

Thoughts of Song Du-Yul, a Unification Philosopher, on the Border of the South-North Division*

Park, Young-Kyun**

Professor at the Institute of the Humanities for
Unification at Konkuk University (IHU)

Abstract

This thesis deals with Song Du-Yul's unification philosophy, which is a philosophical inquiry into the division and unification of the Korean Peninsula. His unification philosophy basically starts off from thoughts on the 'border' of 'South and North', and then onto producing 'the third something'. He believes the mutual antagonism of 'South or North' is premised on the totality of the Korean Peninsula. Therefore, based on the totality of the Peninsula, he proposes an 'epistemological transition' to 'South and North', and defines unification as a process of producing a 'common denominator' as the third something from this epistemological transition. To his end, he proposes a 'innate and critical approach' and a 'hermeneutic circle' as methods to understand the dissimilarities of the 'the other' in and of themselves, from the perspective of 'philosophy of a borderer', and goes on to discussing 'coexistence of dissimilarities' and 'change as a process'. Also, in relation to the 'border experience', he asserts 'reflexive nationalism' and 'subjective globalization' as a move beyond the conflict between the South's 'globalization' and the North's 'uniformism', through which he is able to bring out the universal significance of creating a unified Korean Peninsula. Based on such analysis, this thesis focuses on Song Du-Yul's unification philosophy, assesses its significance and the limitations, and proposes a new unification philosophy, based on 'the otherness of the other', consisting of 'philosophy of the two', 'asymmetrical communication' and 'creation of commonalities through inter-Korea communication'.

* "This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea Grant funded by the Korean Government (MEST)" (NRF-2009-361-A00008).

** dudrbs99@naver.com

Received 28 September 2014; Revised version received 14 November 2014; Accepted 22 December 2014

Key words : Song Du-Yul, Borderer, Philosophy for Korea's Unification, Hermeneutic Circle, Nationalism, Other, Communication, Commonality

1. Introduction: The Unfinished Return Home and Song Du-Yul as a Borderer

If there is one person who could be labelled a ‘unification philosopher’ in divided Korea, it would be Song Du-Yul, a philosopher based in Germany. The division of the Korean Peninsula, which came together with national liberation on 15th August 1945, changed the lives of Koreans. Therefore, the division had great impact on Korea’s intellectual trajectory, particularly on culture, arts, history and politics to name a few. However, despite such intellectual trajectories, there are not many people who took upon themselves the task of philosophically asking and contemplating on ‘division in and of itself’. One exception would be Song Du-Yul. He focused on ‘division in and of itself’ in his philosophy and considered it the coordinates of his basic thoughts.

However, this is not because he had studied Eastern or Korean philosophy in Korea. He studied Western philosophy in Germany and is teaching philosophy at a German university. Nonetheless, he has drawn a unique trajectory of thought in ‘Korean philosophy’ that is more ‘Korean’ than Koreans studying Korean philosophy in Korea. He was able to do so focusing on division and unification of the Korean Peninsula as subjects of inquiry in his philosophy, and has studied philosophy from that perspective. But all this led Song Du-Yul to pay a very high price because dealing head-on with the issues of division and unification in Korea entails thinking about a nation beyond division - quite a dangerous task in a country where the National Security Act persists.

On 22nd September 2003, there was an upheaval in Korean society due to the return of one elderly philosopher, allowed to return to his homeland only after 37 years. At the time, he had returned trusting the government which had promised he would not be politically persecuted. However, he was arrested by the National Intelligence Service agents at the Incheon International Airport for ‘investigation’

and was then indicted with detention for violating the National Security Act while the Korean conservative press and ultra-rightwing organizations insinuated him as a North Korean spy. He was sentenced to 7 years imprisonment at the first instance trial and then 3 years imprisonment with 5 years suspension of sentence at the second instance. He was finally released 9 months after being detained, but right after his release, he had to fly back to Germany on 5th August 2004.

His homecoming after 37 years was met with all sorts of humiliation, oppression and degradation. The time in Korea he had been dreaming of was filled with detention and going back and forth from the courts. After returning to Germany, he published a book, *The Unfinished Return Home and After* - a very appropriate title. Korean society became democratized after the pro-democracy uprising of 10th June 1987, and thanks to democratization, he was able to come back. However, his homecoming could not become a proper homecoming because, despite his lifelong dedication to dismantling the North-South antagonism and to overcoming the barrier of division, his efforts eventually fell into a trap set up by that same antagonism leading him to become a political scapegoat.

The regime of division on the Korean Peninsula is based on ‘a relationship of antagonistic interdependence’, forged by making hatred and confrontation between the two Koreas into a force internally binding each divided state and strengthening ruling power. Historically, the South Korean government has used the South-North hostility to eliminate political enemies and democratic opposition leaders, mainly by using the National Security Act to criminalize them as ‘pro-North Korean = communist = left wing’, or by manipulating public opinion about North Korea’s political maneuvers. The unification philosophy of Song Du-Yul started from the ‘need for praxis’ in order to overcome this harsh reality in Korea. He struggled for democratization and improvement of human rights in Korea, realizing that the anti-democratic nature of Korea was directly related to the regime of division. He therefore strove to dismantle that regime.

The year he attained his PhD in philosophy in Germany with Habermas as his advisor, 1972, was a year filled with very important events in the history of the Korean Peninsula. On 4th July, the two Koreas proclaimed the ‘South-North Korea Joint Communiqué’, in which they agreed for the first time after being divided to

promote reunification based on the ‘Three Principles of Reunification’ - autonomy, peace and grand national unity. However, in October the same year, the South and the North, as if they had made a promise, declared legislation of the ‘Yushin Constitution’ and the ‘Socialist Constitution’ respectively, and then on 27th December, on the same day, the two sides each declared their constitutions. So the two Koreas, after proclaiming the July 4th Joint Communiqué, each established a state wielding absolute power.

In 1974, when the National Federation of Democratic Youth Students case erupted, and 180 or so Korean academics were detained, Song Du-Yul organized in Germany the ‘Association for Building a Democratic Society’ to resist the Park Jung Hee dictatorship and became its president. From then on, he was banned from entering Korea, and his life as an outsider, unable to return to his home country for 37 years, started. Like the Korean composer based in Germany, Yun I-Sang, he was labelled a ‘dissident’ and a ‘pro-North Korean’. Nevertheless, like Yun I-Sang, he transformed his life as an ‘outsider’ into a life as a ‘borderer’, transcending the border of division between the South and the North. After visiting North Korea in 1993, he continued to visit the country, and in 1991, he even lectured at the Kim Il-Sung University at the invitation of the North Korean Academy of Social Science. In addition, he organized the ‘South-North Academic Conference’ in Beijing every year since 1995.

During his trials in 2003, he tried to make public the practical relevance of the ‘philosophy and life as a borderer’ he had been developing. However, the National Intelligence Service’s attempts to fabricate him into a spy succeeded, based on the Korean public’s embodiment of the hostile habitus instilled by the regime of division (Song, Du-Yul 2007, 16-17). 4 years after he returned to Germany, on 17th April 2008, the Supreme Court of Korea acquitted him of majority of the accusations, reversed the original sentencing of ‘3 years imprisonment with 5 years suspension’ and remanded his case. However, there are still many Koreans who believe Song Du-Yul to be a ‘pro-North Korean leftist’ or even a ‘spy’.

In this sense, his phrase ‘unfinished return home’ and the humiliation he had to bear paradoxically reveal the fact that it is the ‘regime of division’ preventing the advancement of human rights, democracy and peace in Korea, and that in order

to dismantle the regime, ‘philosophy of a borderer’, seeking to overcome division, would be necessary. Song Du-Yul returned to Germany, hurt by the reality in Korea, and 4 years later, he wrote, “Since people think returning home is about imagining and approaching the land of the future where no one had set foot in, I want to emphasize that ‘unfinished return home’ is not a sad feeling about a distant past but a proactive action to realize the future dream we seek to create” (Song, Du-Yul 2007, 7).

2. Epistemological Transition of Unification Philosophy: Philosophy of the Border

Song Du-Yul’s unification philosophy is basically grounded in his inquiry on the ‘border (Grenze)’. He highlights the idea of the ‘trans-border’ brought by today’s globalization. However, his inquiry into the border is not about ‘trans-border’ as discussed in multiculturalism, which is about post-nationalization of diasporas and creating ‘hybridity’ beyond the borders of nation states. The ‘border’ he focuses on is the innately given border within his existence and life, and is also the reality itself that suffers because of that border. He calls himself a “borderer (Grenzgänger)”. A borderer refers to ‘a person from South Korea who travels to and from North Korea, a person from the East but studying Western philosophy in the West, a person from the impoverished Third World but living in the First World country of Germany’ (Song, Du-Yul 2000, 189).

Of course, this border is not one consciously created by Song Du-Yul as an existing being. It is a geographical and spatial border made by present day global social structures as well as being a border that segments and controls his body. This is where his existence suffers ‘pain and fragmentation’. However, Song does not consider this fragmentation and collision as a clash between one’s vibrant life and structural oppression of that life. Therefore, he does not interpret the clash brought by the fragmenting border as ‘differentiation’ due to power of life inside oneself nor as strength of ‘hybrid creation’ as proponents of post-modernism would. Rather, like Hegel, he focuses on the logic of ‘totality’ and ‘integration’

hidden underneath the idea of 'exclusion' - ideas maintaining one's identicalness through territorialization.

Because the East and the West, and the South and North are tied together based on a certain border, each is mutually exclusive. However, not only do they exclude each other but they also tie each other within a certain framework. Territorialization between the East and the West differentiates the two within the framework of the 'world' while territorialization between the South and the North differentiates them within the 'Korean Peninsula'. So Song focuses not on 'invigorating differences' where the borders themselves between 'the South and the North, and the East and West' are dismantled, but rather, on forging relationships between the 'two' within 'totality'. At this point, the 'twos' of South and North Korea, and of the East and the West, maintain their identities. However, they do not exist isolated but by creating 'the third' through the relationship between the two.

Thus, first of all, Song tries to deconstruct the 'law of identity'. According to the law of identity, where 'A=A', 'A' is only 'A', and also follows the law of excluded middle where 'non-A' can never become 'A'. In this case, the East and the West, and the South and the North are merely mutually exclusive, hiding the totalities of the 'world' and of the 'Peninsula', which bind them. Therefore, Song argues for a 'philosophy of the borderer', in which the two are left as two within totality but are not mutually exclusive and retain a tense relationship within the 'totality'. The border in this case is obscure and uncertain (Song, Du-Yul 2007, 100). The logic of 'A or non-A' interacts within the totality that binds them, so they mix and their identities are unclear. This is why alternatively, they create 'the third'.

For example, the present day Truce Line is the border between the two Koreas. However, its definition is a 'line of confrontation between the two Koreas provisionally under an armistice'. So it is a border with a temporary fate and can one day disappear. The identities of the two states - South Korea and North Korea - are 'partial identities' that can only be maintained as far as the Truce Line exists. Also, the two Koreas are mutually exclusive and antagonistic, but the fact that the totality of the Peninsula binds their partial identities together is manifested at this point. Therefore, Song, rather than adhering to the dichotomous logic of choice between 'South or North' tied to a one-dimensional border concept according to

the law of identity ‘A=A’, proposes an ‘epistemological transition’, where totality of the Peninsula, or the idea of ‘South and North’, is considered, and this is the starting point of his unification philosophy.

“The logic of ‘South and North’, replacing ‘South or North’, has its premise on ‘mutuality’, where the ‘North’ exists within the ‘South’, and the ‘South’ within the ‘North’.” However, such mutuality is not always positive. Song maintains that the existing ‘Truce Line’ dividing the two Koreas articulates ‘mutuality’ not positively but negatively. “We can easily find examples of this in people frequently talking about ‘*bookpoong*’ or ‘*chongpoong*’¹⁾” (Song, Du-Yul 2000, 128). Here, the border, as the Truce Line, acts as an antagonistic relationship “used by both the North and the South to create a certain level of tension and confrontation with the other to consolidate internal unity, integration or stability of ruling power” (Lee, Jong-Seok 1995, 146-148).

In other words, as displayed by the legitimacy competition between the two divided Koreas, there is hostility between the two because they push each other out antagonistically based on the law of identity (‘A=A’) and the law of excluded middle (‘A≠non-A’), and convert totality of the Peninsula into a relationship of antagonistic mutuality. Therefore, Song seeks to convert the ‘antagonistic mutuality’ of ‘South or North’ into a ‘solidaristic mutuality’ of ‘South and North’, which is why he asserts an ‘obscure and uncertain border’ referred to as ‘the third’. ‘The third’ is the point where the relationship of ‘antagonistic symbiosis or symbiotic antagonism’ of ‘South or North’ is dismantled.

“The border in the form of the Truce Line persistently, under tension, brings out the ‘alter ego,’” providing ‘border experience (Grenzerfahrung)’ (Song, Du-Yul 1995b, 259). “It is only when we hit the border of a space through specific action and feel something that we are able to differentiate the ‘inside’ and the ‘outside’. ... The space we live in does not simply mean ‘here’ but ‘somewhere’ as a place of ‘kindness’ open to others.” “This is where the ethicalness of the ‘border’” is revealed (Song,

1) *Bookpoong* and *chongpoong* literally translates to ‘winds from North Korea’ and ‘winds from guns’ respectively. *Chongpoong* was coined from a scandal in which Lee Hoi-Chang, the ruling party’s candidate for the 1997 presidential election, secretly met North Korean officials in Beijing during the election period and requested firing of guns in demonstration against the South at the Truce Line, in order to raise support for his candidacy. *Bookpoong* refers to exerting political influence in South Korea by using North Korea, as was shown in the *chongpoong* case.

Du-Yul 2002, 279). Thus, Song rejects the dichotomy based on territorialization, stands on an obscure point called the border, and asserts that the tension created by the border be retained. Only border experience can eliminate the obstinacy, dogma and mutual antagonism continuing in the dichotomy between the other and oneself, thus paving the way for a new ethical life of coexistence with the other.

Therefore, Song maintains that unification philosophy has to consist, not of separate ‘South’ or ‘North’, but of thoughts that put ‘life as a borderer’ into practice, where the border itself, as the Truce Line shared between the two Koreas, is expanded. “A ‘borderer’ is a person who is able to create breathing space for both this and that side. In order to create that space, the borderer has to perform the difficult task of finding that side within this side and this side within that. ... A niche on the border as the South-North Truce Line has to be opened so that both sides can breathe, and if we want to expand this space to the entire Peninsula so as to create space for peaceful life, then we must first of all free ourselves from the customary one-dimensional border concept of either this side or that side” (Song, Du-Yul 2007, 101).

Here, the borderer, adhering to ‘the third’, plays the ‘role of criticizing and dismantling’ the partiality of the South and the North. However, in Song’s unification philosophy, the life of a borderer adhering to ‘the third’ does not stop there. Song’s idea of the ‘life of a borderer’ is also a life creating ‘the third’ because the ‘epistemological transition’ from the dichotomy of ‘South or North’ towards the totality of ‘South and North’ requires transcending the antagonistic logic of the two Koreas that discredit dissimilarities between them as heterogeneity, and moving towards ‘ethics of the other’, with understanding of the ‘dissimilarities with the other’ as dissimilarities in and of themselves, thereby accommodating both the South and the North.

3. Coexistence of Dissimilarities and Change as a Process: Innate and Critical Approach and the Hermeneutic Circle

From Song’s perspective of ‘ethics of the other’, the dissimilarities between the

South and the North are not mutually antagonistic but are ‘the other’s dissimilarities’ that are a part of the totality of the Peninsula. Therefore, they are a subject to be understood, and form a ‘coexistence of dissimilarities’ to be accepted by each side. In that sense, unification, where the two would become one, will not be a sudden one-off event, but the result of a ‘process’ attained by the different two coexisting over a long period of time, influencing and changing each other. Song Du-Yul’s unification philosophy of “coexistence of dissimilarities” and “change as a process” comes from these ideas (Song, Du-Yul 2007, 279).

However, the main trend of previous unification discourse was that, although the two Koreas are now divided, they were initially ‘one nation’, which is why we need to reunify. Proponents of this trend failed to consider the actually existing ‘dissimilarities’ between the two Koreas and thought the ‘dissimilarities’ as heterogeneity that has to be eliminated. They asserted that national homogeneity has to be revived and thereby attain unification. But the problem is that this view leads to a ‘paradox’ of inter-Korean confrontation further deteriorating over ‘what is really national’. The South will argue its own values, sentiments and culture to be truly national whereas the North will also argue theirs to be real.

It is precisely under these circumstances that Song Du Yul considers ‘coexistence of dissimilarities’, not national homogeneity, as his starting point. Although the idea ‘coexistence of dissimilarities’ accepts the fact ‘we are one nation’, it starts from the premise that, realistically, there are two different states and two sets of people. ‘Dissimilarities’ between the North and the South do not have to be eliminated but can coexist. However, in order for the two to communicate, they not only have to accept the ‘coexistence of dissimilarities’ but also go through a process of understanding the ‘dissimilarities’ in and of themselves, since generally, people tend to interpret others’ actions and lifestyles from their own set of values and experience.

In such a situation, each would interpret and understand the other’s words or actions from its own value system and lifestyle, internalized in the process of living in different systems. So even if the two Koreas do converse with one another, this conversation can in fact lead to greater misunderstanding and hence become a vicious cycle. Therefore, Song proposes an ‘innate and critical (immanent-kritisch)

approach' and a 'hermeneutic circle', which involve one not "considering one's prescribed value system absolute and forcing it on others" but rather finding "the essence of the other inside the other" (Song, Du-Yul 1995a, 242). Here, 'innate approach' does not mean understanding the North from the South's perspective, nor vice versa.

Song Du Yul's 'innate approach' is understanding the 'North' from the context of the North's own history and value system, and understanding the South based on those of the South. This is why he tries to understand the North's ideologies of 'Socialism of Our Own' and 'Self-Reliant (*Juche*) Society' not from the perspective of the South, but from North's own socio-historical context, different even from East German, Chinese or Russian socialism (Song, Du-Yul 1990a, 1990b). Nevertheless, Song's innate approach does not mean, as some allege, unconditionally and uncritically accepting and supporting the 'North' (Chin, Hee-Gwan 1995; Yi, Guk-Yueng 2008).

Song believes that both the antagonistic view of unconditionally criticizing the other as well as the opposite of idealizing the other are problematic because both tendencies come from viewing the two Koreas not as a totality of the Peninsula but from the perspective based on 'isolation and exclusivity of a part', i.e., South or North. According to Song, the only way to avoid isolation and exclusivity of South or North is neither through an 'antagonistic view' nor an 'idealizing view' but through 'border experience' that adheres to the border itself. So the 'innate approach', in which the South sees the North from the North's perspective and the North views the South from the South's perspective, involves interpreting a particular event not from one's own stance but from the other's, as different from one's own, and therefore pushes one into the tension of the 'alter ego', just like the 'border experience'.

Such tension, just like the obscurity and uncertainty of a 'border experience', can lead to the following three biases. The first bias is where one has unbearable fear about the other remaining as the other and feels the obsession to conquer or destroy the other. The second is the opposite case, where one mystifies the other while belittling oneself, and the third is falling into lethargy and skepticism that the wall between oneself and the other is too high to surpass (Song, Du-Yul 1995b,

259). These tendencies exactly match the frames that appear in today's Korean society - 'anti-North Korean antagonistic unification theory', 'pro-North Korean national unification theory' and 'sense of futility and skepticism towards unification'. Song tries to transcend all three frames and, to this end, integrates the 'innate approach' and the 'critical approach'.

However, his 'critical approach' does not refer to criticizing the other from one's perspective, as people generally tend to do. Rather, it is 'critical approach' premised on 'innate interpretation', which, as was seen before, creates tension with the 'alter ego' and therefore deconstructs the 'identicalness of oneself and a dogmatic character'. So the criticism that takes place afterwards is not criticism from one's own perspective but rather criticism based on deconstruction of one's dogma. In other words, 'critical interpretation' means "Criticizing others must be based on strict self-criticism." And only then can "universal values that are jointly sought or should be sought be manifested" (Song, Du-Yul 2002, 166).

So Song's 'innate interpretation' does not negate critical interpretation. However, critical interpretation here is 'criticism' premised on self-criticism. This is the point where the 'innate and critical approach' transforms into another approach of Song, the 'hermeneutic circle'. The 'hermeneutic circle' is one in which oneself and the other look from each other's perspective. One looks at oneself through the other and at the other through oneself. Song explains that the 'hermeneutic circle' is "reflecting on the wish of a wish" where "If you do as I wish, then I will do as you wish." This is a method of walking in someone else's shoes (Song, Du-Yul 2002, 104-105).

However, the method of 'walking in someone else's shoes' is not simply mutualism or switching perspectives as some may easily think. It involves switching perspectives after having gone through the processes of innate interpretation of the other and of self-criticism, and is also a hermeneutic circle of creating something new. Therefore, Song's 'coexistence of dissimilarities' is neither relativism nor pluralism involving 'tolerance' and mutual acceptance, where the 'dissimilarities' are left as they are. His version of 'coexistence of dissimilarities' is a process of 'hermeneutic circle' performed on top of 'innate and critical approach'. It entails 'change as a process' in creating 'the third', which goes beyond the differences

between North and South Korea. This is the point where the position of ‘the third’ transforms into a new creation of ‘the third something’.

For Song, the ‘coexistence of dissimilarities’ is the process of creating “we, as a collective singularity” “under the sense of solidarity where our view is not necessarily equal to their view, but the two views may converge and can easily learn from one another” (Song, Du-Yul 1991, 42-43). The hermeneutic circle in this case involves “mine crossing something different and something different crossing mine” and is creating a “productive third something”. So Song argues that ‘coexistence of dissimilarities’ and ‘change as a process’ “are the essence of the philosophy of a ‘borderer’ as a ‘productive third person’” (Song, Du-Yul 2007, 101). As a historical example, he cites paragraph 2 of South-North Joint Declaration of June 15th 2000, agreed by the Heads of States of North and South Korea.

After being divided, the South and the North, despite the Joint Communiqué of July 4th 1972, continued to clash with one another, one arguing in favor of ‘unification based on a federation system’ and the other ‘unification based on a confederation system’. However, in paragraph 2 of the South-North Joint Declaration of June 15th 2000, the two Heads of States agreed, “... There is a common element in the South’s concept of a confederation and the North’s formula for a loose form of federation. The South and the North agreed to promote reunification in that direction.” In Song’s view, this agreement was a historical event, where the two Korea found a common denominator through a hermeneutic circle despite their conflict over methods of unification. If the ‘North’ could be found within the ‘South’ and the ‘South’ within the ‘North’ through a ‘hermeneutic circle’, it would be possible to find the South’s idea of the ‘Korean national community unification formulae’ within the North’s ‘federation system’ and the North’s idea of a ‘federation system’ within the South’s formulae (Song, Du-Yul 2002, 91).

Thus, the ‘coexistence of dissimilarities’ is not the type of coexistence that comes from a relativist stance of leaving the dissimilarities between the two entities as they are and never intervening. Song’s coexistence is about accepting the premise that there are two, ‘South and North’, nonetheless using the difference between them as a basis for self-criticism. It then goes further to overcome the partiality of the South and the North within the totality of ‘South and North’, finds

a common denominator, and thereby goes through ‘change as a process’ of building a ‘unified Korean Peninsula’. He says, “The reason I view unification not as a single ‘event’ but as a continual ‘process’ is because if the horizon of understanding between the two were to expand through dialogue, then I am certain we would be able to find many similarities in the form and content of lives encompassed by unification” (Song, Du-Yul 2000, 189).

If this is the case, then the ‘unification’ in Song Du-Yul’s unification philosophy is not a ‘past-oriented’ event of reviving the previous homogeneity as the ‘same nation’, but rather a ‘future-oriented’ act of creation. This is because, even though the two Koreas may have lived as one cultural community for a long time, the dissimilarities between the two states cannot be resolved easily, and require, for a prolonged period, ‘coexistence of dissimilarities’ as well as a process of ‘mutual change’, where the two meet and influence one another. Here, unification is not going back to the traditional community of the past. Unification requires change in the two different Koreas, and therefore cannot be but a process of creating ‘something that does not yet exist’.

4. Unification as Future Home: Reflexive Nationalism and Reflexive Modernization

Before Song Du-Yul, the traditional nationalists leading reunification theories in Korea, as well as North Korea maintaining an anti-imperialist nationalism as ideology of its regime, both consider unification as ‘reunification’, i.e., a return to the national community formed in past history. Thus, they strove to find an existing form of a nation or a cultural origin shared by the two Koreas before division, and asserted that they be the basis for reunification. However, such effort fails to view the reality of dissimilarities in value, sentiment and culture, which had evolved in each Korea after division, because it is entrapped inside the ‘desire for homogeneity’ and for merger of the two Koreas into ‘one nation’. Therefore, Song criticizes such theory as ‘subjective philosophical unification theory’ and redefines unification as a future-oriented act of creation.

For Song, unification is constructing a 'future home'. It is "not simply going back to the 'past' but a future-oriented act of creation" (Song, Du-Yul 2000, 129). This does not mean he negates nationalism altogether. In fact, he refers to nationalism as the strongest motive in overcoming division (Song, Du-Yul 2000, 87). However, Song's nationalism is different from traditional 'nationalism', which generally highlights only its relevance in the Peninsula's national history and the imperative for unification. Rather, he contemplates on dissimilarities between the two Koreas and the border defining those 'dissimilarities' within 'totality', while at the same time viewing unification as a process of 'expanding the border' and creating 'the third something' within that totality.

His ideas on solidaristic mutuality of 'South and North' or the 'totality' of the 'Korean Peninsula' do not mean regressing to national homogeneity in the traditional sense. In fact, from the perspective of the border, both the 'antagonistic mutuality' of 'South or North' and the 'solidaristic mutuality' of 'South and North' are based on the 'totality' of the 'Korean Peninsula'. However, the totality binding the Peninsula in the former is different from that of the latter. In the former version of totality, the 'nation', based on divided states of 'South or North', involves imaginatively reviving the past to conform to the objectives of each state and thereby excluding the other. In the latter case, the 'nation' of 'South and North' is something of the future that has to be newly created. Therefore, though Song does accommodate the desire for 'national homogeneity', he does not argue going back to it.

Rather, the 'nationalism' he supports is 'reflexive nationalism'. He recognizes the "dangers of aggressive nationalism" like the German Nazism (Song, Du-Yul 2000, 127). Nonetheless, he does not try to surpass such dangers through concepts trendy in the West such as 'post-nationalism', 'trans-border' or 'hybridity'. Rather, he seeks to surmount those dangers by starting off from the 'dissimilarities between the South and the North' as manifested by the reality on the divided Peninsula and also from reflections that come from the border experience as shown by the 'Truce Line'. He then creates 'the third something' through the process of unification, which is also the process of constructing the 'future home'. Of course, the basic sentiment and value of 'nationalism' do activate in this process. However, Song maintains that nationalism witnessed here is different from that discussed in the West.

Song asserts that nationalism of the West was aggressive nationalism, as proven by the history of imperialism, whereas nationalism on the Korean Peninsula was a form of nationalism defending oneself, as shown by the history of resisting Japanese imperialism. Furthermore, such defensive or resistance nationalism is also valid today, according to Song, because the Peninsula is located at the juncture where there is a hegemonic competition between the US and China - a Cold War in Northeast Asia instigated by globalization - and where 'Japan-centrism' and 'Sino-centrism' collide. Moreover, unification of the Peninsula can only be grounded on 'defensive or resistance nationalism' to counter such Cold-war-style confrontation. He therefore argues that nationalism based on efforts to unify the Peninsula can contribute to forming a Northeast Asia Regional Community and realizing actual peace (Song, Du-Yul 2007, 192).

Of course, dangers do exist. As is the case in North Korea, a form of nationalism stimulating internal unity against international forces pushing in from the outside can be forged. In order to counter such dangers, Song activates 'a system of internal reflection', which is 'reflexive nationalism'. However, in this case, the 'target of reflection' activated by 'reflexive nationalism' is not limited to the problems borne by the 'divided society'. It inevitably expands to cover the problems arising from globalization as well. As revealed by the conflicts between the US and China, and between China and Japan, which take place on the corridor of the Korean Peninsula and threat 'peace in Northeast Asia', Song maintains that the problems from a 'divided society' are intertwined with those from a 'risk society' under globalization.

"In South Korea, where the 'risk society' and the 'divided society' form a complex structure, the two contradictions are so complicatedly intertwined that it is difficult to identify which is the primary contradiction and which is secondary" (Song, Du-Yul 1998, 41). However, according to Song, on the present day Peninsula, the South and the North each advocate 'globalization' and 'uniformity' respectively, pitting the global against the local and 'universality of globalization' against 'specificity of the subject'. South Korea interprets 'globalization' as globalization of capital, and so not only does it support global management but also universalization of 'the global' and unification through 'international

cooperation'. On the other hand, North Korea identifies 'globalization' as 'uniformity' by the world's only superpower, the US, to make the entire world into 'one', and calls for unification based on 'self-reliance (*juche*)' and 'national cooperation' to counter such uniformity.

However, all this is "wasting time by just criticizing 'uniformity' to be the cause of all difficulties and by relying on vague hopes 'globalization' would solve all problems, without any prospect of resolving those problems within a unified nation state" "... caused by a 'risk society' built in both the divided South and North" (Song, Du-Yul 1998, 41). He thus contemplates on the idea of glocalization, which goes beyond both the global and the local (Song, Du-Yul 2000, 178). Furthermore, as a matter of world history, he links the task of overcoming the risk society created by modernity, as discussed by Ulrich Beck, with the task of overcoming the divided society as a specificity of the Peninsula, and says that the process of accomplishing the two tasks together is the process of creating 'the third', i.e., 'unification'.

In Song's view, theories on modernity that reflect into the fear and risks from today's globalization are 'second modernity' of Anthony Giddens and 'reflexive modernity' of Ulrich Beck. They contain 'the global' and 'universality'. However, globalization is "already along side locality or inside it" (Song, Du-Yul 1998, 51). Moreover, "The Peninsula is a place where the world of simultaneity seeking globalization exists at the same time with the world of non-simultaneity emphasizing the subject, which is why we are faced with a dual task. In other words, we concurrently face both the task relating to modernity of building a unified nation state as well as that relating to post-modernity of globalization" (Song, Du-Yul 1995a, 220). He therefore merges 'second modernity' and 'reflexive modernity' into 'reflexive nationalism'.

"Within 'collective memory' that views the structures of the 'risk society' and the 'divided society' holistically as one, one has to be able to reflect not only on proactive freedom of the individual but also on solidarity that protects life of the community" (Song, Du-Yul 1998, 42). Reflexive nationalism is "not nationalism that is conscious only of the 'outside'" but "one that reflects into the 'inside'". It is also a nationalism that "maintains 'nation-ness' without losing its 'human-ness', through which it also attains the universality that allows co-existence

with other nations” (Song, Du-Yul 2000, 127). And based on such ‘reflexive nationalism’, he proposes the concept of ‘subjective globalization’, which goes beyond the conflict between ‘globalization vs. the subject’. ‘Subjective globalization’ discussed here is “the idea that the South and the North recognize each other as a system and set each other as an environment, and thereby maintain a dynamic stability” (Song, Du-Yul 2007, 221).

For example, he cites the fact that with globalization and informatization, four fifth of the working population are being excluded from the social security net of a welfare society - a problem of a ‘risk society’. But on the Korean Peninsula, such problems of a risk society are exacerbated due to the inter-Korea military confrontation and the North’s economic difficulties from the economic sanctions. Therefore, Song believes that in order to resolve such problems of a risk society on the Peninsula, we also have to be able to solve the problems of a ‘divided society’, by alleviating the hostility between the two sides. He further asserts that this process involves ‘politics of mutual recognition (Politik der Anerkennung)’, where solidarity is forged from “the perspective of a communal society (Gemeinschaft) not from the perspective of an association society (Gesellschaft)”, i.e., from “internal exchange within a nation”, as manifested by the economic community initiative and the recognition of commonalities between a confederation system and a low-level federation system mentioned in the South-North Joint Declaration of June 15th 2000 (Song, Du-Yul 1998, 69).

5. Conclusion: The Cornerstone and Significance of Unification Philosophy; Going Beyond Its Limitations

In 1991, Song Du-Yul announced his so-called “Categories of Meta-Theory of Unification Theories”, composed of 6 theses on unification philosophy. They are: ① Philosophy of peace that “there cannot be a war” ② Philosophy of dialogue with “a dialectic character of changing together” ③ Philosophy of solidarity in which “we confirm ourselves as a collective singularity within solidarity” ④ Philosophy of process, through which change is sought not as an existing thing

but as a relationship. ⑤ Philosophy of hope, which “is not about simply going back to home of the past, but about pulling the future forward” ⑥ “Philosophy of responsibility” where one reflects upon the responsibilities towards the future generation (Song, Du-Yul 1991, 38-46). However, in Song’s unification philosophy, there is a higher basic principle that cuts through all six theses, and that is his very own existential situation of being a “borderer” and his “life as a ‘borderer’ seeking ‘the third something that excludes but at the same time integrates’” (Song, Du-Yul 2007, 62). His unification philosophy does not choose either side of the border, whether it be between the ‘East and West’, ‘South and North’ or ‘First World and Third World’, but seeks to go beyond them to produce ‘the third’, based on the totality that binds the two together. In other words, his unification philosophy is a philosophical inquiry with the aim of building a unified Peninsula as the ‘future home’, by creating ‘the third’ based on the totality of the ‘Korean Peninsula’. This line of reasoning also applies to the juxtapositions of the East and the West, the South and the North, and underdeveloped countries and developed countries.

He cuts through the nation and the post-nation, the modern and the post-modern, and simultaneity and non-simultaneity, and intercrosses Eastern philosophical thought and that of the West. However, his point of praxis, which is where his philosophy starts, is overcoming inter-Korean hostility and the South-North division, and establishing a unified Peninsula. He holds onto the concept of the ‘nation’ at the same time maintaining vigilance against ‘dangers of nationalism’, and focuses on ‘the global’ at the same time daring himself to an adventure of looking for universality within specificity, i.e., division of the Peninsula.

According to Song, “In face of new possibilities as well as limitations of the democracy brought by ‘globalization’,” “[unification...] raises an important point for solving the contradiction and tension that exist between the ‘openness’ and ‘secludedness’ of a system towards ‘universalism’, ‘specificism’ as well as ‘globalization’” (Song, Du-Yul 1998, 97). He believes that the process of unifying the Peninsula itself will contribute to surpassing the entangled national interests and civilizations brought by today’s globalization as well as the ‘conflict and the clashes’ that come from such entanglement. Unification will thus pave the way

to bringing peace not only in Northeast Asia but the world at large. Under these ideas, Song proposes the possibilities of ‘unification without the violence of the multitude’ as a form of “tolerance for things that are different or cannot be absorbed” (Song, Du-Yul 1998, 44), and also “non-violent unification based on diversity” (Song, Du-Yul 2007, 175).

Nevertheless, this also means that Song Du-Yul’s unification philosophy has to be more critically analyzed. In his philosophy, ‘unification’ is attained through ‘totality’ and ‘reflection’ on this totality. But here, one can see the dark shadows of Hegelian philosophy. As Hegel, his unification is also an evolving process in which the other is reintegrated into the totality through reflection into the other outside of oneself. “I am reminded of the intersubjectivity as directness of solidarity, proposed by Hegel as a principle of accepting the other, or the difference of the other. Without the tolerance of being able to see from the other’s perspective so as to form solidarity between myself and the other, the other will simply be seen as a target of domination and destruction” (Song, Du-Yul 2002, 8). So the other, according to Song, is ‘the other inside oneself’, or ‘the other’ as long as one is able to understand it.

Then the issue is, whether this other can really be thought as ‘the other’. According to Karatani Kojin, the other found inside oneself is merely “another form of self-consciousness”, and the contemplations that take place here are simply “introversive contemplations”, while dialogues are “dialogues with oneself, in other word, monologues” (Kojin 1998, 82). In fact, the reason why Song Du-Yul’s visit in 2003 was an ‘unfinished return home’ was because South Koreans accepted only this kind of ‘the other’. For them, North Korea is ‘the other’ that can never be understood from their language and values. Thus Kojin says, “Dialogue exists only between those who do not share a language game. And the other cannot be someone who does not share the language game with oneself.” Also, “An asymmetrical relationship of teaching and learning is the basis of communication” (Kojin 1998, 14-16).

The same applies to inter-Korean dialogue. At the moment, both sides criticize the other for being anti-democratic and anti-peace. Also, in regard to unification principles, the South advocates the three principles of ‘autonomy, peace and

democracy’ while the North ‘autonomy, peace and grand national unity’. They denounce and attack each other as ‘anti-unification forces’ and for reneging the agreements made between them in the past (Park, Young-Kyun 2014). However, such situation arises from the fact that they interpret the various values including ‘democracy, peace, autonomy and unification’ from their own stance. Therefore, in order to get the two to understand their dissimilarities and to communicate with one another, there has to be a process of creating ‘rules’ and ‘meaning’ through dialogue, rather than basing the rules of the game on one’s own context through a prescribed language (Park, Young-Kyun 2013).

Kojin once said, “Rules are found after a leap.” (Kojin 1998, 50) The rules of forging the future of a ‘unified Peninsula’ through inter-Korea dialogue can also be found after a leap, where the rules of the language game itself are found through communication between the two Koreas. In order to enable such a process, ‘the third’, as theorized by Song, should be considered not as a common denominator within the totality of the ‘Peninsula’, but rather as a beginning of ‘commonalities’ created through dialogue between the ‘two’ Koreas. A ‘commonality’ is born from a ‘process of transformation’ that takes place when two bodies meet and collide. Thus, such ‘commonalities’ are not tied to the totality of the ‘Peninsula’ but are instead outside the boundaries, and are formed when the two meet (Lee, Byung-Soo 2011; IHU 2014).

Therefore, for Song Du-Yul’s unification philosophy as a ‘philosophy of a borderer’ to become one that builds a unified Peninsula as the future home through exchange and communication of dissimilarities, not as ‘violence of identicalness’ of excluding dissimilarities between two Koreas and seeking to back to identicalness, it is necessary to start once again from the premise of ‘philosophy of the two’, consisting not of ‘the other inside oneself’ but ‘otherness of the other’. In fact, the ‘two’ as ‘the other inside oneself’, which involves finding only the common denominator, will merely remain as an ‘introversive dialogue’. Therefore, it is necessary to reposition Song Du-Yul’s unification philosophy as a ‘philosophy of communication’, which starts from the ‘philosophy of the two’ of the South and the North mutually recognizing one another, accepting the dissimilarities in ‘values, sentiments and culture’ as ‘differences’ borne by ‘otherness of the other’, and thereby leading those differences to creation through empathy and contact.

Works Cited

- Chin, Hee-Gwan. 1995. "Professor Song Du-Yul's Two Proposals for the Unification". *The Korean Journal of Unification Affairs* 23: 322-329.
- IHU (The Institute of the Humanities for Unification at Konkuk University). 2014. *Koreans Crossing the Border of Nation and Non-Nation*. Seoul: Sönin.
- Kojin, Karatani. 1998. *Philosophical Inquiry I*. Translated by Tae-Wook Song. Seoul: Saemulkyul.
- Lee, Byung-Soo. 2011. "Reflections on the National Commonality". *Epoch and Philosophy* 20(3): 115-146.
- Lee, Jong-Seok. 1995. "The Establishment of Dictatorships in South and North Korea" In *Fifty Years of the Division and Tasks of the Unification Era*, Edited by The Institute for Korean Historical Studies. Seoul: Critical Review of History.
- Park, Young-Kyun. 2013. "The Humanities Vision of Unification: Unification as Communication". *Epoch and Philosophy* 22(2): 211-236.
- _____. 2014. "Principles of Unification and Fundamental Values of Unification Process: Nation and Peace". *Epoch and Philosophy* 23(2): 111-147.
- Song, Du-Yul. 1990a. *Modern Time and Thought: Socialism, the (Post)Modern, and Nation*. Seoul: Hangilsa.
- _____. 1990b. *USSR and China: Workers, Peasants and Intellectuals in Socialist Society*. Seoul: Hangilsa.
- _____. 1991. *The World at a Turning Point and Nation Intelligence*. Seoul: Hangilsa.
- _____. 1995a. *Searching for the Logic of Unification*. Seoul: The Hankyoreh.
- _____. 1995b. *The End of History?* Seoul: Dangdae.
- _____. 1996. *Enlightenment and Emancipation*. Seoul: Dangdae.
- _____. 1998. *Dialogue with the Twenty First Century*. Seoul: The Hankyoreh.
- _____. 2000. *Nations Do Not Disappear*. Seoul: The Hankyoreh.
- _____. 2002. *A Border Man's Reflections*. Seoul: The Hankyoreh.
- _____. 2007. *The Unfinished Return Home and After*. Seoul: Humanitas.
- Yi, Guk-Yueng. 2008. "Korean Acceptance and Misconception of Immanent Approach in Germany: Implication on North Korea Studies". *The Korean Journal of Unification Affairs* 50: 1-46.