed that the zainichi population are North Korean citizens. A North Korean-sponsored repatriation program with the support of the General Association of Korean Residents in Japan (Chongryon) officially began in 1959. Chongryon’s founding secretary, Han Doksu, delivered a speech in 1955 affirming the North Korean line. Chongryon played a role as a de facto government for Koreans in Japan: collecting “taxes,” increasing welfare, and trying criminals.\(^{74}\)

However, reflecting the Cold War atmosphere in general and the division of the Koreas in particular, Chongryon failed to sustain a united front among the Korean diaspora in Japan. Its communist orientation generated a splinter group to the right: South Korea-affiliated Mindan (Community of Resident South Koreans in Japan) in 1948.\(^ {75}\) In contrast to Chongryon, Mindan’s expectation was that Koreans would soon repatriate, avoid intervention in Japanese politics, and align itself with South Korea. It was broadly pro-Japanese because of South Korea’s pro-U.S. stance.

Unlike North Korea, the South Korean government willfully neglected the Korean


\(^{75}\) Yuhwan, Ri. 1971. Zainichi Kankokujin 60 man. Tokyo: Yoyosha.102-103
diaspora in Japan until the 1970s. While Mindan members did not make any serious commitment to ethnic education, such as language and culture, Chongryon schools continued to teach Korean language and the North Korean Chongryon brand of nationalist communism. In addition, Chongryon was the main conduit of information and support, especially for rural zainichi. Chongryon established a significant presence in Japan by creating an ethnic Korean enclave in Japanese society. The organization established and operated its own businesses, banks, schools, hospitals, and newspaper.

Prior to restrictions being imposed in the 2000s, Chongryon operated commercial vessels transporting goods between Japan and North Korea with few restrictions or inspections, while also remitting earnings from Koreans in Japan to their families in North Korea. From 1992 until the imposition of sanctions in 2006, a large ferry and cargo ship, the Mangyongbong-92, sailed regularly between the Japanese city of Niigata and Wonsan, a city on North Korea’s eastern coast. Chongryon also established a network of pachinko parlors in Japan, which allegedly served as a front for gambling and illicit activities.

Given the above fact, Chongryon was popular from the early 1950s to the mid-1960s because North Korea financially supported it. The relationship between North Korea and Chongryon was much closer than the one between South Korea and Mindan until the mid-1960s. Not only did North Korea influence Chongryon’s political activities, but also Chongryon members participated in North Korean politics although such

78 Yoshi Yamamoto, 2011 Taken "North Korea's Criminal Abduction of Citizens of Other Countries (Committee for Human Rights in North Korea) http://www.hrnk.org/uploads/pdfs/Taken_LQ.pdf
participation was nominal. As a result, most of the Korean diaspora in Japan regarded themselves as North Korean, regardless of their regional origin. The South Korean government displayed a lukewarm attitude towards zainichi compared with North Korean enthusiasm. However, after the normalization of 1965, the South Korean government provided financial support to Mindan, in particular in the wake of the Mun Sae Kwang incident\(^{80}\) in August 1975 and the North Korea project of organizing a Chongryon members’ tour to North Korea. The Mun Sae Kwang incident is one of the examples of Chongryon’s deep involvement in political confrontations between North and South Korea whereas Chongryon began to decline due to the lack of financial support from North Korea. This was because the power of the diasporic organization is closely related to homeland assistance toward zainichi groups. Therefore, the power of the diasporic organization also could influence the choice of zainichi national membership.

(2) Social Identity Theory

| Hypothesis 1 | Given the condition that the ethnic schools that are affiliated with homeland A are powerful, there is a higher chance that the diasporas will choose to hold the citizenship of homeland A. |

This hypothesis explains the shift of zainichi’s citizenship. From the 1950s to 1960s, the DPRK and Chongryon managed all ethnic schools. The ethnic schools were established during the pre-WWII period and during the war itself. The North Korean government and the Chongryon offered to fund these schools, while South Korea did not care about the zainichi’s education. Since the DPRK valued the ethnic education as a crucial source of maintaining the national identity and self-esteem of diaspora, the
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\(^{80}\) Mun Sae Kwang, as a second generation Zainichi, who was an activist in Choryon, underlook special training and committed the assassination of the then first lady of South Korea who was mistakenly targeted while the actual target was the then President, Park Jung Hee.
schools received increasing support in the 1950s and 1960s and many zainichi students went to ethnic schools.

After the normalization in 1965, however, the existence of ethnic Korean schools notwithstanding, the majority of zainichi children attended Japanese public schools. What was worse that since 1994, the relationship between Chongryon and North Korea has frayed, with internal conflicts within the organization being frequent. Statistics show that the number of people who changed their nationality from North Korean to South Korean, Japanese or something else after Kim Il-sung’s death that year, was almost the same as the number as during the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.81

Moreover, tensions between North Korea and Japan influenced the survival of ethnic Korean schools. While a number of local governments provide small subsidies to Chongryon Korean schools, the national government does not offer subsidies because of the provocation of North Korea. As a result, the facilities of these schools are poor and school buildings are in great need of repair, with no proper safety measures for earthquakes. Chongryon schools underwent a major revision in 1993 to incorporate more pragmatic and more Japanese-oriented curriculum.82 Around 2003 many North Korean primary and junior high schools removed portraits of the Kim family from the classrooms due to a belief that such portraits were not appropriate for small children.83 As of 2013, many schools use their own curriculum distinct from that of the North Korean curriculum. By 2014 the loss of funding put many North Korean schools in financial

82 ibid.77.
In contrast to the past, many Chongryon ethnic schools declined, with few students still studying in ethnic Korean school. In this context, the waning prevalence of the identity constructed by North Korean education partly influenced the choice of zainichi nationality.

[Hypothesis 2] When diaspora feels more national pride from homeland A based on international reputation, then the diasporas are more likely to want to hold nationality of homeland A.

The national pride hypothesis could explain the zainichi case. As mentioned, image of North Korea was good during the 1950s and 1960s thanks to generous financial aid. However, the international image of North Korea was declining due to various reasons including authoritarian state, restrictions on freedom of movement inside the country, political prisoner camps, forced labor and human right. According to a poll conducted by the BBC, around 90% of the Japanese population negatively view North Korea. This is the most negative view toward North Korea in the world.

These made Zainichi disappointed about their homeland, North Korea.

In addition, during the 1950s to 1980s, some zainichi Korean returned to North Korea through the DPRK’s repatriation program. Not much later, zainichi realized that they were deceived by North Korean’s distorted advertisement. Through this event, the romanticism toward North Korea was declining as well. Also, in 2002, Kim Jong-il, admitted that North Korea abducted 13 Japanese citizens in the 1970s and 1980s. In the 1990s, there were the nuclear crisis of North Korea threatened the security of Northeast

---

84 McCurry, Justin. "Japan's Korean schools being squeezed by rising tensions with Pyongyang" (Archive) The Guardian. Monday 15 November 2014
Asia.

As a result, many zainichi turned their backs on North Korea choosing the South Korean nationality or naturalizing as Japanese. In contrast to North Korea, the international image of South Korea has been getting better. South Korea has experienced dramatic changes during the past few decades. It has transformed itself from a war-torn country to an economic powerhouse in only half a century. Due to its blossoming economy, South Korea has vigorously engaged in global governance and thus grown into a prominent player on the global stage. Based on economic size, population, and military capability, South Korea belongs to the middle-power country category.\(^{87}\) Not only did South Korea achieve economic and political development, but also South Korea held the Seoul Olympics in 1988, and many zainichi Korean sent their donation for homeland development.\(^{88}\) The Japanese view South Korea as a respectable and highly recognized partner, as has been demonstrated by the two countries’ successfully cohosting the World Cup, Korea’s rapid growth in information technology industries, and Korea’s hosting of the Asian Games. Along with the enhancement of the South Korean image in Japan, the number deciding the South Korean nationality increased among zainichi groups.

(3) Rational Choice Theory

[Hypothesis 1] When diasporas gain more practical benefits from homeland A, then diasporas are more likely to choose the citizenship of homeland A.

This hypothesis is applicable to the zainichi case. Before the normalization of 1965, zainichi who identified as North Korean were able to obtain more benefits. While

---


the South Korean government did not care about the lives of the *zainichi*, the North Korean government actively supported the *zainichi* community running advisory services for Chongryon members such as legal and marriage advice and employment help. Moreover, Chongryon operated businesses and banks providing jobs to the *zainichi*, and offered services and social networks as well.\(^9\) For example, Chogin Bank, run by Chongryon, played a crucial role in strengthening the *zainichi* community by providing financing for *zainichi* enterprises.\(^9^0\)

After the treaty of 1965, the South Korean citizenship provided profound incentives for the *zainichi* to seek South Korean citizenship, which would offer a relatively secure footing in Japan, the relative freedom to travel abroad and return to Japan), and access to Japanese medical and welfare benefits. Unlike the South Korean nationality, the North Korean *zainichi* have trouble going abroad using their passports. In this context, the *zainichi* Korean nationality changed due to practical benefits from the homeland.

**[Hypothesis 2]** When homeland A has a better economic growth than homeland A, then the diasporas are more likely to want to hold the nationality of homeland A.

From the 1950s to 1960s, in the *zainichi* community, the population who identified themselves as North Koreans were higher. Such phenomenon is closely related to the economy of two homelands. Comparing the economic development of the two Koreas in the immediate postwar period, North Korea achieved higher growth than South Korea. There were several reasons to the growth gap between the two states. On the one hand, during the Japanese colonial rule, heavy industries were concentrated in the


northern part of Korea where it was less populated but with affluent resources. The division of the Korean peninsula brought the imbalance of natural and human resources. In 1945, approximately 65 percent of Korea’s heavy industry was located in the North.\(^91\) Although both Koreas suffered from the massive destruction of the Korean War, North Korea’s recovery was quicker than South Korea due to its ability to mobilize its labor force and affluent natural resources. In contrast, South Korea greatly lacked natural resources. On the other hand, the former Soviet Union and the PRC provided assistance to the industrial development of North Korea and achieved rapid growth. For example, the PRC’s economic assistance to North Korea accounted for about half of all Chinese foreign aid.\(^92\)

However, in 1965, South Korea’s economic growth rate first exceeded North Korea in most industrial areas, though South Korea’s per capita GNP remained lower than North Korea’s.\(^93\) In this context, the zainichi population may have had greater national pride toward North Korea due to North Korea’s great economic achievement until the mid-1960s.

---


\(^93\) 1967. North Korean Intentions and Capabilities With Respect to South Korea. CIA.
From the late 1960s, the South Korean economy developed rapidly and eventually surpassed North Korea’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of North Korea in the early 1970s. As seen from [Figure 10], it is interesting to note that 1969 was the year that the population who possessed South Korean nationality among *zainichi* surpassed that of the *de facto* North Korean nationality. In this sense, it is not a coincidence that the increasing number of South Korean *zainichi* in the late 1960s was related to the economic growth of South Korea, and therefore it is important to note the impact of economic development on the preference of diaspora’s citizenship.

**[Hypothesis 3]** Given the condition that the economic relationship between Homeland A and the host state is strong, there is a higher chance that the diasporas will choose to hold the citizenship of Homeland A.

The bilateral economic relationship between the homeland and the host state affects the decision of *zainichi*’s citizenship. Although Japan and North Korea did not establish the diplomatic relations, there was trade between the two states since the 1950s.

---

This was because Japan was able to trade with North Korea through unofficial channels. From the 1950s to 1970s, the enhancement of relationship between North Korea and Japan led to a sharp increase in the amount of trade. Reportedly, Japan’s export to North Korea was exceeding 100 billion JPY in the early 1980s.\(^\text{95}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mid-1950s to late 1960s</td>
<td>Initial phase of DPRK-Japan trade relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 1970s</td>
<td>Growing DPRK-Japan relations and increase in plant export</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1970s</td>
<td>Unpaid debt and export decrease from Japan to DPRK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early 1980s</td>
<td>Spot transaction increasing the scale of trade to 100 billion yen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1980s</td>
<td>Scale of trade reduced to 60-70 billion yen due to export decrease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s to the present</td>
<td>Clothing industry as main source of trade, Reduction in scale of trade to 40 billion yen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Figure 11 Timeline of DPRK-Japan Trade Relations}\(^\text{96}\)

However, in the late 1980s, Japan-North Korea relations became antagonistic due to a string of incidents such as the abduction of Japanese citizens by North Korea and North Korea’s nuclear test. These incidents provoked anger from the Japanese public and Japan imposed economic sanctions against North Korea. In recent years, their relationship declined to an all-time low after a North Korean nuclear-capable ballistic missile launch landed in Japanese waters.\(^\text{97}\)


\(^{96}\)ibid.

In contrast to North Korea, after the normalization of diplomatic ties, the economic relations between South Korea and Japan steadily improved. Japan provided economic assistance to South Korea and the amount of trade began to increase as well. Today, South Korea has become an increasingly significant export market for Japan in which Japan’s reliance on exports to South Korea increased from 6.4% in 2000 to 8.1% in 2010. In addition, Figure 12 shows 5 of Japan’s top trading partners, countries that imported the most Japanese shipments by dollar value during 2016. South Korea is the third largest trading partner of Japan and in this sense, the economic bilateral relationship is another factor that affects the zainichi’s choice of citizenship.

---


(4) Primordialist Theory

**Hypothesis1** Diasporas would choose the homeland from which they originated regionally before moving to the current state in which they reside.

When approaching the decision of homeland membership, primordialists contend that the diaspora’s choice is largely shaped by a primordial element such as biological factors or regional origin. We chose the hometown of *zainichi* in their homeland as an indicator for representing primordialism since among primordial aspects territorial location could also be included.

However, even though the regional origin perhaps may partly influence the formation of the diaspora’s identity, this argument does not seem fully convincing. The argument is unable to explain the *zainichi* case that most *zainichi* came originally from southern Korea (Gyeongsang province and Jeolla province, as well as Jeju Island), but in the early 1950s to mid-1960s, the majority of them identified themselves as North Korean (Joseon nationality, de facto North Korean).

![Figure 13 Hometown of Zainichi Korean in March 1953](image)

---

After the ROK had established diplomatic relations in December 1965, only zainichi Koreans who had or have the South Korean nationality were able to apply for permanent residency in Japan. Only 20,000 of over 600,000 Koreans applied for permanent resident status in 1965, the first year of the five-year application period. Some of zainichi members applied for citizenship of South Korea in order to visit their actual hometown or their ancestral hometown. Gradually, most zainichi would come to claim the South Korean nationality except for naturalized zainichi. Today, more than 90% of zainichi members hold the South Korean nationality. Moreover, from the second or third generation, almost all of the zainichi Koreans were born and raised in Japan. As time went by, there were fewer attachments to hometown, compared to the first generation thus. In this sense, the influence of primordial element in deciding the citizenship of Korean diasporas would become waning. Thus, primordialism specifically focusing on one’s hometown does not seem to be the driving factor for the choice of the nationality of zainichi.

Figure 14 Nationality Percentage of Zainichi Korea in 1953

5.2 Hanhwa

5.2.1 Background Knowledge of Hanhwa

![Demographic Change of Hanhwa](image)

The Chinese immigration to Korea has a long history. It can be traced from the Qin and Han Dynasties. However, the mass emigration to Korean peninsula occurred at the end of the 19th century. During the Imo Mutiny (*Imo Kullan*), a military revolt of some units of the Korean military in 1882, the Korean government (*Joseon Dynasty*) asked China (*Qing Dynasty*) to send the military to suppress the revolts. In return for
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104 The Imo Mutiny (*Imo Kullan*), a military revolt of some units of the Korean military in 1882, caused by a dispute about unpaid wages. The soldiers occupied Changdeok Palace, and the Korean government asked for military help from China. The revolt was suppressed by Chinese troops. After this incident, Chinese power expanded in the Korean Peninsula.
this assistance, the Chinese government requested to sign the treaty of the *Sino-Korean Regulations for Maritime and Overland Trade*. As a result, 4000 soldiers and 40 traders came to the Korean peninsula and the Chinese influence over it had increased until the First Sino-Japanese War in 1895. Prior to the Japanese colonial period, there were three residential areas—Incheon, Busan, and Wonsan—that allowed overseas Chinese people to reside.\(^{105}\) Chinese traders became an important pillar in the Korean economic development. During the colonial era, due to the instability of domestic security in China and labor migration, the number of Chinese immigrants increased. In 1942, the population of Chinese immigrants reached the highest number, 82,661.

After the end of the Second World War, in the spring of 1946, United States Military Government in Korea (USAMGIK) granted Chinese immigrants in Korea (*hanhwa*) the permission of business in South Korea without any restriction because the Republic of China was an Allied Nation. At that time, since one of the aims was to make Korea economically independent from Japan, USAMCIK severed off trade with Japan. Korean trade should rely on China and Hong Kong. As a result, *hanhwa* dominated the trade market between Korea and China.\(^{106}\)

However, when South Korea was established in 1948, the government restricted new immigration of foreigners, thus, the Chinese migrants were not able to enter. Since the Korean government did not have diplomatic relations with Communist China in 1949, the Chinese trading companies began to leave Korea and no longer shipped to the Korean ports. From that time on, until the normalization of diplomatic ties between ROK and PRC in 1992, the population of *hanhwa* in South Korea had to rely on purely natural birth.

\(^{105}\) 손정목, 1982, 한국 개항기 도시사회 경제사 연구, 일지사, 135-149쪽
\(^{106}\) 왕언메이, 2016, “해방 70 년: 한국화교에 대한 이해”, 역사비평, 303쪽
Today, the overall number of Chinese immigrants, approximately 20,000-registered *hanhwa* (0.04% of total population) reside in South Korea.

![Figure 16 Citizenship Percentage of Hanhwa](image)

When it comes to the nationality of *hanhwa*, all *hanhwa* have to have citizenship from Republic of China because of anti-communism until the year of 1992 that South Korea cut off the diplomatic ties with Taiwan. The ideology that tied the *hanhwa* of South Korea exclusively to Taiwan has declined, with the changes in diplomatic relations.

After South Korea severed the diplomatic ties with Taiwan, some scholars began to argue that the *hanhwa* might be able to rediscover and reaffirm their Chinese identity with the support of PRC’s growing economy and increased international power.¹⁰⁸ However, there is no dramatic nationality change of the *hanhwa* from ROC to PRC among the *hanhwa* in South Korea. The majority of *hanhwa* (98 percent) still claim

---

¹⁰⁷ According to the Wang Enmai’s articles, 98% of the huaqiao in South Korea have Taiwanese passport.¹⁰⁷

nationality of ROC, although a few *hanhwa* returned to their hometown, *Shandong* region in mainland China.\(^{109}\)

Under the Cold War, the *hanhwa* had to choose the nationality of ROC due to the ideological reasons. However, it is interesting to note that even after the end of diplomatic ties with Taiwan in 1992, the *hanhwa* maintained their ROC nationality, not changing to PRC unlike the *zainichi* Korean. In the following section, we will examine why *hanhwa* maintained the nationality of ROC, despite the rapid economic growth and the rise of international status of PRC had increased many economic opportunities, through the four approaches mentioned before, splitting the time into before and after the South Korea-PRC diplomatic normalization in 1992.

### 5.2.2 Hypotheses Test

#### (1) Instrumentalist Theory

*Hypothesis 1* When host state adopts exclusionary policies toward diasporas who hold the nationality of homeland A for their political purpose, then the diasporas are more likely to choose to citizenship from homeland B.

This hypothesis is applicable before the diplomatic normalization between the ROK and PRC, but after that, it no longer explains the *hanhwa* case. In order to explore the citizenship of *hanhwa*, it is important to establish an understanding of its host-state, South Korea, which has had a tumultuous modern history of colonization, civil war, and military regimes, experienced a dramatic growth into a developed economy. The Korean population has gradually diversified, with 632,490 persons (1.28%) of registered
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\(^{109}\)왕언메이. 2016. “해방 70 년: 한국화교에 대한 이해”, 역사비평
foreigners with non-Korean citizenship in 2006. Of them, the 21,806-registered *hanhwa* majority constitutes 0.04% of the total population.\textsuperscript{110}

Historically, after the South Korean government was established on August 15, 1948, she had a mission to make Korea a wholly Korean nation due to its traumatic colonial past. In this context, the foreign group, *hanhwa* was unnecessary to make a nation for the ethnic Korean people.\textsuperscript{111} South Korea did not see the PRC as a legitimate regime representing the whole of China and did not establish diplomatic relations with the PRC during the Cold War era. Thus, the overseas Chinese from the PRC were not able to live in South Korea. If the Chinese were pro-PRC, then they were deported or needed to move to North Korea. Because of the strong anti-communism movement, all *hanhwa* members had passports from the ROC.

In addition to persecution toward the pro-PRC overseas Chinese, the policy of the Korean government toward the *hanhwa* was exclusionary and discriminative. For example, restrictions on the use of foreign currencies by foreigners and the independent management of foreign trade companies were banned, and all newspaper publications became available only in the Korean name. The most serious problem in economic activity was the foreigner’s land acquisition permission system and the legal limit to prevent the acquisition of land over a certain size. Moreover, naturalization as a Korean citizen was difficult for *hanhwa* members. Naturalization through marriage was possible based on the Nationality Act of 1949, but in other cases, there was a provision that requires the approval of the Minister of Justice, which made it almost impossible to naturalize. Therefore, due to the host land’s discriminative policy and anti-communism

\textsuperscript{110} Rhee, Young Ju. "Diversity within Chinese Diaspora:"Old" versus "New" huaqiao Residents in South Korea." Global Conference.
\textsuperscript{111} ibid.131
ideology, the *hanhwa’s* only option was ROC passports, unless they returned to Taiwan or re-immigrated to other countries such as the North American or European countries.

However, after the Sino-ROK diplomatic normalization, the political ideology of the Cold War era was waning, and the discriminatory judicial institutional discrimination toward *hanhwa* members have been alleviated. The South Korean government accepted overseas Chinese from the PRC and has gradually improved its existing regulations and exclusionary measures to the *hanhwa* group. In particular, in the end of the 1990s, in order to attract foreign capital after the IMF crisis, the Korean government allowed foreigners to invest in real estate, showing a positive attitude toward attracting foreign investment. In 2002, the Permanent Resident Registration System was adopted and in 2005, the local voting right with permanent resident status was granted; thus legal restriction on *hanhwa* were alleviated.\(^{112}\) *Hanhwa* members have more avenues to choose their nationality compared to the past. Nonetheless, there was no significant shift of *hanhwa*’s nationality after the normalization of 1992. In this reason, the instrumentalist argument focusing on the host’s policy is less convincing for explaining the *hanhwa* after normalization.

**Hypothesis 2** When homeland A adopts an inclusive policy toward diasporas for their political interest, then the diasporas are more likely to choose citizenship from homeland A.

Although this hypothesis is persuasive in explaining the time before normalization, it does not fully explain the post normalization context.

\(^{112}\)인녕, 2008. “한국화교의 정체성 연구-부산지역 화교사회에 대한 설문조사를 중심으로”, 부경대학교 국제지역학과 석사학위 논문, 34-35쪽
(1) Taiwan

Historically, overseas Chinese communities have provided tremendous financial support for the homeland such as the Xinhai Revolution and the establishment of the Republic of China in 1912. In this regard, Sun Yat-sen mentioned, “the Overseas Chinese is called the Mother of Revolution”. Therefore, Taiwan has offered the policy of supporting overseas Chinese. In the Constitution of the Republic of China, which was enacted in 1947, Overseas Chinese are to be elected by the National People’s Congress, the legislative members and members of the Supervisory Board. Also, the government is obligated to subsidize economic projects, education and welfare for overseas Chinese.\(^\text{113}\)

Taiwan’s overseas Chinese policy began when the PRC began to establish policies for overseas Chinese and attract their capital to build a united front (统一战线) strengthening economic cooperation with the overseas Chinese. Taiwan has set up the Chinese Overseas Service Office (华侨证照服务室) to simplify the procedures for returning, visiting, and sightseeing and revised the “Investment Promotion Scheme” to invite overseas Chinese businessmen and reinforce vocational education for them.

On the other hand, in order to support educational projects for overseas Chinese, Taiwan has been providing financial support for overseas Chinese schools and offering ROC textbooks. They also established a center of Chinese culture in South Korea such as language, cooking, calligraphy and encouraged hanhwa students to study in Taiwan.\(^\text{114}\)

Taiwan has also implemented various support and inclusion policies for hanhwa. Especially, in the field of education, they have provided free embassy possession sites to

\(^{113}\) 정영록. 2002. “화교와 우리의 과제, 화교 네트워크와 우리의 기업활동방안”, 산업자산부, 59쪽
\(^{114}\) 조정원. 2009. “중국의 화교 정책에 대한 연구: 대만의 화교 정책과의 비교를 중심으로,” 민족연구, 제 37 집, 148-149쪽
overseas schools and provided financial support and textbooks every year. In addition, a special examination was conducted at the time of enrollment for universities in Taiwan, so hanhwa were able to enter university in favor of Taiwan students, and ID cards were issued to all students who graduated from Taiwanese universities. At the time of the vacation, a visitors program was organized for the hanhwa students, called the National Rescue Group (救国团), and the student camp, lectures, and all expenses were supported by the Nationalist Party of the ROC.  

However, after the Democratic Progressive Party (DPP, 民进党) became the ruling party in Taiwan, the favorable policies for the hanhwa have gradually diminished. In September 2000, the government of the ROC revised the Nationality Act for the first time within 71 years. In the past, ID cards were issued along with university entrance in Taiwan, but now females must stay in Taiwan for more than a year after graduation while males must either join the military service or graduate from the university and return to their residential country, and then they are required to come back and apply for an ID Card.  

Another change was that the government of the ROC has reduced financial support for overseas Chinese education. In the past, the hanhwa school received subsidies every year from the government of the ROC. However, after 2000, when the schools applied for subsidies, the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO, 台北经济文化办事处) reviewed it and supported them with approval. In addition,

---

115 조정원.2009.“중국의 화교 정책에 대한 연구:대만의 화교 정책과의 비교를 중심으로,” 민족연구, 제37집,148-149쪽  
117 ibid.48-53쪽
although the majority of the *hanhwa* have the nationality of the ROC, they are also discriminated in Taiwan due to the status of *waishengren (外省人)*\(^{118}\), which refers to people who were not born inside of Taiwan.

However, after the ROK-PRC recovered their diplomatic ties in 1992, the *hanhwa* community began to turn to the PRC for new economic opportunities. Therefore, some scholars argue that the identity of the *hanhwa* in South Korea is no longer exclusively tied to the ROC and the perception of the ROC has been changing toward the *nationality in the passport*.\(^ {119}\)

Therefore, the instrumentalist idea that the homeland’s policy is closely associated with the decision of diasporas is able to explain the time before normalization but can’t fully explain post normalization.

(2) Mainland China

When the PRC was proclaimed in 1949, the overseas Chinese were not an important element in the PRC’s foreign policy. After that, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) began to devote some attention to the problems of the overseas Chinese in Southeast Asia. In the initial stages, the PRC pursued a policy similar to that of the Kuomintang (KMT, Nationalist); it wanted to draw the support of the overseas Chinese in order to ensure the success of the CCP over the KMT, gain diplomatic recognition for

\(^{118}\) *Waishengren (外省人)* refers to people who move to Taiwan from Mainland China after independence of Taiwan (August 15 in 1945) from Japan.

their new government and economically lure financial investments from the overseas Chinese toward its side.\textsuperscript{120}

However, since the PRC experienced domestic social turmoil and economic stagnation during the 1960s and 1970s, she was less concerned about the overseas Chinese. More liberalized emigration policies enacted in the 1980s facilitated the legal departure of increasing numbers of Chinese who joined their overseas Chinese relatives and friends. The Four Modernization program, which required Chinese students and scholars, particularly scientists, to be able to attend foreign education and research institutions, brought about increased contact with the outside world, particularly the industrialized nations. In 1983, emigration restrictions were eased in part due to the economic open-door policy. Not only the export of labor to foreign countries increased but also the PRC government increased funding for the overseas Chinese. Although the PRC made efforts toward the overseas Chinese, the hanhwa community did not significantly change their nationality. Thus, this hypothesis is less persuasive for the hanhwa case.

\textbf{[Hypothesis 3]} When diasporic organizations that are affiliated with homeland A support diasporas more in order to expand their power, relative to those organizations in the other homeland, then the diasporas are more likely to choose the citizenship of homeland A.

This hypothesis could not explain the constancy of hanhwa’s nationality. Hanhwa members have valued the role of diasporic associations. Hanhwa society formed a complex network around the hanhwa associations. Through these organizations, the hanhwa have shaped a strong cohesion toward the ROC. Most of the hanhwa in South

Korea have joined one or more associations, and strengthened their relationship in the community. Of those hanhwa organizations, the Chinese Resident’s Association Seoul Korea (CRASK, 汉城华侨协会) is one of the famous associations that represents the hanhwa society. According to the statistics of the Korea Chinese Chamber of Commerce & Industry (KCCCI, 韩国中华总商会), there are 36 officially registered overseas Chinese associations. 121

In hanhwa society, the overseas Chinese association was formed under the embassy of the ROC. Hanhwa who have been excluded from Korean society have maintained the order of the diaspora society centering on the ROC. Therefore, despite the diplomatic relations with the PRC, leaders among the hanhwa organizations were not willing to connect with the embassy of the PRC. This was because connecting with the PRC was regarded as a kind of “betrayal” against the ROC.122 Yet, this situation started to change since 2000. This was the result of the domestic political power dynamics in the ROC. The Democratic Progressive Party (DPP) took power instead of the Nationalist Party (KMT).

It was not happy news to the hanhwa in South Korea. It was only meaningful for the hanhwa to be connected to the whole of China, but the DPP, which claimed the independence of Taiwan, could not represent the ROC. The shift of administration to the DPP became a crucial moment for the hanhwa to re-recognize the ROC.123 As a result, the hanhwa community in South Korea felt a limitation in identifying the Nationalist Party as the Republic of China. Due to the change of power in Taiwan, the hanhwa no

121 한국중화총상회, http://www.kccci.or.kr
122 왕문영씨 인터뷰, 국사편찬위원회 편, “한국화교의 생활과 정체성”, 파천:국사편찬위원회, 2007, 40 폭
123 왕언메이 2016. “해방 70 년:한국화교에 대한 이해”, 역사비평
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longer needed to feel guilty for having contact with the PRC. The influence of the PRC has increased in *hanhwa* communities while the power of the ROC rapidly diminished.

Moreover, the Seoul Overseas Chinese Association (汉城中国侨民协会) led by the embassy of the PRC was established in 2002. One year later, the Seoul Chinese Resident’s Association Seoul Korea (汉城华侨协会), which used to be under the ROC, re-registered with the embassy of the PRC. In this way, the *hanhwa* community’s centering on the ROC collapsed since 2003. Although the support and power of the ROC diasporic organization is declining, the number of ROC *hanhwa* is not sharply decreasing. Thus, this hypothesis that the *hanhwa* members would choose their nationality depending on the power of diasporic organization is not able to explain the *hanhwa’s* case.

(2) Social Identity Theory

[Hypothesis 1] Given the condition that the ethnic schools that are affiliated with homeland A are powerful, there is a higher chance that the diasporas will choose to hold the citizenship of homeland A.

This hypothesis is applicable to the constancy of *hanhwa’s* national membership. People from the ROC established overseas Chinese schools. This history of schools, such as the Hansung Overseas Chinese Elementary School and the Incheon Overseas Chinese Elementary school, were established more than 80 to 100 years ago. In 1902, the first overseas Chinese school was founded in Incheon, and as of 2011, there are 21 elementary schools, 4 secondary schools, and 1 kindergarten. The overseas Chinese schools have played a central role in linking the overseas Chinese in South Korean society. This is an

---

124 김기호.2005.초국가 시대의 이주민 정체성-한국화교의 사례연구, 서울대학교대학원 인류학과 석사논문, 56-57 폭
Important function in maintaining the Chinese language and its culture to raise self-esteem as a Chinese national. Overseas Chinese schools are full-time schools where Chinese or Taiwanese textbooks are taught in Chinese. All schools follow the academic system of the ROC. In this context, due to the overseas Chinese school run by the ROC, the hanhwa were able to identify themselves as Taiwan people.

For a while, the overseas Chinese schools were supported by Taiwan, but currently due to the financial problem of these schools, some schools received financial support from the government of the PRC. There are two representative organizations in Taiwan for overseas Chinese education: One is the Overseas Community Affairs Council (OCAC, 侨务委员会)\(^{127}\), which is under a cabinet-level council of the executive branch. The other is the Department of International and Cross-Strait Education (国际及两岸教育司)\(^{128}\) under the Ministry of Education. Their main goal is to serve as a cultural, education, economic and informational exchanges organization between Taiwan and the overseas communities.

However, since 2000, the OCAC has undergone a significant change because of the shift of government change from KMT to DPP. During 2000 to 2008, discussing the abolishment of OCAC, the merger with Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the budget cults, the position of OCAC was greatly weakened. Due to these political factors, the OCAC has not been able to pursue long-term projects for a while. Particularly, in 201, some overseas Chinese language education centers were shut down. Even the financial system

---

\(^{126}\) 이병창, 김혜련.2011, “한국 화교의 다중정체성에 대한 고찰” 전남대학교 세계한상문화 연구단단,138쪽


that the OCAC has regularly supported to the overseas schools has been changed to the application system through the submission of the budget plan.

After the leader of the Nationalist Party Ma Ying-jiu (马英九) took power in 2009, he insisted on the cease of overseas affairs to promote collaboration and differentiation between the PRC and the ROC. In academic terms, it will stimulate exchanges and bilateral exchanges on Chinese language education and culture-related contents industry and youth employment abroad.

In recent years, the PRC has invested more in overseas Chinese education compared to the past. The PRC’s education of overseas Chinese is mainly led by the Overseas Chinese Affairs Office of the State Council (国务院侨务办公室)\(^{129}\) of the PRC and Chinese Language Culture Education Foundation of China (中国华文教育基金会)\(^{130}\) and Office of Chinese Language Council International (中国国家汉语国际推广领导小组办公室), which are affiliated with the Chinese Ministry of Education. The OCAOS has recently implemented the “Overseas Chinese Language Culture Education Model School.” From 2009 to 2014, the OCAOS selected 210 schools, and currently, there are 4 model schools in South Korea.\(^{131}\)

Nevertheless, in South Korea, the education of the ROC system is more welcomed by the hanhwa community. In the overseas Chinese schools, the majority of students have Taiwan passports, while there are a few students from South Korea and the PRC. Thus, ethnic schools affiliated with Taiwan are still influential in the hanhwa community, making hanhwa pertain to the identity of the ROC. The argument that the

\(^{131}\)고영희. 2015. “중국과 대만의 화교 화인 교육 비교”, 민족연구 63 호, 90-91 쪽
diaspora is more likely to choose national membership of a homeland that more supports ethnic schools is convincing for the hanhwa case.

[Hypothesis 2] When diasporas feels more national pride from homeland A based on international reputation, then the diasporas are more likely to want to hold the nationality of A homeland.

The national pride argument is applicable to why the hanhwa chose Taiwanese national membership. When it comes to economic development, Taiwan was more developed than the PRC from the 1950s to the 1990s. Moreover, Taiwan and South Korea relations date back to January 1949 and the ROC set up an embassy in Seoul’s Myeongdong district. Also, Taiwan continued to help and support the hanhwa community in South Korea such as education, welfare and their security. In this sense, at that time, the reputation of Taiwan was better than communist poor China in the global community and the hanhwa community.

With the collapse of the Soviet Union, the PRC became a state to a prominent player in international affairs. On August, 1992, South Korea announced diplomatic ties with the PRC. In addition to the normalization, economic development, and nostalgia for their hometown reinforced the solidarity between the ROK and the PRC. The solidarity with the PRC gradually may strengthen the self-confidence of being Chinese.

However, although the PRC has increasingly developed over the last decades, the hanhwa did not change their nationality. Based on the national pride argument, not only material elements but also psychological elements influence the nationality choice of hanhwa members. This study argues that the national pride of the ROC is higher than the one of the PRC among the hanhwa community.

On the one hand, hanhwa members are hard to understand and are accustomed to
the lifestyle of the PRC. This was because of the different political systems and societies between the PRC and the ROK. The political system of the PRC is communism while the one of the ROK is democracy. Moreover, although a majority of the hanhwa came from mainland China, they stayed in South Korea for more than half a century. Thus, they feel more comfortable living in South Korea.

On the other hand, in terms of the international reputation between the PRC and the ROC, the PRC is one of the charter members of the United Nations recognized by the global community. However, it is hard to say which one has the better image in the international community. Although many countries do not acknowledge the ROC as a legitimate state based on the one China policy, the hanhwa still regarded the ROC as an important player in the global community. For example, at present, Taiwan has effectively self-governed for over 65 years and has had a democratic government for the last 20 years as a full-fledged international actor.\(^\text{132}\) The hanhwa also have a bad collective memory against Communist China because many of them attended the Korean War against the PRC.

For these reasons, the hanhwa’s national pride for the PRC could be less than for the ROC. They did not change their nationality from Taiwan to Beijing. Thus, this hypothesis is applicable to the hanhwa case.

**(3) Rational Choice Theory**

[Hypothesis 1] When diasporas gain more practical benefits from homeland A, then diasporas are more likely to choose the citizenship of homeland A.

This hypothesis is applicable to the hanhwa case. Even after the establishment of

diplomatic relations between the PRC and the ROK, most of the *hanhwa* hold Taiwan passports. This is because the *hanhwa* can still be welcomed in mainland China even if they hold a Taiwanese passport. There is no legal discrimination in the state and its society even if they are living in China with Taiwanese citizenship. On the other hand, they will no longer be allowed to enter Taiwan once they give up their Taiwanese passports and acquire PRC passports.

Moreover, there are some benefits to living in South Korea and maintaining their foreign citizenship. Since the overseas Chinese schools in South Korea provide degrees with the status of “study abroad.” This allows many *hanhwa* students to attend prestigious university in South Korea. This was a consequence of their status as foreign nationals. *Hanhwa* students do not need to take competitive entrance examinations as the South Korean students do. This fact also influenced why some *hanhwa* members do not naturalize as South Korean nationals.

Thus, the incentives to retain a Taiwanese passport are much greater than the obverse. For this practical reason, only very few Chinese have changed their nationality from that of Taiwan to the PRC since 1992.  

This hypothesis partially explains this case so it is less convincing. During the past years, mainland China and Taiwan have adopted different types of socioeconomic systems and pursued divergent strategies of development. In 1952, per capita income

[Hypothesis 2] When homeland A has a better economic growth than homeland A, then the diasporas are more likely to want to hold the nationality of homeland A.

This hypothesis partially explains this case so it is less convincing. During the past years, mainland China and Taiwan have adopted different types of socioeconomic systems and pursued divergent strategies of development. In 1952, per capita income

---

between the PRC and ROC was quite close ($50 in Taiwan, $46 in mainland China). However, by 1980, the per capita income of Taiwan soared up to $2,278, while the PRC’s remained a meager $256.\textsuperscript{134}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GNP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainland China</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainland China</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GNP per capita</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainland China</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Figure 17 Rates of Growth of GNP in Taiwan and Mainland China (1952-1980)}\textsuperscript{135}

The economic growth of Taiwan was much better between the 1960s and 1970s, and at that time, mainland China was struggling with economic depression and political turmoil by the Cultural Revolution. However, after Mao passed away in 1976, as Deng adopted an open door policy, the economy of mainland China developed rapidly with two-digit growth for almost three decades. As seen from below [Figure 18], the GDP gap between Taiwan and mainland China is very clear. But the choice of nationality among the \textit{hanhwa} group did not show significant change. Thus, it is difficult to say that the economic growth of the homeland affects the diaspora’s national membership.


[Hypothesis 3] Given the condition that the economic relationship between homeland A and the host state is strong, there is a higher chance that the diasporas will choose to hold the citizenship of homeland A.

This hypothesis is not able to fully explain this case. Based on this hypothesis, the diaspora would get the citizenship of the homeland that has a good economic relationship with the host state. In terms of the trade relationship between mainland China and South Korean, China is South Korea's largest trading partner, and South Korea is China's third largest. Since 1987, Korea started to report trade statistics with Mainland China, although the diplomatic relationship with China was not developed until later. Diplomatic normalization propelled the volume of Korean trade with China, putting China as the first largest trade partner of Korea. This reflects the high interests of Korean business circles.

---


in trading with China. Naturally, the increase in Korean economic cooperation with China has provided more diversified business opportunities to the *hanhwa*.\(^{138}\)

Thus, the influence of the PRC has increased in *hanhwa* communities while the power of the ROC rapidly diminished after 1992. In addition, the growing economy has given South Korean businesses an opportunity to make profits. Seoul’s decision to join the China-led Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB) rather than the US-initiated Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), and South Korean President Park Geun-hye’s attendance of a parade marking the 70th anniversary of the end of what Beijing calls the World Anti-Fascist War in August last year created the impression that South Korea is drifting toward China.\(^{139}\)

![Figure 19 South Korea's Top Trading Partners](http://www.worldstopexports.com/south-koreas-top-import-partners/)

---


Above is a list showcasing 7 of South Korea’s top trading partners in terms of exports sales during 2016. That is, these are countries that imported the most Korean shipments by dollar value. As seen above [Figure 18], China imported $124.4 billion accounting for 25.1 percent of total Korean exports, while Taiwan imported $12.2 billion with 2.5 percent of the total exports.\(^{141}\) However, although currently the trade relationship between mainland China and South Korea is better than Taiwan, the hanhwa still claim the nationality of Taiwan. Thus, this hypothesis does not work in the hanhwa case.

(4) Primordialist Theory

\textbf{[Hypothesis1]} Diasporas would choose the homeland from which they originated regionally before moving to the current state in which they reside.

Primordialist’s approach contends that the national membership of diaspora can be determined by birthplace or a family’s place of origin. This perspective is not able to explain the national membership of hanhwa. The majority of hanhwa came from Shandong Province (95%), followed by Hebei province (3%). The remaining came from Guangdong, Hubei, Shanxi, Zhejiang, Guizhou, and Sichuan. The origin of Shandong region refers to the hometown of their or their ancestors.

A historical perspective can help explain the reason for the predominance of Shandong. According to a 1980’s source from then the Taiwanese Embassy, a majority of *hanhwa* came from the Shandong province. There are some reasons for immigration. First of all, Shandong Province geographically is close to Korea and the Qing government encouraged Chinese people to the Korean peninsula in order to balance the influence of Japan. Additionally, the origin of Boxer Uprising was Shandong Province and many participants fled to Korea from the severe persecution of imperial powers. Based on the hometown, diaspora’s national membership can be established but it is not the case for *hanhwa*.

---

5.3 Discussions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>zainichi</th>
<th>hanhwa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instrumentalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host state’s policy</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland’s policy</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diaporic Organization</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Identity Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Schools *</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Pride *</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Choice Theory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical benefits *</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Growth</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Bilateral Relationship</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 21 Outcome of Hypotheses Tests in Two Cases

In the case of the zainichi, the constructivist hypotheses – including instrumentalism, social identity theory, and rational choice theory – are applicable. Similar to the zainichi, the hanhwa case can also be explained by two hypotheses of social identity theory and the practical benefit hypothesis of rational choice theory. For both cases, the primordial hypothesis fails to resolve the identified puzzle. However, the cases are not without distinctions. In contrast to the zainichi case, the instrumentalist theory (measured by the host state policy, homelands policies, and the influence of diasporic organizations) and rational choice theories (of economic growth in the homeland and the bilateral economic relationship between the homeland the host state) are not applicable to the hanhwa case. Given the analyses of these two cases, I concluded that education at ethnic schools in the host state, the national pride toward the homeland and the practical benefits from citizenship affect the preferences and choices of the two diaspora’s citizenship.

In terms of the instrumentalists’ hypothesis, all three pertaining actors- a host state, homelands and diasporic organization- attempt to utilize and manipulate the
zainichi and hanhwa’s ethnic identity to serve their own interests and to maximize relational advantages. Interestingly, the same objectives result in different preferences for citizenship of the two groups. While most zainichi Koreans changed their citizenship from North Korea to South Korea, the hanhwa’s citizenship preference did not change significantly. I suggest that there are three reasons that engendered such divergence between the diasporas.

First, it seems that the longer it takes for the divided countries to reach diplomatic normalization from the time of separation, the more difficult it is for diaspora members to shift their identity. For example, after the division of the Korean peninsula, Japan established a diplomatic relationship with South Korea. The normalization stabilized after 20 years. While 20 years seems like a long time, the stabilization of the diplomatic relation occurred relatively fast compared to that of South Korea and China, taking 40 years. Although it is unclear how long it takes to produce a group’s national loyalty among diaspora, the comparative case study allows the theory to speculate that the longevity before diplomatic normalization affects citizenship preference.

Second, the difference might be due to the difference in the exchange of material and human resources. Comparably, China and Taiwan exchange much more frequent and larger material and human resources than the two Koreas. The most telling example might be that there are direct flights from Beijing to Taipei, which indicates at least an open border between the two counties. Although the degree of openness across a shared border between the two countries might be a low bar to pass when compared to the Korean case, it implies a semblance of a peaceful relationship between Beijing and Taipei. In support of the mutual dependence of the two countries, economic cooperation and
Chinese investment in Taiwan have steadily increased. Even culturally, the countries have much more similarities than differences. On the contrary, the relationship between South Korea and North Korea has been tense, especially since the Lee Myung-bak administration and the DPRK’s nuclear tests. Moreover, the growing social and cultural disparities between the two countries are only inevitable given the complete shutdown of the border. The evidence suggests that there is relatively little incentive for the hanhwa who claim Taiwan citizenship to shift their citizenship preference since there is no distinguishable difference between Chinese and Taiwanese citizenship. However, the relationship between North and South Korea complicates and personalizes national identity for zainichi Koreans.

Third, the level of the security threat posed by one of the homeland countries to the host states is different between the two cases. For example, North Korea poses a lot more of an imminent threat to Japan than Taiwan does to South Korea. Besides frequent military and nuclear threats, the North Korea government is notorious for kidnapping Japanese civilians in Japan and elsewhere. In contrast, Taiwan poses near to zero threat to South Korea. The level of security threats directly correlates to the receptivity of passports. While South Korea shows no discrimination between the Taiwanese and Chinese passports, Japan shuns away from the North Korean passport. Given that national security is one of the pivotal objectives of any democratic government, security threats irrevocably result in discriminatory practices against the members of the perpetrating state.
VI. CONCLUSION

This article focuses on the zainich and hanhwa who wished to retain their homeland identity. In depth, this study explores how the diasporas identify themselves under a situation in which a once unified homeland separates into two separate countries. Despite the fact that the zainichi and hanhwa are distinct diasporas in different host states, there are similar characteristics in both cases. Most of the zainichi and hanhwa were born and raised in Japan and South Korea respectively. Since they do not have citizenship of their respective host state, they are technically foreigners, though many have never been outside of Japan or South Korea. For this reason, they often become targets of exclusionary policies and hate speeches by the conservative associations and residents in the host state. In response, the host states have always argued that they have the option of becoming citizens. Although it is true that the number of naturalization is increasing every year, many of them still want and claim to maintain their homeland identity. Understanding the motivations behind citizenship preference and choice among these groups may be useful knowledge for governments that may want to encourage the harmonious integration of the zainichi and hanhwa into their societies.

This study discovered that social identity theory and rational choice theory best explain the two diasporas’ choices of citizenship. Specifically, when diasporas choose their national membership, they are affected by education in ethnic schools, national pride towards their homeland, and the practical benefit from their citizenship. Since ethnic school education shapes diaspora’s collective identity through the learning of their homeland’s specific ideology and pride, its successfulness affects the preference of a diaspora’s nationality. Moreover, national pride, which is a kind of favorable attitude
toward one’s country by international image, also is significant because it implies that not only material achievements but also psychological factors influence the preference of citizenship. Lastly, as expected, practical benefits from homeland are one of the main factors for the choice.

Politically, diaspora’s citizenship is important for the legitimacy of the homeland, especially, in the divided homelands case, in which the game to gain more legitimacy is competitive. To get more support from diaspora, providing education, improving national pride, and offering practical benefits are very crucial. This study suggests that government policies should consider these factors, if they want to help diasporas achieve citizenship instead of remaining foreigners.

Over generations, the ethnic identity of the diaspora steadily becomes less entrenched, and most diasporas will be assimilated by the host state. However, I believe that delving into how diasporic identity has evolved over generations and whether there is a significant shift in their national membership or not is a meaningful project. This is because in diaspora studies, the relationship between diasporas and homelands is crucial in defining a group as a diaspora. Additionally, looking into the identity of a diaspora with two homelands is more complicated than one with a single homeland due to the additional variables that need to be considered. Last but not least, nobody knows in the future what kind of conflicts will occur. There might be a possibility that some unified states will be divided by civil wars and separatist movements.

By examining the dynamics of a diaspora’s identity and national membership, this study contributes to identity and membership politics in diaspora studies academically and sheds light on policy considerations and its implication for a future society beyond
the nation-state. I hope this study furthers the discourse on understanding the field of diasporic identity and citizenship. Future research may build upon this one by further exploring the preferences of other diaspora groups, which may lead to additional reasons for why certain groups choose particular citizenships.
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