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Abstract

This thesis examines how different collective memory and national identity of the Republic of Korea and Japan affect their bilateral relationship. This is also deal with the role of collective memory and national identity in the bilateral relationship between the Republic of Korea and Japan. Of diverse conflicting issue between two countries, I studied territorial issue over Dokdo/Takeshima issue because Dokdo/Takeshima issue is not only territorial matter but also historical matter. So, there are frequent clashes over Dokdo/Takeshima between two countries. To study this topic, in a theoretical framework, I utilize constructivism, collective memory and national identity to analyze different ideas of two countries. Furthermore, as I study coverage of media in two countries, theory of news frame is also utilized. Analyzing media and statements of two countries about Dokdo/Takeshima, I compared them and produced an integrated analysis.
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1. Introduction

The world has been more shrinking day by day. After two Great wars, the world has put more effort on restoring peace. For establishing peace, reconciliation and cooperation with neighbors are of supreme importance. However, possible dangerous factors in international society still exist today. For example, North Korea has threatened international society with nuclear weapons and missiles. The conflict between China and the United States of America in Asia is another example. Besides these explicit dangerous factors, there is an implicit factor such as a historical dispute. Especially, historical disputes in East Asia have been an issue for a long time. The Chinese government is carrying out the historical research project in boundary between Manchuria and the Korean peninsula. Because of different historical stances about this research project, North/South Korea are in conflict with China. Another problem is the differences of view of Asian history amongst Korea, China and Japan. Their historical disputes are a strong obstacle for further cooperation between those countries, even if they have to cooperate in order to overcome diverse international crises such as an economical crisis and military threats from North Korea. Especially, the Republic of Korea (hereafter, the ROK or Korea) and Japan are sharing common political and economical systems and joint interests in East Asia. The both are well-aware of them themselves, which led to normalize their relations in 1965. However, they are hard to cooperate with each other perfectly due to different historical stances. Whenever two governments intensify cooperation, unexpected historical problems put on the brakes. This is because the Koreans and the Japanese have different national identities and collective memories about same affairs between the ROK and Japan. Especially, territorial dispute over Dokdo/Takeshima is one of major issues which show clashes of different collective memories and national identities between two countries. Therefore, in this thesis, I studied how collective memories and national identities of the ROK and Japan affect their bilateral relationship, focusing on Dokdo/Takeshima issue.

1.1 Background

---

1 The China government has been pursing the historical project to study history in Manchuria area. In the ancient period, Kokuryu and Balhae Dynasty conquered Manchuria area and ruled. China government is trying to include Kokuryu and Balhae Dynasty into their history because Chinese dynasties have been ruling the Manchuria area for a much long time relatively than Korea. As North/South Korea succeed these two dynasties, two Koreas worry about losing their ancient history. So they protest the China government strongly.
“Japan and Korea are close but distant neighbors”: i.e., close in “Geography” but
distant in “mind”. It is a common description of bilateral relationship between Korea and
Japan. This phrase comes from the history of bilateral relationship between Korea and Japan.
From ancient times, Korea and Japan has exchanged their cultures and trade products.
However, there are some unhappy incidents. One of them is the Imjin War (known as
Hideyoshi’s invasion) in the 16th century. This war devastated Korea severely. The Korean
peninsula was turned into ashes, and its people were left in anguish. Hundreds of thousands
of people were either killed, injured, or raped. About 60,000 to 70,000 Koreans were taken
away to Japan as war prisoners or slaves. The second huge unhappy incident is Japanese
colonial Rule from 1910 to 1945. The Koreans has suffered from Japanese Colonial Rule so
far because compensation of victims in the Japanese colonial rule has been unsolved. The
principle policy of Japanese occupation was to assimilate the Koreans by absorbing their
culture, banning their language, obliging the use of Japanese surnames, and coercing worship
of the Shinto State religion. Additionally, nearly 20 percent of the rural population moved to
unskilled mining and factory occupations in northern Korea, Manchuria, Sakhalin, and Japan
under subhuman working conditions. Many young men were forced to go to the frontline of
World War II as the Japanese troops and young women were forced to serve the Japanese
troops sexually, which is called ‘comfort women’. As evaluation over these affairs of the
ROK and Japan is different, conflict between two nations still exist. For these reasons, the
Koreans and the Japanese call that their relationship is close but distant neighbors. And
historical conflict between two nations shows why historical problem is of supreme
importance in their relations. In fact, historical problem have made a problem over bilateral
relationship between the ROK and Japan. After the Cold War began, the ROK and Japan had
shared common enemies; Socialist bloc and North Korea. In the late 1960s, the Nixon
doctrine calling for Asian allies to provide primarily for their own defense and passive US
responses to a series of North Korean provocations led the ROK and Japan to conceptualize

---

2 Yoon Tae-Ryong “Historical Overhang Is What States Make of It? – Realism of Historical overhang in Korea-Japan Relations”, BK21 Globalizing Korean Political Science Corps, Department of Political Science & International Relations, Korea University , 2010. p.3
and elucidate the nature of their defense relationship in the form of the Korea clause, Okinawa base agreement, and ‘positive economic cooperation.’ However, from 1972 to 1974, resurrection of historical animosity issues and bilateral domestic disputes nearly drove the relationship to rupture twice in the short 2-year period. Besides, currently, territorial dispute over Dokdo/Takeshima have became an obstacle in the development of their relations. The reason why I mention Dokdo/Takeshima issue is that this is not only territorial dispute but also extension of historical dispute over colonial rule of Japan. So, I would like to explain Dokdo/Takeshima briefly.

Dokdo/Takeshima is located approximately 215km from the east coast of Korea and 211km from the southwest coast of Japan. Dokdo/Takeshima is separated by two islets. Although these islets’ size is too small, they are of importance in terms of economic, military-security, politics. For example, sovereignty of Dokdo/Takeshima can guarantee wider fishing area for their people who work in fishing industry. Dokdo/Takeshima has diverse

---

6 Ibid. p.316
8 Ibid. p.2
marine resources as well. In the area of Military-Security, the geographical position of Dokdo/Takeshima is important in that the country who has Dokdo/Takeshima can utilize the islets in order to detect military troops such as warship, submarine, aircrafts in East Sea. In politics, the territory is one of the primary factors in consisting of the nation. So today it has a characteristic that a nation cannot give up territory from other country regardless of value of economic and size of islands.

1.2 Purpose

In the year of 2012, General Security of Military Information Agreement (hereafter, GOSOMIA) between the ROK and Japan had become a big issue in the ROK. In the late of June, a cabinet meeting of the ROK decided that the government will sign GOSOMIA with Japan. Sung-Hwan Kim who is a minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade argued that GOSOMIA enables the ROK to get more information about nuclear weapon, missile and import/export of Weapons of Mass Destruction (hereafter, WMD) of North Korea. However, because the ROK and Japan governments have discussed this agenda secretly regardless of public opinion, lots of Korean citizens have complaints about it. Additionally, before colonization by Japan, Japan enforced Korea on some kinds of agreement in terms of the military, diplomatic right, economic sovereignty and the majority of the Koreans are remembering it. Because of these collective memories, they are very sensitive to the agreement with Japan and are against to GOSOMIA. As a result, the National Assembly of the ROK demanded the government to postpone signing GOSOMIA and the ROK government accepted it. This affair indicates how collective memory of people about history affects cooperation between the ROK and Japan and necessity of reconciliation.

The purpose of this thesis is to examine how collective memory and national identity of the ROK and Japan affect their bilateral relationship. This is motivated by that I believe different national identities and collective memories of the ROK and Japan deteriorate their relations. Especially, territorial dispute over Dokdo/Takeshima contains problems of different national identities and collective memories of two countries. Through this issue, I studied

---

11 Ibid p.8
12 National Assembly Research Service(of Korea), 2012 Policy-Information of the National Assembly inspection II, 2012 p.36
connection collective memories and national identities of two countries and their bilateral relationship.

1.3 Problem Formulation and Research Questions

As I mentioned in the purpose of my thesis, I have interest in influence of collective memory and national identity on the ROK-Japan relations. So, my topic needs to study how 2 countries distinguish ‘we’ from ‘they’ at first through collective memory and national identity. So my first main research question is next.

1. How have the ROK and Japan construct collective memory and national identity of each other as ‘we’ and ‘the other’?

After studying this, I studied “what is the role of collective memory and national identity in the ROK-Japan relations?” That is, my second research question is next.

2. How collective memory and national identity affect the bilateral relationship of two nations.

Studying my second research question, I was able to know how two countries utilize their collective memory and national identity in the bilateral relationship and how they affect the ROK-Japan relationship. Especially, my study is helpful for the world which is sharing similar problem because some countries in the world still have a conflict with other countries. They construct image of ‘themselves’ and ‘the other’ in a negative way and reproduce conflict. This is a vicious circle in international relations. For example, bilateral relationship of two Koreas and China-Japan are fine examples. Through problem of the ROK and Japan, we can be aware of ramification of these kinds of vicious circle which is affected by clash between different collective memory and national identity.

1.4 Previous Research

Since Historical dispute between the ROK and Japan is major issue in Northern-East Asia, there are many literatures dealing with historical disputes of two countries. Especially,
the ROK and Japan has historical and emotional problem interlinked with each other. Before studying my thesis, I summarized other literatures concerning the ROK-Japan relations. Additionally, as I focus on Dokdo/Takeshima issue, I read some literatures about it.

The first literature is “Memory Politics and International Relations in East Asia : Focusing on “Past Problem” between South Korea and Japan.” Written by Choi Eun-Mi. This literature focuses on emotional matters among the nations. That is, she thought the emotional matter is centered on past problems and current conflicts and her literature is explaining how emotional factor affects international relations, especially Korea-Japan relationship. She chose constructivism as main theory of her literature because she explained that realism and liberalism have a limitation to understand the special relationship in East Asia. In order to explain national identity and emotional matters, she thought that constructivism is suitable for her study. She has explained concept of collective memory and how national collective memory affects international relationship. She applied these theoretical discussions to Korea-Japan relationship and their past problem. In case study of Korea-Japan relationship, firstly, she has explained warfare memory of Japan in personal memory and group memory. In second part of case study, she has introduced political conflicts between the ROK and Japan in 2001 and 2005 which was caused by past problems. She has studied conflicts of two countries and the efforts of the ROK and Japan for reconciliation in detail. Finally, she has investigated the number of Japanese tourists coming to Korea and the number of Korean tourists coming to Japan from 2004 and 2006 and explained how political and historical problem affect the number of tourists coming to counter states. From my perspective, this literature did not show how emotional matters affect the relationship between Korea and Japan perfectly. As the literature progressed, it focused on conveying conflictual events of two countries.

The second literature is about Dokdo/Takeshima. The title of this is “Built to last: The Dokdo territorial controversy. The baseline conditions in domestic politics and international security of Japan and South Korea.” This literature is about why the Dokdo/Takeshima issue is built to last. Before dealing with it, he mentioned why Dokdo/Takeshima is important in terms of politics, economy, fisheries, collective memory. He argued the collective memory of the Japanese and the South Koreans that has made the

14 Bong , Youngshik D, “Built to last: The Dokdo territorial controversy. The baseline conditions in domestic politics and international security of Japan and South Korea.”, Memory Studies, 6.2 , (2013): 191-203
Dokdo/Takeshima issue so critical rather than the strategic and economic benefits. In this literature, he raised 3 questions; “What are the conditions under which a state is inclined to reconcile its past relations with other countries?” “When does a country opt for an assertive attitude and recalcitrant policy with regard to a historical issue?” “When does it choose to adopt a conciliatory and long-term solution?” According to him, the answers to these questions are based on three considerations; the degree of the burdensome past, the autonomy of state elites, and the emergence of new conditions that favor reconciliatory policies. In respect to the degree of the burdensome past, as the historical disputes are so important to national identity and sovereignty principle, it is difficult to reconcile its past relations with other nations. In second consideration, he explained nationalism and characteristics of state elites. He argued nationalism is both a constraint and an instrument for state elites. Especially, escalating tension in international relations is likely to compel states to allocate additional resources to decrease a hostile security environment, which affects foreign investment and trade. On the other hand, he argues that a territorial dispute is not an inherent ramification of nationalist pressure. In order to understand the complexity of a territorial dispute, the important thing is that state elites have considerable autonomy in minimizing or magnifying the territorial issues for their own political benefits. The third consideration is the emergence of new conditions that favor reconciliatory policies. It means a state moves to ‘thin’ reconciliation with other countries when mutual hostility or passive peace is the governing norm. This is a kind of self-preservation. In part of theories of international relations and the Dokdo/Takeshima issue, as the ROK and Japan are sharing democracy and economic interests, author argue that they are willing to settle disputes peacefully. Finally, he explained why the Dokdo/Takeshima issue still exists. At first, the ambiguity in the San Francisco Peace Treaty over Dokdo/Takeshima is main reason of current territorial dispute because this treaty did not mention about Dokdo/Takeshima. However, Dokdo/Takeshima is not important issue as much as the current. In the middle of 1990s, when they discuss fishing industry and EEZ problem in East Sea, Dokdo/Takeshima issue has become an issue. Then, this territorial dispute is getting worse.

As I read the above two literatures, I can understand well historical background and political situation of Korea and Japan. The second literature is good for understand Dokdo/Takeshima issue briefly. Especially, the first literature is helpful for me to understand how emotional matters make ramification of bilateral relationship. However, in my thesis, I study how collective memory and national identity affect relationship of Korea and Japan by
1.5 Delimitations

Other Historical disputes of the ROK and Japan: In the ROK-Japan relations, there are diverse historical disputes such as textbooks, comfort women system during the World War II, and territorial dispute over Dokdo/Takeshima. The reason why I exclude textbooks and comfort women system is territorial dispute over Dokdo/Takeshima, nowadays, has became the most important issue in bilateral relationship of the ROK and Japan. Furthermore, the most recent conflict of two countries is Dokdo/Takeshima issue. Of course, historical dispute over textbook and comfort women system is appropriate issue to study my topic. However, I need to focus on one issue because of lack of time. I have insufficient time to study every historical dispute between two countries. I believe Dokdo/Takeshima contain problems of national identity and collective memory in two countries’ relation sufficiently.

Delimitation of Time: The timeframe is limited to the 10th of August - 30th of September in 2012 because at this time, the conflict of territorial dispute over Dokdo/Takeshima was higher than before. Of course, this territorial dispute usually has existed. For example, in 2005, Japan established “a day of Takeshima” and wrote “Dokdo/Takeshima is Japanese history” in their a white book of defense. Furthermore, in 2006, as the Japan government would embark on investigation over radioactive contamination in Dokdo/Takeshima, the President of the ROK gave a speech, “Special statement about the ROK-Japan relationship,” and revealed why Japanese claim over sovereignty of Dokdo/Takeshima is unjust, why this problem is related with the colonial rule by Japan, how the ROK government defend sovereignty over Dokdo/Takeshima. After that, the ROK and Japan governments agreed on joint investigation and tied up the conflict. However, the conflict in 2012 was different from other conflicts over Dokdo/Takeshima. Before it, generally, as the Japan government tried to argue over sovereignty of Dokdo/Takeshima, the ROK government responded against Japanese argument. However, in the year of 2012, as the President of the ROK visited Dokdo/Takeshima, the conflict was started. The President’s visits to Dokdo/Takeshima was 10th of August. So, start point of time delimitation is 10th of August in 2012. After visits of the President Lee, the other diplomatic accidents were ensued until middle of September in 2012.
So I researched information until 30th of September in 2012.

2. Theoretical Framework

Relationship between the ROK and Japan is affected by not only political and economical factors but also historical factors because two countries have shared history for a long time. When it comes to the same past history between both of them, difference of collective memory and national identity are one of the main issues in relationship. In order to understand these collective memories and national identity of two countries and their relationship, constructivism is an appropriate theory. On constructivist’s view, ideas, beliefs, norms and identities shape the interpretation of an actor. That is, these factors construct the collective memory, national identity and society. Thus, constructivism is a useful theory to understand collective memories of ROK and Japan. Furthermore, as I study this topic by analysis of coverage of media, I deal with framing theory.

2.1 Constructivism

In the late of 1980s, numerous theories existed in international politics. The situation of International politics was changing and required an end of the nuclear arms race. The critique concerning the end of the arms race was on increase and extended in many parts of the world. In this situation, questions about these phenomena began to be raised about the theories and scientific methods of International Relations and constructivism was appeared in International Relations. On the other hand, from the end of World War I to the end of the Cold War, debates between main theories such as Realism vs Idealism, Behaviouralism vs Traditionalism was passed and post-positivism began to float to the surface of the International Relations. Constructivism was also another reaction to overcome ideological chaos.

Wendt criticized neo-realism and world-system theory. He pointed out those theories have a limitation to explain how states behave in the international system even though they

16 Ibid. p.178
focus on providing “structural” explanations of behaviours of states. He focused on internal organizational structures in explaining state actions while other international relations theorists tend to discount the importance of internal organizational structures. Wendt found a basis for discussion of constructivism in International Relations Theory and Onuf introduced a conception of constructivism in International Relations.

Constructivists have focused on importance of norms, rules, and language at social dimensions of international relations. K.M. Fierke offered fine example of this in his article; Gorbachev’s “New Thinking” led the end of the Cold War. Furthermore, increasing importance of norms of humanitarian intervention and the spread of liberal democracy values indicates that there are some problems in realist theory which emphasize on material interest and power. Constructivists put emphasis on analysis of how material and ideational factors combine in the construction of different possibilities and outcomes. Finally, constructivists have emphasized on the process of interacting with others such as history, culture and politics. In respect to this, there are two examples of the ROK and Japan. Next two examples show how diverse factors interlinked with and led to state’s behaviour.

After the World War II, Tokyo trials sentenced war criminals to the death penalty and carried out execution. However, although all militarists waged war by the name of the emperor, Tokyo trials did not touch the emperor. This is because the United States has to keep Asian ally against Communism states in Asia and need Japan. Japanese emperor’s status was massive in Japan, so MacArthur concerned backlash of the ultraconservatives and people in Japan, when US punish Japanese emperor. So MacArthur decided to protect emperor. Instead of this, Japanese emperor turned over his government to the citizens. Additionally, of 26 A-level war criminals, only 7 criminals were punished with capital punishment, the rest of

---

18 Nicholas Onuf is a professor of Florida International University. One of well-know his book is “World Our Making (university of south Carolina press, 1989)”
21 Ibid. p.179
22 Ibid. p.179
24 Ibid. p.378-379
them were released. Shigemitsu Mamoru and Kaya Okinori entered the cabinet of the Government and Kishi Nobusuke was appointed the Prime Minister even if they are all A-level war criminals. From my perspective, as postwar dealing was not clear, I doubt that Japanese government and the Japanese are not taking their war crime seriously. Therefore, I believe that this problem affects current relationship with the ROK and Japan and the Japan government’s behaviour.

On the other hand, Japan announced some apologies to the ROK, even if the ROK government and people were not satisfied with Japanese apologies. However, it is also undeniable fact that the ROK government has not accepted apologies of Japan because of domestic political purposes. For example, in 2006 and 2012, Roh Moo-Hyun and Lee Myung-bak administrations responded strongly against Japan. Of course, all the ROK administrations responded against trial of distortion of textbook by Japan and improper comments of the cabinet members of Japan. Roh and Lee administrations responded by special statement of the President, visits to Dokdo/Takeshima islands and requirement of apology of Japanese emperor. Although their responses are natural response against provocation of Japan, it has been an issue in the ROK and Japan because responses of the ROK are totally new ways. Thanks to this, the President Roh and Lee can increase their approval rating. Especially, taking their relatively low approval rating and they know the effects of utilizing Anti-Japanese sentiments of public into consideration, it is certain that they expected domestic political effects with rejecting Japanese apologies.

As I mentioned the above, these examples of two countries can reveal which factors can affect state’s behaviour in the view of constructivism. Because of unclear postwar dealing, the Japanese didn’t think their war crime in the past seriously. In case of the Koreans, Anti-Japanese sentiment is one of the most effective methods to gather themselves and escape from their domestic politics. These phenomena lead to reach a deadlock in their relationship. On the other hand, collective memory and national identity are related to constructivism in that they are affected by people’s norm and memory. So, it needs to explain what collective memory and national identity are.

2.2 Collective memory

---

The term of collective memory is traceable to Emile Durkheim through his book, “The Social Frameworks of Memory”, in 1925. His student, Halbwachs, accepted his academic prosperity and developed it. Halbwachs emphasized sociability of memory and used the term of collective memory for the first time. He classified memories by individual memory, historical memory, collective memory and social memory. According to Halbwachs, memory is a matter of how minds work together in society and how their operations are structured by social arrangements. Collective memory is constructed by the group and shared representations of the past. And social memory is constructed through experience.

Collective memory has several characteristics. First, collective memory can be reproduced. Halbwachs claims that “collective memory reconstructs its various recollections to accord with contemporary ideas and preoccupations” on his book. The past is reconstructed with needs of the present. Furthermore, Halbwachs argues that people can choose from the past the period into which they wish to immerse themselves and it is up to choose the society in the midst of which they wish to find themselves. Any painful history and memory can be forgotten by choosing specific memory. Pierre Nora also pointed out on his study. He argues that collective memory is “in permanent evolution, open to the dialectic of remembering and forgetting, unconscious of its successive deformations, vulnerable to manipulation and appropriation, susceptible to being dormant and periodically revived.”

28 Ibid P.67
35 (Re-Quotation) Nora, Pierre. “Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de M’emoire.” Representation 26,
Secondly, collective memory is political. History is closely related to memory of public.\(^\text{36}\) History and historical perspective can be controlled by dominant ideology regardless of a fact.\(^\text{37}\) Thus, history and historical perspective are political.\(^\text{38}\) The other characteristic of collective memory is durability of memory in the society and this memory affects nation’s behaviour and attitude to other countries.\(^\text{39}\) Additionally, P. Novick compares collective memory and history. He argues that collective memory is simple and sees events from a single, committed perspective while history comprehends phenomena as complicated and different perspectives. \(^\text{40}\)

### 2.3 National Identity

National Identity is one of the key factors in this thesis because national identity can universally affect to national policies and foreign policies. Most of countries build their policies based on national Identity. So in this thesis, I would like to introduce what national identity is. National identity is difficult to define concisely\(^\text{41}\) because it is used in various fields of knowledge such as political sciences, sociology, cultural studies, psychology, etc.\(^\text{42}\) National Identity have similar characteristics with collective memory. Individual learns norms, ideas, political views, etc in a group culture. Sharing these things, they have a feeling of belonging to their group.\(^\text{43}\) Miller also argues that people believe in an existence of national community and national community share certain characteristics.\(^\text{44}\) The formulation of national identity is close related with history of the group as a nation and national identity


\(^\text{38}\) (Re-Quotation) Kim In Hwa and Kim Myong Sob, “International Politics of Memory : Japanese historical textbook Issue and Northeast Asia,” *Social Science Review* 38, 1, 2007 [In Korean]


\(^\text{41}\) (Re-quotation) Gnat’Uk, “Farewell to the empire. Ukrainian discussions on identity.”, *Krytyka*, 2005 [In Ukraine] p.42

\(^\text{42}\) Ivanova, Olena, “Collective Memory of the Holocaust and National Identity of the Student Youth in Ukraine”, Third Annual Danyliw Research Seminar on Contemporary Ukraine, (12th–13th of October 2007) p.4

\(^\text{43}\) Ibid p.4

forms through construction of national memory. National identity is organized by the perception of the national group. Leszek Kolakowski claimed that national identity requires historical memory. Furthermore, he said argued that “no nation can survive without the awareness that its present is the continuation of a past one-and the further awareness that the older those (real or imaginary) memories are, the deeper they reach back into the past, the more firmly its national identity is established.” Essentially, national identity is interlinked with collective memory. Nation establishes national identity by sharing collective memory. Ahn Byung-Jik, a professor of Seoul National University, argue that nation focus on the sufferings of a people with their glory when they seek national identity and national unity. He argued that “there is no better one than sufferings that people experienced together in unity of society.” He offered an example of colonial rule by the Japanese in Korean Society. For the Koreans, they suffered during the colonial rule by the Japanese, a memory of the period of colonial rule by the Japanese is very negative. Finally, he said Anti-Japanese sentiment is a factor of the Korean identity because the Korean society is filled with collective memory about colonial rule by the Japanese. On the other hand, the Japanese believe themselves as victims in their memory because of damage and loss during the World War II. This is because individual memory about war is affected by personal experiences. And, it spread rapidly overall Japanese society. Especially, conservative groups in Japanese society have tried to deny their war crime and depicted themselves as victims. Because of this different view over common past, the ROK and Japan are always in conflict.

2.4 News Frame

In my thesis, I study Dokdo/Takeshima issue through media and analyze coverage of media by frame. Additionally, Tuchman claimed that framing has to be defined and

operationalized on the basis of this social constructivism. Studying news frame is needed. There are diverse definitions of news frame. Goffman made a definition of news frame earlier than other scholars. Frames are helpful for audiences to locate, perceive, identify, and label accidents. Neuman claimed that news frame is “conceptual tools which media and individuals rely on to convey, interpret and evaluate information.” Gamson and Modigliani offered definition of media frame; “a central organizing idea or story line that provides meaning to an unfolding strip of events…The frame suggests what the controversy is about, the essence of issue.” Tuchman defined media frame as “The news frame organizes everyday reality and the news frame is part and parcel of everyday reality…[it] is an essential feature of news.” Many scholars has argued that news frame have much influence on interpretation and judgment of audiences. Especially, Tuchman argued that news frame can lead audiences’ interpretation by not only emphasizing specific parts but also cutting other parts. Analyzing news frame enables to understand mutual relation between coverage of media and construction of reality of audiences. Furthermore, researcher can evaluate public opinion and construction of ideology of audiences.

Of course, news frame have much influence on people’s judgment about specific issue. These news frames are affected by other factors. Gans, Shoemaker and Reese suggested at least three potential sources of constructing news frames. The first source of influence is journalist’s influences. Journalists actively construct frames in order to convey news. So, their attitudes and professional norms affect the formation of frames. Secondly, political orientation of news media is also another source. Finally, last source of influence on constructing news frame is external sources such as political actors, authorities, interest group,

---

58 Scheufele, Framing as a theory of media effects, journal of communication 49(4) 103~122. 1999, p.115
and other elites.\textsuperscript{59}

There are two approaches which are introduced by Semetko and Valkenburg in 2000. First approach is deductive approach. Deductive approach has predefining certain frames. Another one is inductive approach. Unlike deductive approach, inductive approach has not predefining certain frames. So, researcher can make array of possible frames with more open view and analyze a news story.\textsuperscript{60} In this thesis, I study my topic through inductive approach because creative frames are produced in case of inductive approach. In case of deductive approach, I cannot produce creative frames because of predefining frames.

3. Method

3.1 Qualitative research and political discourse

In this thesis, I deal with the topic by qualitative research. As quantitative research focus on statistics, quantitative research is an unuseful method for understanding collective memory. As qualitative research requires interpreting deeper aspects of specific situation, I focus on qualitative research. So, how to analyze news media and statements of the government is important. Especially, qualitative data such as text/discourse analysis and quotes from policy-makers are more justified to be used in answering the research questions.\textsuperscript{61} Of discourses, I analyze statements and of the governments and the governmental officials. Above all, as their statements and are official responses, it is helpful to study governments’ stances exactly. Essentially, from my perspective view, statement of the government is a political discourse, because statements contain direction of their policy and an intention for persuade people. Landtsheer offer a definition of political discourse as public communication on the subject on politics.\textsuperscript{62} Dorna classified 4 characteristics of political discourse.\textsuperscript{63}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{59} Ibid, p.115
  \item \textsuperscript{60} Semetko, H.A & Valkenburg, Framing European Politics. A content Analysis of Press and television news, journal of communication 50, 93–109. 2000, P.94-95
  \item \textsuperscript{63} (Re-quotation) Alexandre Dorna, “The linguistic effects of political discourse”, Hermes n.16, 1995, 132-133 [In French]
\end{itemize}
1. Political discourse form social structure with social behaviours of different style such as communication, mass media, and political system. To exercise politics, political discourse is a necessary condition.

2. Political discourse is process of decision-making. Power intend to inform the opposite’s faults and persuade public. An important factor of political process is decision-making.

3. Political discourse have an educational function in order to get public’s agreement, reproduction of political system or change of political system.

4. Political discourse intends to give symbolic cohesiveness to public with ideology of discourse. Political discourse grant mean of a word and is not allowed to arouse suspicion.  

As Dorna classified characteristics of political discourse, political discourse persuade public and inform the opposite’s faults. Not only that, political discourse give symbolic cohesiveness to public. So, statements of the government are closely related to public’s idea. I already mentioned constructivism, collective memory and national identity is established by diverse factors in part of theoretical framework. And public’s idea is one of them. So, by analyzing statements of the government, I can find how public establish their collective memory and national identity and expect how their collective memory and national identity affect relationship between two countries. I deal with statements of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the ROK and Japan from 10\textsuperscript{th} of August to 30\textsuperscript{th} of September in 2012 because I study territorial dispute of Dokdo/Takeshima which is caused by the President Lee’s visits to Dokdo/Takeshima.

3.2 Case study

I focus on case study of a big affair which causes historical disputes between the ROK and Japan. It can show that the view on the history between two countries. Many scholars

---

64 Ji, Young Ho, “The analysis of political speech of Nicolas Sarkozy during the presidential election in 2007”, Master Thesis, Sungkyunkwan University. P.13
offer diverse definitions of case study. The following definition of case study is offered by Simons.

“Case study is an in-depth exploration from multiple perspectives of the complexity and uniqueness of a particular project policy, institution, program or system in a “real life” context.65“

As this definition explained, I can search multiple perspectives of Dokdo/Takeshima issue. Through this, we can approach stances of two countries over this territorial issue and expect their collective memory and national identity. After it, I research how these factors affect relationship between the ROK and Japan.

Choosing a case is also important. So Gary Thomas mentioned importance of a case. He offers example of this by The Korean War.

The Korean War’s status as a case of something has to be established. Is it a case of a war? If so, can it be said that it is a case of an especially remarkable or unusual kind of war? Perhaps, by contrast, it may be a case of a border dispute or of U.S. resistance to the perceived threat of communist expansion.66

The reason why I chose Dokdo/Takeshima is that Dokdo/Takeshima is not only territorial issue but also historical issue. There are some islands between the ROK and Japan. Dokdo/Takeshima is only islands which are in dispute between two countries. Furthermore, Robert Yin argued that a case study should be used in 4 cases. ; the focus of study is to answer “how” and “why” questions, researcher cannot manipulate the behaviour of those involved in the study, researcher want to cover contextual conditions because he/she believe they are relevant to the phenomenon under study, the boundaries are not clear between the phenomenon and context.67 For my case, my thesis is focusing on answering “Why”, I chosen the case study. Case study is enabled to view and explore phenomena from multiple

perspectives.\textsuperscript{68}

Comparative approach about some cases in the view of the ROK and Japan is also required because stances of two countries over Dokdo/Takeshima are too different. By comparing their views, main points of historical disputes of two countries could be exposed, I can find out difference of the historical stance of two countries.

3.3 Material used

Coverage of major media is also one of the useful materials to study. Public opinion is formed by the mass media\textsuperscript{69} and mass media play a key role in increase of nationalism. Gabriel Tarde, J. Habermas and M. McLuhan claimed nationalism can be established by mass media.\textsuperscript{70} So, coverage of major media is of vital importance because diverse factors in society establish collective memory and national identity. Before analyzing coverage, I try to find out some frames and intention of editorials and columns, I can find collective memory and national identity of two countries. Furthermore, I can find how they affect relationship between two countries. I search coverage of newspaper in the ROK and Japan and compare their coverage about same agenda which make a historical dispute between two countries.

Especially, I deal with not articles but editorials and columns because most of articles try to keep a balance and neutral position. However, editorials and columns express clearly their positions than any other general articles. Time delimitation is from 10\textsuperscript{th} of August to 30\textsuperscript{th} of September in 2012. During this term, the President of the ROK visited Dokdo/Takeshima and conflict between the ROK and Japan has severe. The two governments were in conflict for around a month. So this is why I set up time delimitation. At first, I am supposed to choose two representative newspapers which represent conservative newspaper and progressive newspaper in the ROK and Japan. However, there are some limitations to get editorials and columns of conservative newspaper such as Yomiuri, Sankei, Nikkei newspaper. Unavoidably, I chose Mainichi newspaper which is a midway position. Except for this, I chose Chosun newspaper as conservative newspaper and Hankyoreh newspaper as progressive newspaper in

\textsuperscript{68} Baxter, Pamela and Jack, Susan "Qualitative Case Study Methodology: Study Design and Implementation for Novice Researchers” \textit{The Qualitative Report} 13.4, (2008): 544-559.p.556


the ROK.  

As progressive newspaper of Japan, I chose Asahi newspaper. Then, I separate some frames from editorials and columns which deal with Dokdo/Takeshima issue and analyze them. I search editorials and columns by word ‘독도(Dokdo/Takeshima)’ in Korean media and ‘竹島(Dokdo/Takeshima)’ in Japanese media and chose editorials and columns related to visits of the President of the ROK to Dokdo/Takeshima. Finally, I don’t know Japanese language, so my friend, Seung hun Shin, translated Japanese media.

4. Analysis

4.1 Territorial dispute concerning Dokdo/Takeshima in 2012

On 10th of August in 2012, Lee Myung-bak, the President of the ROK, visited Dokdo/Takeshima islands and stayed for one and half hours. As soon as his visited Dokdo/Takeshima, the Japan government protested against the ROK strongly. Because Dokdo/Takeshima is Japanese territory in the view of Japan, Japan considered that the Korean President’s visits to Dokdo/Taekushima is provocation. So the Japanese ambassador in the ROK was recalled. 4 days later, the President of the ROK required apology from Japanese emperor to people who was independence movement activists and passed away in the period of independence movement. In respect to this requirement, Japanese cabinet expressed unpleasant responses. On 15th of August in 2012, liberation day of Korea, some Japanese cabinets paid their respects at Yasukuni-Shrine. As Yasukuni-Shirne honors not only people who died for Japan but also A-level war criminals during the World War II, the ROK government condemned this visits to the Yasukuni-Shrine. When the conflict between the ROK and Japan are getting worse, Noda Yoshihiko, the Prime Minister of Japan, sent a letter to the ROK President. However, the Japanese government opened the content of letter to media before the President Lee receive it. The ROK government thought it is a disrespectful
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71 The result of study in regard to way of coverage about North Korea and ideology of Korean newspaper, Chosun newspaper and Dong-A newspaper are conservative and Kyunghyang and Hankyoreh newspaper are progressive. Kim Kyung-hui and Roh Ki-young. “The study about the way of coverage concerning North Korea and ideology of Korean newspaper”, Korean Society for Journalism & Communication Studies, 55.1, p.361-387 2011 [In Korean]
behaviour in diplomacy. So, the ROK government did not accept a letter and sent back it to the Japanese government. In case of Japanese government, this behaviour of the ROK government was discourtesy and refused a councilor the ROK government entering the Ministry of the Foreign Affairs of Japan. The ROK – Japan relations was getting worse. Besides, the Japanese government considered economical retaliation, this territorial dispute was about to extend other fields. As it was the latest big conflict between the ROK and Japan, I deal with this conflict.

4.2 Stances of Korea

4.2.1. Reasons of Dokdo/Takeshima belong to Korea

The ROK government reveals their argument why Dokdo/Takeshima belongs to Korea in a pamphlet of the ministry of Foreign Affairs and another pamphlet of Korean Maritime Institute. The title of first pamphlet is “Korean beautiful islands, Dokdo” which has Korean, English, Japanese, Chinese, French, Arabic, Russian, Spanish, German and Italian version. It is made up of 33 pages. There are 4 main arguments with extra explanations and Question and Answer over Dokdo/Takeshima. The title of another pamphlet is “Dokdo is Korean territory” which has Korean, English, Japanese, Chinese version. As the pamphlet which is published by Korean Maritime Institute is more detail, I summarized it.

The first main argument is Dokdo/Takeshima has continued to be an integral part of Korean territory. Dokdo/Takeshima belonged to “Usanguk” during the Three Kingdoms Period (1st Century~7th Century.) and was called as “Usando”, “Jasando”, “Gajido”, “Sambongdo” in the era of Joseon Dynasty(from the year of 1392 to 1897). Mention of Usando(Dokdo/Takeshima) are found in several Joseon-Dynasty’s written resources such as Jiriji (Book of Geography) of Sejong Silok(Book of Annals of King Sejong, 1454), Sinjeung Dongguk Yeoji Seungnam(Revised and Augmented Version of the Survey of the National Geography of Korea:1530), Dongguk Munheon Bigo (Expanded Reference Compliation of Korean Documents:1908). Park Se-dong, in his book, who was a scholar of the late Joseon

period made a clear distinction between Usando(Dokdo/Takeshima) and Ulleungdo which is located approximately 92km from Dokdo/Takeshima. Besides, Korean historical records which were from the 15th century the 20th century mentioned Dokdo/Takeshima. This indicates that Korea has known the existence of the island from the past. The other sure evidence is activity of Ahn yong-bok who was fisherman and crossed the East Sea to Japan in order to defend Korean ownership of the island. Japan has long argued that Ahn yong-bok’s testimony was a false testimony. However, after the discovery of “Memorandum on the Arrival of a Joseon Ship on the Japanese coast in 1696” provided evidence which support his original testimony. In this document, Ahn yong-bok was well aware of the fact that the two islands, referred to by the Japanese as “Takeshima” and “Matushima”, were Ulleungdo and Dokdo/Takeshima respectively, both under the jurisdiction of Gangwondo Province of Joseon. Besides, this document revealed that the position of Ulleungdo and Dokdo/Takeshima and reason why Ahn yong-bok came to Oki-island, size and tools of the Ahn Yong-bok’s ship.

The second argument is the next; “Dokdo is Korean territory under international law”. There are 3 grounds of this argument. In 1900, the Korean imperial government issued Chingnyeong No.41(Imperial Ordinance No.41) which ordered changing the name of Ulleungdo to Uldo and grant Dokdo/Takeshima the administrative status of county. The name of Dokdo/Takeshima was changed to Seokdo which is a local name for Dokdo/Takeshima. It indicates that the island was under the jurisdiction of the Great Han Empire. In 1905, Japan incorporated Dokdo/Takeshima as their territory through a local administrative notice of Shimane Prefecture. This pamphlet said that this action of Japan contradicts the Japanese claim that Dokdo/Takeshima has been Japanese territory since old times. The Korean government knew incorporation of Dokdo/Takeshima by indirect route, the government could not protest because the Korea was under the Japanese protectorate. Furthermore, after World War II, the legal status of Dokdo/Takeshima was not explicitly stated in Treaty of Peace with Japan(known as the San Francisco Peace Treaty) although it is obvious that Dokdo/Takeshima is the territory of the ROK. This is because US-led Allies did not want to take a position in a territorial dispute between their allies. Until 1st to 5th draft of the San Francisco Peace Treaty clearly mentioned Dokdo/Takeshima is a Korean territory, however,
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75 Great Han Empire is a name of the Korean empire. In 1897, the king of Joseon Dynasty declared to change an Empire and its name is Great Han Empire.
mention of Dokdo/Takeshima was deleted because of successful lobbying by Japan and Korea’s lack of diplomatic clout. And once the ROK was founded in 1948, Korean government placed Dokdo/Takeshima under Gyeongsangbuk-do Province. No country protested against this action and even Japan did not protest it. This proves Dokdo/Takeshima is a Korean territory.

The third argument is that the Japanese government officially recognized Korean sovereignty over Dokdo/Takeshima between 17th and 19th centuries. Japan of the Edo era perceived Dokdo/Takeshima is not their territory. In 1963, there was “Takeshima incident”, Japanese fisherman kidnapped Korean fisherman. Japanese people in Edo period called today’s Ulleungdo as Takeshima and Dokdo (current Dokdo/Takeshima) as Matsushima. Following this incident, Japanese Shogunate asked Tottori Prefecture seven questions including “Since when did Takeshima (known as Ulleungdo currently) belong to Inaba and Hoki?”, “Is there any island other than Takeshima belong to Inaba and Hoki?” and Tottori Prefecture replied Neither Takeshima (known as Ulleungdo currently) and Matsushima (known as Dokdo/Takeshima currently) belong to Inaba and Hoki. The Meiji government of Japan also recognized Dokdo/Takeshima is a Korean territory. One year after the Meiji Restoration, the new Japanese government dispatched its foreign ministry officials to Joseon to inquire the political circumstances of the Joseon. Then, they submitted a report titled Chosenkoku Kosaishimatsu Naitansho which include explanation why Takeshima (known as Ulleungdo currently) and Matsushima (known as Dokdo currently) came to belong to Joseon. In the year of 1876, the Meiji government decided Ulleungdo and Dokdo/Takeshima did not belong to Japan in the Meiji government’s geographical publication project. In 1877, the Imperial Japanese Council of State gave its final confirmation that Takeshima and an island (Ulleungdo and Dokdo/Takeshima) have no relation with Japan.

Finally, this pamphlet said following that: “It is established beyond any doubt that Dokdo has continued to be an integral part of Korean territory and, therefore, the questions over its legal status cannot submit to international adjudication, arbitration or any other means of dispute settlement.” Since the Allies Nations decided the end of Japanese colonial rule of Korea and approved the independence of Korea through Cairo Declaration, the Potsdam Declaration, and the San Francisco Peace Treaty, Japanese claim over Dokdo/Takeshima is a refusal to recognize the end of Japanese colonial rule and a challenge to the sovereignty and independence of Korea. As Korean government’s position, there is no
legal doubt over Korean sovereignty over Dokdo/Takeshima and there is no reason Dokdo/Takeshima should be discussed in an international tribunal, adjudicatory, arbitral or otherwise.

I summarized the claims over sovereignty of Dokdo/Takeshima by the ROK through a pamphlet of Korea Maritime Institute which is the official institution of the ROK government.

4.2.2 Coverage of Mass Media in Korea

I picked up two major Korean newspapers; Chosun newspaper, Hankyoreh newspaper. From 10\textsuperscript{th} of August in 2012 to 30\textsuperscript{th} of September in 2012, there are 30 editorials and columns. These editorials and columns can separated by 4 frames; Critique toward Japan, Critique toward Korea, Calling for unification of domestic public opinion, and Giving advices for the ROK government and the Japan government. Of them, I study characteristics of coverage of media and focus on finding how mass media lead to establishment “we” and “the other” by collective memory and national identity of the Koreans.

First, I analyze a frame of critique toward Japan. 11 of 30 editorials and columns are criticizing Japan. They expressed the Japan as trouble maker and condemned problematic and insincerity attitude about the past atrocities.

If Japan regrets their wrongdoings about colonial rule in Korea, Japan has to finish the unreasonable claim over sovereignty in Dokdo/Takeshima which is a legacy of invasion. However, Japan claims that Dokdo/Takeshima is Japanese territory in a white book of defense for the last 8 years and continues to develop textbooks which contain this claim every year.\textsuperscript{76}

Japan should be aware of direct reason which makes to twist relationship of two countries and twisted relation is caused by a fact that they provoke about Dokdo/Takeshima aggressively and prevaricate the past history from

the establishment of current Japanese cabinet.  

These editorials pointed out problematic and insincerity attitude about the past toward Japan. Mentioning colonial rule period, media remind negative memory such as colonial rule by the Japanese. According to theory of collective memory, diverse factors can establish collective memory and national identity. Coverage of media is one of those factors. Through coverage of media which deal with negative memory about Japan, the Koreans and Korean society establish negative collective memory regarding Japan. This produces resentment against Japan. Additionally, media covered that Japanese argument over Dokdo/Takeshima means that they did not repent their colonizaton. This can lead the Koreans to think that the Japanese try to take Korean territory by force again. Another common things of the above two editorials is not deal with critique about the ROK government such as utilizing territorial dispute and Anti-Japanese sentiments in domestic politics. They focused on criticizing only Japanese attitude and historical stance. No editorials and columns raise a question about propriety of Korean claim over Dokdo/Takeshima issue. They are premised on there is no drawback in ‘our nation’s claim.’

The other editorials criticized the Japan government utilize nationalism into not only relationship between the ROK and Japan and but also domestic politics in Japan in order to their approval rating.

Although Japan can utilize nationalism as temporary motivation to support their foreign policy, they have to know a lesson of history that uncontrollable nationalism leads to destroy peace of themselves and the whole area which have a relation.

As Democratic Party which is a ruling party and Liberal Democratic Party which tries to seize power stimulate nationalism sentiment, relationship between the ROK and Japan has become the worst after normalization of relationship. In Northern-East Asia which consists of the ROK, China and
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Japan, China can get more options and wider spaces to act because the relationship between the ROK and Japan getting worse. That is, Japan caused the most reluctant situation themselves.\textsuperscript{79}

Mentioning problems in domestic politics of Japan, editorials reveal that a core of Japanese claim over Dokdo/Takeshima is in problems of domestic politics. In detail, they analyze that Japanese claim over Dokdo/Takeshima comes from conservative shift, because nationalists and their political groups want to show strong of their countries to their people by Dokdo/Takeshima. These contents of editorials remind the Koreans their painful memory about colonial rule by the Japanese. They make the Koreans to get potential worry about Japan and get defensive national identity in order to protect their territory. As a result, the Koreans consider the Japanese as ‘they’ who try to steal ‘our’ territory and the Koreans as ‘we’ who are innocent.

4.2.3 Statements of the ROK government

Over Dokdo/Takeshima and history issues, the ROK government keeps a firm stance. When the ROK government deals with Dokdo/Takeshima issue, the government always links colonial rule and the war crime of Japan to Dokdo/Takeshima issue. And the ROK Government doubts the sincerity of apologies of Japan and they express it. The ROK government is unwilling to compromise with Japan in terms of historical issue.

If the Japan government keeps wrong comments which are based on wrong belief without repentance of the past (Colonial rule and war crime), we cannot tolerate. Additionally, the ROK government clearly indicates that those comments are very tragic in the ROK-Japan relationship.\textsuperscript{80}

Japanese politicians and well-known Japanese politicians said “we regret our wrongdoing concerning past history.” Despite of these Japanese


apologies, if they (the Japanese) continue to pay their respect at the Yaskuni-shrine which is a symbol of Japanese militarism and honors war criminals as individual or minister, the ROK government which is a victim will doubt sincerity of their repentance.\(^8\)

(The President of the ROK) visited Takeshima in Shimane Prefecture”

This expression is too unjust and we cannot accept it. The name of Takeshima islands do not exist.\(^2\)

Considering those statements, the ROK government believes that Japanese claim over Dokdo/Takeshima is due to irresponsible attitude about their war crime and colonial rule, because the Koreans think that they recover territorial sovereignty over Dokdo/Takeshima after the World War II. So the ROK government doubts the sincerity of apologies over their colonial rule and war crime. Additionally, the ROK government obviously reveals that bad relationship of the ROK and Japan is attributed to irresponsible attitude of the Japanese. Since political discourse has educational function to public and intend to inform the opposite’s fault, statements of the ROK government make the Koreans to think that the biggest problem in the relationship between two nations is irresponsible attitude of the Japanese. In the view of national identity, the Korean establishes their own images as ‘innocent’ and the Japanese images as ‘problematic’.

4.3 Stances of Japan

4.3.1 Reasons of Dokdo/Takeshima belong to Japan

Grounds of claim over sovereignty of Dokdo/Takeshima by Japan are also written in a pamphlet which is published in the ministry of Foreign Affairs of Japan. The title of this pamphlet is “10 Issues of Takeshima”. This pamphlet is made of 8 pages and has diverse


language versions including Japanese, Korean, English, Chinese, Arabic, French, German, Spanish, Portuguese, and Russian. Now I intend to summarize claims of Japan in this pamphlet.

In this pamphlet organized 10 arguments with extra explanation and grounds of them. The first argument is “Japan has long recognized the existence of Takeshima. Japan called Dokdo/Takeshima as “Matsushima” in the past and called Utsuryo Islands (pronounced Ulleungdo in Korean) as “Takeshima” or “Isotakeshima”. This fact founded in a variety of written documents. Representative example is “Kaisei Nippon Yochi Rotei Zenzu” (Revised Complete Map of Japanese: first published in 1779) which is written by Sekisui Nagakubo. This book is the most prominent published cartographic projection of Japan. This pamphlet also claimed that there is no evidence that the ROK has long recognized the existence of Dokdo/Takeshima. It pointed out logical contradiction of various written Korean documents such as Samguksagi (History of the Three Kingdoms: 1145), Sejong Sillok Jiriji (Geographical Appendix to the Veritable Records of King Sejong: 1454), Sinjeung Dongguk Yeoji Seungnam (A Revised Edition of the Augmented Survey of the Geography of Korea: 1531), Dongguk Munheonbigo (Study of Korean Documents: 1770), Mangi Yoram (Handbook of State Affairs: 1808), and Jeungbo Munheonbi-igo (Augmented Study of Documents: 1908). While the ROK argued “Usando” which is written in Joseon Dynasty’s documents is the past name of Dokdo/Takeshima, this Japanese pamphlet claimed that “Usando” is not the past name of Dokdo/Takeshima.

“Japan used Takeshima as a stopover port to go to Utsuryo Island (pronounced Ulleungdo in Korean) and as fishing ground. Japan established its sovereignty over Takeshima by the mid-17th century at the very latest.” This is a third argument of Japanese pamphlet. In 1618, Jinkichi Ohya and Ichibeu Murakawa who are two merchants of Yonago in the region of Houki-no-kuni in Tottori clan received permission from the Shogunate. After that, two families engaged in fishing and felled bamboo. According to argument of this pamphlet, it indicates that Japan has established the sovereignty of Dokdo/Takeshima in the at least mid 17th century. Furthermore, although the Shogunate issued the order of prohibiting go to outside world, no measure was taken in Utsuryo Islands (pronounced Ulleungdo in Korean) and Dokdo/Takeshima islands. This is another proof that shows that Dokdo/Takeshima is Japanese territory. This pamphlet explained that diplomatic conflict between Joseon and Japan on Utsuryo island (pronounced Ulleungdo in Korean) in the end of 17th century, although Japan prohibited entering the Utsuryo island (pronounced Ulleungdo in
Korean), there was no action about Dokdo/Takeshima. It also proves that Japan considered Dokdo/Taekshima as their territory.

This pamphlet has explained that Ahn Yong-Bok’s testimony which support Dokdo/Takeshima is Korean territory has logical contradiction. It pointed out discrepancies between Japanese and Korean documents. In respect to argument of Korea that incorporation of Dokdo/Takeshima into Shimane Prefecture in 1905 is another proof showing Dokdo/Takeshima is not Japanese territory, Japan has argued that this action is reaffirmation of sovereignty of Dokdo/Takeshima. Additionally, This pamphlet argued that even if Korea granted Dokdo/Takeshima the administrative status of county, they did not exercise effective control.

In case of the San Francisco Peace Treaty, Japan has claimed opposite interpretation. While Korea has argued that no mention of Dokdo/Takeshima is a result from lobbying by Japan, Japanese pamphlet said that U.S did not add the mention of Dokdo/Takeshima because U.S has thought Dokdo/Takeshima is originally Japanese territory. Dean Rusk, United States Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, sent a letter to Korean ambassador Yang Yoo-chan. In this letter, the content of letter was, “As regard the island of Dokdo, otherwise Known as Takeshima or Liancourt Rocks, this normally uninhabited rock formation was according to our information never treated as part of Korea and, since about 1905, has been under the jurisdiction of the Oki Islands Branch Office of Shimane Prefecture of Japan. The island does not appear ever before to have been claimed by Korea.” Japanese pamphlet said that it is evidence that Dokdo/Takeshima is a Japanese territory. Besides, the supreme command for allied Powers designated Dokdo/Takeshima as a bombing range for U.S Forces. After 1952, U.S Forces desire to use Dokdo/Takeshima as a bombing range continuously, U.S dealt this problem with Japan. It is other evidence that Dokdo/Takeshima is a Japanese territory.

Finally, this pamphlet has introduced illegal occupation of Korea over Dokdo/Takeshima and Japan suggested to the ROK that the dispute over Dokdo/Takeshima be referred to the International Court of Justice. In the year of 1952, Syngman Rhee, the President of the ROK, declared “Syngman Rhee Line” which is concerning maritime sovereignty and include Dokdo/Takeshima. This pamphlet said “Syngman Rhee Line” was a unilateral act in contravention of international law. Furthermore, Korea dispatched Coast Guard to Dokdo/Takeshima, Japanese pamphlet said this action of Korea is illegal and the Japan government has been making strong protests against illegal occupying
Dokdo/Takeshima by Korea. The Japan government also proposed the ROK government to dispute over Dokdo/Takeshima in the International Court of Justice, but the ROK Government has been rejected.

4.3.2 Coverage of Mass Media in Japan

I researched editorials and columns in Asahi newspaper and Manichi newspaper which published from 10th of August to 30th of September in 2012. Editorials and columns in two newspapers can be separated by 4 frames; critique toward ROK government, critique toward Japan government, giving advice to the Japan government, and mention in order to settle a conflict between Japan and the ROK government. In critique to the ROK government, the editorials said that visits to Dokdo/Takeshima by the President Lee is caused by crisis of his domestic politics and focus on his unstable circumstance.

However, reason of the visits of the President Lee is his problems in domestic politics rather than territorial dispute. Facing with expiration of his term in next February, the President Lee’s brother and people close to the President were arrested. There are also complaints over increasing the economical gap and Lee Administrations is losing their power.

Before the independence day of Korea, 15th of August, although showing a firm stance over territory is goal, there is no benefit except for temporary public popularity. It is no longer helpful for increasing the power of Lee Administration. In contrast to this, it shows a fact that there is a dispute over sovereignty of Dokdo/Takeshima to international society.

We can see politicians raise issues to outside when they are in crisis of domestic politics. Territorial issue which produces nationalism is good source of this.83

As Korean media criticized Japanese claim over Dokdo/Takeshima is result from a crisis of domestic politics, Japanese editorials criticized the visits of the President Lee is unadvised

performance and caused by solution of crisis in domestic politics. It analyzed the ROK government utilizes a nationalism to increase his approval rating through territorial issue. Besides, other editorial said this visits of the President Lee is an inappropriate behaviour as major country.\textsuperscript{84} The Japanese media focus on reasons of utilizing Dokdo/Takeshima issue by the President Lee and blame the ROK in this territorial dispute. Through these kinds of coverage, the Japanese believe that Dokdo/Takeshima issue is a mean to escape crisis in domestic politics for the Koreans. In a position of the Japanese, Dokdo/Takeshima is originally their territory and the Koreans started to control Dokdo/Takeshima in the period of postwar. For the Japanese, Dokdo/Takeshima is controlled by the Koreans illegally and they have no problems in this conflict. These belief of the Japanese establish ‘we’(Japan) as innocent country and ‘they’(the ROK) as problematic country. From my perspective, this frame of ‘we’ and ‘they’ is related to Japanese collective memory and national identity. Japanese society is turning to the right side in politics in order to recover their national pride, because growth of China and the ROK and prolonged recession in Japan began to damage national status of Japan in the international society. Despite of neighboring countries’ worries, Japan is trying to change the historical view over World War. Furthermore, they try to deny war crime and glorify the past. The real problem is change of social atmosphere. 20 years ago, denying war crime never would have happened. Although some ministers of the Japanese government tried to deny war crime, they are dismissed immediately. However, today leading members of the Japanese government tried to deny war crime. Abe, the Prime Minister of Japan, claimed “The definition of what constitutes an ‘invasion’ has yet to be established in academia or in the international community. Things that happened between nations will look different depending on which side you view them from.”\textsuperscript{85} The ROK and China infuriated against his comment and many foreign media criticized his comment. However, he is still the Prime Minister of Japan and his party won the general election overwhelmingly in last July. Besides, Japanese Vice Prime Minister,Taro Aso, praised for Nazi tactics.\textsuperscript{86} After controversy,
he explained his intention of that comment. This change of social atmosphere is quite big difference compared to the past. It proves that they are no longer taking war crime seriously than before. The Japanese media also cover Dokdo/Takeshima issue in a similar way. Ignoring their problem, they try to focus on problems of the ROK. If the leading members of the Japanese government and media try to deny their war crime and blame their faults to other countries, then the Japanese will believe that they were victims in Pacific War and innocent later. Finally, these beliefs will become a part of their collective memory and national identity. According to theory of collective memory and national identity, the past is reconstructed with needs of the present. Since the government and rightists want to be free from guilt, they will try to establish people’s collective memory and national identity disregarding war crime.

4.3.3 Statements of the Japan government

After the President of the ROK visited Dokdo/Takeshima, they criticized visits to Dokdo/Takeshima and considered sending territorial dispute of Dokdo/Takeshima to International Court of Justice. In the position of Japan, behaviour of the ROK government is unacceptable and provocation.

We are aware of that the President Lee Myung-bak visited Takeshima today. So in order to show our will of strong protest, we have already decided to recall ambassador of the ROK, Shin Gak-su. Takeshima is our territory and it is a true by history and international law. Thus, as the visits of the President Lee is opposite position of our country, we protested against the ROK government strongly.87

Firstly, we suggest meditation which is based on exchange of notes in conflict-resolution between Japan and the ROK and referring Takeshima problem to International Court of Justice. As the ROK government claims to stand for “Global Korea”, If their claim over sovereignty of Takeshima is
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legal, I believe they will accept suggestions of our country. And I hope to require it strongly.88

The interesting characteristic of statements of Japan is separation between territorial dispute and history. The Japan government never mention about history, while the ROK government make a link between Dokdo/Takeshima territorial dispute and the past history such as Japanese militarism and the Japanese colonial rule. In my own opinion, it has two possibilities. One is the Japan government ignores the position of the ROK government intentionally. Second possibility is the lack of understanding position of the ROK government. In my own opinion, the first possibility is more probable. If they accept the position of the ROK government which links territorial dispute to history of invasion by Japan, dispute over the Japanese colonial rule can be inevitable and they have not any advantages in this territorial dispute. Dispute about contrition will be ensued. For Japan, they do not want to face with this situation because announcing contrition will engender controversy in their society. According to “Memory, Apology and International Reconciliation” written by Jennifer Lind89, dilemma of Japan is backlash by conservatives. Although the Japan government has pronounced apologies to neighboring nations, some of conservatives criticize contrition of the government and cause backlash in domestic politics. Those conservatives believe contrition of the government is anti-patriotic and try to glorify or deny their wrongdoings. Because of this, neighboring nations including the ROK, China conclude that Japanese contrition is insincere. Considering this, in order to avoid backlash in domestic politics, the Japan government is continue to ignore stance of the ROK. According to theories of collective memory and national identity, country sometimes ignores disadvantageous historical fact. From my perspective, the Japanese government offer typical example of this. Emphasizing problems of the ROK, the statement of the Japanese government will affect an establishment of collective memory and national identity of the Japanese.

4.4 Integrated analysis

Analyzing media and statements of the ROK and Japan, I focus on how media and statements establish collective memories and national identity of people. And then, in this section, I analyze the role of collective memories and national identity of the ROK and Japan in their relationship. Both of two countries criticized that the opposite country brings historical issue to politics in order to solve domestic political problem. In fact, it is obviously that both of two nations did. For example, the ROK government also utilized national identity and collective memory of the Koreans in their domestic politics, even if the ROK government claimed the President Lee’s visits to Dokdo/Takeshima is just a reaction about irresponsible attitude of Japan over comfort women issue. Before visits of Dokdo/Takeshima, the President Lee was in crisis because his brother and people close to the President are involved in corruption. In this situation, 5 days earlier than liberation day of Korea, the President Lee visited Dokdo/Takeshima and 4 days later, he required apology from Japanese emperor. Continuous aggressive comments of the President Lee and conflicts with Japan enable the President Lee to stir up public’s complaint. The Prime Minister of Japan, Noda Yoshihiko, is also struggling with his low approval rating. Although The Democratic Party of Japan seized power in 2009 for the first time since 1955, they could not realize public desire and were in crisis of domestic politics. So, prospect over victory of Liberal Democratic Party which is the opposition party in next parliamentary election was dominant. In this situation, by showing strong stance over Dokdo/Takeshima dispute, The Prime Minister of Japan was willing to escape from crisis in domestic politics. Taking that territorial dispute is related with nationalism and history into consideration, Japanese behaviour is relevant to utilization of national identity and collective memory.

In this process, they utilize negative collective memory and national identity of their people. For example, the Koreans have negative collective memory against Japan over the colonial rule. So their national identity is defensive and aggressive over Japan. Especially, the Korean media and statements of the government stimulate these collective memory and national identity of the Koreans. By contrast, Japan focused on domestic political problems of the ROK in media and statements of the government. They believe that Korean claim over Dokdo/Takeshima sovereignty is related to solution of domestic political problem of the ROK. Ignoring historical dispute related to colonial rule and blaming domestic problem of the ROK over reasons of historical dispute, the Japanese government establishes negative images of

---

90 On 17th of December in 2012, Liberal Democratic Party won on the parliamentary election of Japan overwhelmingly.
the Koreans to the Japanese. And the Japanese believe the ROK as trouble maker. As a result, collective memory and national identity of two countries are too oppositional. Because of this characteristic, it is easy to make conflict in their bilateral relationship. So national identity and collective memory of two countries have influence on their bilateral relationship in a negative way. Consequently, they has been one of the biggest obstacle in bilateral relationship of the ROK and Japan.

5. Conclusion

In this thesis, I focus on territorial dispute over Dokdo/Takeshima. Even if this issue is territorial dispute, basically this issue is based on different view of history. Two nations are arguing sovereignty of Dokdo/Takeshima with different historical interpretation. For example, Japan incorporated Dokdo/Takeshima as their territory in 1905. Japan has argued this action was reaffirmation of sovereignty over Dokdo/Takeshima. In contrast, Korea has claimed this action indicates Dokdo/Takeshima is not Japanese territory and took Dokdo/Takeshima from Korea in a process of colonization. Dokdo/Takeshima issue is a good source to study how two countries construct different collective memory and national identity and the role of history in the ROK-Japan relations.

Collective memory and national identity are formed by diverse factors including norms, ideas, political views in a group. I believe media and statements of the government are main sources to construct collective memory and national identity. So, I dealt with media and statements of the government over Dokdo/Takeshima issue.

Statements of the ROK government focus on Japanese wrongdoings in the colonial rule and argued Japanese claim over sovereignty of Dokdo/Takeshima is based on distorted view of history. Editorials and columns of Korean media are not different from statements of the ROK government. Furthermore, they explained historical meanings of Dokdo/Takeshima, intention of Japanese argument about sovereignty of Dokdo/Takeshima and Japanese invasion in the period of colonization repeatedly. By doing so, the Koreans remind Japanese atrocities in colonial rule and form negative aspects about Japan in their collective memory and national identity.

On the other hand, statements of the Japan government and media in Japan criticized the President Lee utilized nationalism into domestic politics and showed a firm stance over recovering sovereignty of Dokdo/Takeshima. While statements of the ROK government and
media of the ROK link Japanese claim about sovereignty of Dokdo/Takeshima to historical problem, Japan divided territorial dispute and historical problem. It seems Dokdo/Takeshima issue is just territorial dispute for Japan. The Japanese believe that the ROK government illegally occupies Dokdo/Takeshima, which can lead to establishment of negative image of Korean.

Finally, my second question is about the role of collective memory and national identity in the ROK-Japan relationship. I found out answer of this question in Territorial dispute over Dokdo/Takeshima. Two countries utilize their collective memory and national identity in domestic politics. By responding strongly to each other, their national pride has clashed. Consequently, their oppositional collective memory and national identity of two countries is the biggest obstacle in their relationship.

6. Reference


Alexandre Dorna, “The linguistic effects of political discourse”, Hermes n.16, 1995, 132-133 [In French]


Baxter , Pamela and Jack, Susan ”Qualitative Case Study Methodology: Study Design and

Bong, Youngshik D, “Built to last: The Dokdo territorial controversy. The baseline conditions in domestic politics and international security of Japan and South Korea.”, *Memory Studies*, 6.2 , (2013): 191-203


Chosun Shinmun “There is no advantage by mixing issue of history, national sentiment and domestic politics for Japan” Editorial (19 August 2012) [In Korean]
Accessed May 15, 2013 at
http://news.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2012/08/19/2012081900360.html

http://news.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2012/09/10/2012091002390.html


Gnat’Uk, “Farewell to the empire. Ukrainian discussions on identity.”, Kyiv:Krytyka, 2005 [In Ukraine]


Kim Woo-Chang, “Truth, Morale, Politics” , DangDaeBiPyung Vol. 16, published in SamIn , 2001 [In Korean]


Kuzmanic, Marja, “Collective Memory and Social Identity : A social psychological exploration of the memories of the disintegration of former Yugoslavia.”, Horizons of


Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the ROK, “Regular briefing of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade of the ROK” (16 August 2012) Accessed May, 16, 2013 at

National Assembly Research Service(of Korea), 2012 Policy-Information of the National Assembly inspection II, 2012


Shunji Cui, “Peace and Reconciliation through Environmental Cooperation : Changing the Image of Japan in China.”, The Peace and Conflict Review. 5 2, 2011 Accessed May 2, 2013,


Thomas, Gary A Typology for the Case Study in Social Science Following a Review of Definition, Discourse, and Structure. Qualitative Inquiry 17.6 p.511-521 2011


Yoon Tae-Ryong “Historical Overhang Is What States Make of It? – Realism of Historical overhang in Korea-Japan Relations”, BK21 Globalizing Korean Political Science Corps, Department of Political Science & International Relations, Korea University, 2010