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Abstract

The aim of this paper is to examine the correlation between regime socialisation and censorship support in South Korea. The National Security Act is a policy that has been active in the country mentioned, since the 1950’s and restricts the freedom of speech. In a country like South Korea, which is a democracy, it is hard to understand the dual values that are being portrayed in the society. With the help of a theory about political socialisation by individual experience and by using a linear regression, this paper hypothesises that there will be people who are more supportive or completely against the backing for censorship if they have lived through an authoritarian regime. In the bivariate linear regression, the results indicate that there is a relation between the independent, regime socialisation and the dependent variable, support for censorship. However opposed to the theory of this paper, that inhabitants of countries with former authoritarian rule should be more supportive of censorship, the results from the multivariate linear regression show that with the control variables, gender, education, income and Asian values, the correlation between regime socialisation and the support for censorship is not statistically significant. Instead it shows that gender, education and income confound the relationship between regime socialisation and support for censorship.
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1. Introduction

Not being able to voice one’s opinion is something that still happens in today’s society. One of those tools for silencing one’s opinion can be censorship. This tool can be used when wanting to control and influence people and there has been a recorded history of authoritarian regimes using this on its citizens to further their own cause and agenda. The definition of censorship has been discussed in different liberal democratic societies and can be described as the “(…) coercive process imposed by the state(…)” or in Oxford’s dictionary it is referred to as: “(…) the content of what is publicly expressed, exhibited, published, broadcast, or otherwise distributed is regulated or in which the circulation of information is controlled.” In other studies it has a similar description as a way for the state to control the flow of information in media.

In an article written by Qiuqing Tai, the author describes authoritarian regimes that use censorship to block information that is deemed to be unsuitable for the public by the government. The country that this article is focusing on is China and it is one of the most famous cases when it comes to censorship in a modern society of today. TV, newspapers and radio stations are just some of the media outlets that are being monitored in China. But this may not be such a surprise, that the world’s largest current authoritarian country is using censorship to control what information that can be accessed and not be accessed by its citizens. What can be seen as surprising is that some countries that are being defined as democracies are still using the same tactics as authoritarian regimes, take South Korea as an example. Although South Korea is a country that is perceived as a democracy, with its free and fair elections, it still holds on to some authoritarian tools when it comes to its media.

In an article by Eric Fish, he describes the current condition of the South Korean government and also the previous governments, and their effects of controlling their citizens’ rights to freedom of speech. He continues to describe how South Korea has laws that are from a pre-democratic time in South Korea and how they are censoring what can be said, for instance on the internet. These laws are supposed to put restrictions on: “expression in the areas
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2 Oxford Reference, A Dictionary of Media and Communication: Censorship.
4 Tai, p. 185 f.
5 Tai, p. 185 f.
6 Tai, p. 189.
7 Tai, p. 185.
of obscenity, national security threats, threats to public order, and political debate.” Eric Fish talks about NSA/NSL (National Security Act or National Security Law) and how it has majorly affected the internet censorship of South Korea. The NSA was originally founded to prevent communist influences and to protect the state but have instead been abused and used to arrest journalists who, with their pens, have peacefully criticised the government. How can this be and why are people allowing these kinds of tools in their modern government? How can this law/policy exist in this democracy, which is there to silences the public’s right to express their own thoughts and ideas of the world? That is what this paper will examine closer, to see if inhabitants of countries with former authoritarian rule will be more supportive of censorship and will do this by analysing the citizens of South Korea.

In the first part of this paper I will describe theories and previous research that has been used to explain where people get their values and beliefs from and how people develop them during the course of a lifetime. Chapter 2 will describe how some people might acquire their values from their family and friends or from the education system. This paper will focus specifically on the experiences people endure throughout life and how that might affect the way their values are formed and how their beliefs take shape. The question that will be answered is: Do people who have lived through non-democratic rule become more likely to support censorship? In the end of chapter 2, I discuss the influences by non-democratic countries and how they affect its citizens, who live or have lived under an authoritarian regime. There will be one hypothesis with a counter-hypothesis presented after this chapter, they suggest that people who have experienced the hardship of authoritarian regimes either will support censorship or be against it.

The next chapter will give a quick background of the history of South Korea from the end of the second world war to 1988, the time when South Korea had a non-democratic regime to the start of its democratisation. In this chapter I will introduce the previous presidents and describe how they governed during their respective periods. More history about South Korea will be presented, about freedom of speech in South Korea and how it has been affected by each presidency during the time of 1945 to 1988. The National Security Act will be described and some examples will be given to show the effects this law/policy have had on the South Korean people and its media.

Chapter 5 presents the methodology that will be used in this paper. The one being used in this study will be a quantitative method, and to analyse the data I will be using a statistic programme called “R”. With “R”, I will create a linear regression to see if there is a correlation between the support for censorship and the experience people faced during the time of 1945-1988, which I will call “regime socialisation”. The results will be presented in
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chapter 6 in the form of a table which will be explained in chapter 7 and thereafter a conclusion will complete this study in chapter 8.

2. Theory and Previous Research

2.1 Political socialisation

How do we acquire thoughts, values and beliefs surrounding politics? Scholars believe it has to do with political socialisation. It has to do with having a certain political point of view and there are many theories around political socialisation, about when and how it develops in a person's lifetime. So what affects people's values? There is a number of factors that affect people's values, for instance: media, family, education, friends and religion, these are just some of the agents that influence people of what they believe and what kind of values they develop.

Media can be said to be one of the biggest influences when it comes to political socialisation. Media is where most of our information comes from and here the media controls what they report and how they frame the news for the public to interpret it. This in turn can shape values of people who are in position to transfer their values to others, like a parent to a child.

In an article by M. Kent Jennings and Richard G. Niemi, they discuss the parent-child relationship and how parents may affect their children's values and beliefs. Firstly they present a quote from H. Hyman who stated that “Foremost among agencies of socialisation into politics is the family”. In contrast to Hyman, they argue that the development of political socialisation has evolved beyond the traditional parental-child relationship and perhaps education has become the number one influence when it comes to political socialisation. The authors aim was to see the correlation between the parents values and how it might become inherited by their offsprings. They saw that depending on what kind of values the parent had, only some of them would be transmitted to the child. In another article by Judith Rich Harris, the author questions the traditional view that a parent’s beliefs and values can be transmitted to their children. Instead the author focuses on the genetically inherited traits
that children get from their biological parents, and that those is a result from the impact that comes from the parent-child relationship and that leads to the child’s values. She argues that studies has shown differences in values between biological siblings and adoptive ones and how the adoptive ones have not shown similarities with each other but the biological ones have. The author suggests a different theory on the effects on children and how their values develop: group socialisation which means that "learning is highly context-specific, and on evolutionary considerations."18

Education does also have an affect on what beliefs one person develop, Frederick D. Weil19 discusses the relationship between education and political liberalism and that it can be found in a number of Western democracies. Weil quotes from Hyman and Wrights study from 1979, that education has an universal effect which results in positive lasting values.20

As stated above, there are plenty of studies within political socialisation that show an impact on a person which will result in what they believe and which values they priorities, so when can these values be imprinted on a person, when is a person most vulnerable of influences? Within the field of political socialisation there are 4 distinctive perspectives that where set by David Sears and they are called: the persistence perspective, the lifetime openness perspective, the life cycle perspective and the impressionable years perspective.21 This research paper will focus on the impressionable years perspective. The impressionable years perspective, or the formative, the critical years, is when in early adulthood years, a person is most vulnerable of influences of political opinion and beliefs and values. In this stage the values and beliefs are fluid and can be challenged but overtime they will be formed and become not easily changed as the person gets older.22 The most recent explanation for impressionable years perspective is that in the time of late adolescence and early adulthood, which can also be called the formative years, a person is most susceptible for establishing ones cultural and political attitudes.23
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20 Weil, p. 458.
2.2 Previous Research on Values

Other factors that may affect peoples values can be life-experiences, this in turn can affect the way people value different regimes. In a study by G. Pop-Eleches and J.A. Tucker\textsuperscript{24}, they write about Individual experiences, how attitudes and behaviour can develop from living under a communist regime. The effects of having personally experienced living under a non-democratic regime, can later affect peoples values and their political preferences. They describe two types of experiences: “(1) the effect of having lived under communist rule, and (2) the effect of having lived through the collapse of communism.” They describe that people who live under communist rule can develop distrust for political parties. The authors do acknowledge that the length of exposure affects the individual and that it is not the only factor when measuring the individual experience. They do also state that depending on which communist country that the individual have been living under, the effects of the experience will differ. For instance if an individual have had an education before being under communist rule, it might damage the individual-based legacy effect, in other words, it might influence the result of their study.\textsuperscript{25} Pop-Eleches and Tucker tested the correlation between having lived under communist rule and trust to political parties and identified some mechanisms which showed how communism could affect political attitudes and actions. They found that economic and institutional arrangements are components that affect trust in political parties.\textsuperscript{26} In another article also by Pop-Eleches and Tucker,\textsuperscript{27} they discuss the effects of individuals who are exposed to communism and how that affects the support of democracy and capitalism. Here they test two hypothesis to explain this phenomena: 1) the indoctrination hypothesis, that the more an individual becomes exposed to communism, the more opposed that individual will be of democracy and the market. 2) the resistance hypothesis, that the more an individual becomes exposed to communism, the more supportive that individual will be of democracy and the market.\textsuperscript{28} They continue on testing their hypothesis and find that communism had more of an indoctrination effect than a resistance effect. They also conclude that if exposed in an early age, one would’ve have less support for democracy.\textsuperscript{29}

\textsuperscript{24} Grigore Pop-Eleches and Joshua A. Tucker, Communism’s Shadow: Postcommunist Legacies, Values, and Behavior (Comparative Politics, Ph.D. Programs in Political Science, City University of New York, 2011).

\textsuperscript{25} Pop-Eleches et al. 2011, p. 380.

\textsuperscript{26} Pop-Eleches et al. 2011, p. 396 ff.

\textsuperscript{27} Grigore Pop-Eleches and Joshua A. Tucker, Communist socialization and post-communist economic and political attitudes (Electoral Studies, 2014).

\textsuperscript{28} Pop-Eleches et al. 2014, p. 77.

\textsuperscript{29} Pop-Eleches et al. 2014, p.88.
To continue on indoctrination, which is something that has been used by multiple
government to “control the information received by citizens” according to John R. Lott, Jr\textsuperscript{30}.
In the article, \textit{Public Schooling, Indoctrination, and Totalitarianism}, Lott states that education
is an effective way to indoctrinate people with new ideas and views and that it could be used
as a tool for totalitarian governments.\textsuperscript{31} What Lott concludes in his study is that there is a
relationship between the government and different investments in public education.\textsuperscript{32}
Totalitarian governments preferably like to control the flow in television, where they can
influence people and show their own propaganda.\textsuperscript{33} Not only do they want to invest in
television but in all sectors to gain more influence over the people.\textsuperscript{34}

So we know that experiences leads to values, so what can these values tell us? In an article
by Schwartz and Bardi\textsuperscript{35}, they argue two mechanisms for how life circumstances influence
how we priorities values, acclimation and compensation. The first states that people adjust
their values depending on their life circumstances because people priorities their values
depending on how their future might look or what they predict it will look like. The second
operates for a limited set of values. The values here is what could be considered harder to
attain and are often linked to values such as security and material well-being. Schwartz and
Bardi compare this mechanism with Mallow’s so called ‘deficit needs’ and explain it as:
“Deprivation increases the strength of such needs and, correspondingly, of the valued goals to
which they point”. They believe that by experiencing something in the past, may give way to
other values in the future: “people who have endured economic hardship and social upheaval
attribute more importance to the attainment of wealth and the preservation of social order”.\textsuperscript{36}
In their paper, Schwartz and Bardi continue to explain the circumstances of living during
communist rule and how that affects people’s values. They talk about supervision, strict rules,
suppression and risk, which all affect the value-making process. People under these
circumstances were more likely to add more importance to values such as conservatism and
hierarchy, two values that emphasise propriety and the need to keep the order. By prioritising
these values, people would avoid conflicts and would not question superiors, they would keep
a ‘low-profile’ so to speak. Schwartz and Bardi claim that the increasing importance of

\textsuperscript{30} John R. Lott, Jr., \textit{Public Schooling, Indoctrination, and Totalitarianism} (The University of Chicago
\textsuperscript{31} Lott, Jr., p. 129.
\textsuperscript{32} Lott, Jr., p. 154.
\textsuperscript{33} Lott, Jr., p. 131.
\textsuperscript{34} Lott, Jr., p. 154.
\textsuperscript{35} Shalom H. Schwartz and Anat Bardi, \textit{Influences of Adaptation to Communist Rule on Value Priorities
in Eastern Europe} (International Society of Political Psychology, 1997).
\textsuperscript{36} Shalom H. Schwartz and Anat Bardi, \textit{Influences of Adaptation to Communist Rule on Value
security within the conservatism value aspect, is a counter for the living conditions that can be dangerous and unpredictable under a communist regime.37

2.3 Authoritarian Effects

Many previous research has shown the effects of experience and indoctrination, so perhaps people also can be affected by the regime they live in? There are studies that show that the influences of authoritarian government from what many others might believe, do not give support of compliance from its inhabitants. In an article by Bush et al.38, it shows how they did an experimental test in whether or not authoritarian iconography (visual images and symbols etc.39) affect the compliance or the support of the people living under its rule.40 They describe the influence of authoritarian rule and how these governments stay in power. They use number of means to sustain power, for instance: coercion which means that the government try to keep their opponents and the public in check. They also use a term called personal patronage, which is when the government can award special favours in return for submission or loyalty.41 Bush et al. concluded and found that although their subject did get influences by subliminal images of an authoritarian figure, it did not invoke more compliance or support for the regime.42

Another study that talks about the effects of propaganda in an authoritarian regime is by Haifeng Huang43, who discusses the theory that propaganda is the show of strength rather than the distribution of indoctrination. The author describes a relationship between the government and its citizen (the signaling theory of propaganda), that whether or not the government is seen to have a strong/weak social control, its citizens will or will not choose to rebel against the current regime. So in this case the show of strength is the volume of propaganda being produced and it is the citizens who then choose to rebel or not depending on the show of strength.44 Huang test both this theory and the indoctrination theory (context of propaganda can change individuals values and opinions45). She found that propaganda does

37 Schwartz et al., p. 391.
38 Sarah Sunn Bush, Aaron Erlich, Lauren Prather, and Yael Zeira, The Effects of Authoritarian Iconography: An Experimental Test (Comparative Political Studies, 2016).
39 Bush et al., p. 1708.
40 Bush et al., p. 1705 f.
41 Bush et al., p. 1707.
42 Bush et al., p. 1723.
43 Haifeng Huang, Propaganda as Signaling (Comparative Politics, Ph.D. Programs in Political Science, City University of New York, 2015).
44 Huang, p. 422.
45 Huang, p. 421.
not support the indoctrination theory but does support the signaling theory of propaganda and can explain why authoritarian regimes still use propaganda, as a show of strength.\textsuperscript{46}

2.4 Asian Values

Now that we have established that values can be affected by different factors, we might be asking us another question: is there a chance that depending on where you live you can have different values, can there be a core value for different people? Two researchers named Chong-Min Park and Doh Chull Shin have explored the possibility that there is something called “Asian values” and that it might be a hindrance for regimes to be fully democratic in Eastern countries.\textsuperscript{47} In their article they tested these “Asian values” on South Korea and found that “(…)attachment to those values makes it more difficult to reject authoritarian rule than to embrace democracy.” They tests their theory in two regards, 1) the correlation between the individuals in South Korea and their attachment to these values and 2) the correlation between the values and the regime support. They discuss the different views on the western liberal democracy and how scholars in Asia have not seen it to be compatible with the beliefs in the East. Park and Shin state that there has not been many studies to test if this is really the case, if Asian values really do hinder the development of democracy.\textsuperscript{48}

They define Asian values as the same as Confucian values, and they focus on the values that are social and political. From the Confucian/Asian values they emphasise the importance of morality and ideal of self, the individuals within the Confucian culture are not seen as separate but as working together in a group. So the collective good is put before the individual’s interest. The Western and the Confucian values are different when it comes to moral tradition, individual freedom and autonomy versus social obligations and collective good. The thing they do have in common is education and it is here that scholars think links the two different cultures together. That it is education that could influence the Confucian individuals to embrace more democratic values.\textsuperscript{49}

Park and Shin tested their theory by dividing the “Asian values” into two parts, the social part and the political part. In the social part they chose 8 questions from the East Asian Barometer survey and dividing them into pairs: Social Hierarchy (the human relationship hierarchy, younger people being considered inferior to the elderly), Social Harmony (not disturbing the status quo), Group Primacy (giving up on one’s own self-interest for the collective good) and Anti Pluralism (being unanimous so there is social order and unity, restraining individual ideas and expressions). Later they chose 6 questions and divided them into 3 sections to represent the political part of Asian values: The Family-State (the state is a

\textsuperscript{46} Huang, p. 432 f.

\textsuperscript{47} Chong-Min Park and Doh Chull Shin, Do Asia Values Deter Popular Support For Democracy (Asian survey; Berkeley, 2006).

\textsuperscript{48} Park et al., p. 341 f.

\textsuperscript{49} Park et al., p. 342 ff.
natural authority), The Moral State ("the ruler ought to possess wisdom rather than technical expertise or administrative skills"), Anti Adversarial Politics (In order to have balance, the governing power must be united). These two parts were then tested to see how they affected the view on democracy.50

The result showed that the South Korean people are attached to these Asian values and that that has various effects on the regime support and that the relationship between Asian values and regime support are complex. The research do show that “(…)detachment from Asian values tends to orient people away from authoritarian rule, if not toward democracy.”51

3. Hypothesis

From the previous chapter, we can see that people acquire values and belief which affect how decisions are made when it comes to politics. There are different ways to acquire these values, they can be formed by media, by family influences or from experiences. This paper will look on how experiences during non-democratic times might affect people in current democratic countries. Would a person who have endured an authoritarian regime become more inclined to wanting to preserve certain non-democratic values or would it backfire and make a person more inclined to be more supportive of democracy and renounce authoritarian values. This paper have gone through previous studies that show that people can become affected by authoritarian regimes in terms of how people priorities certain values, for instance: wealth and social order. But some studies had also shown that some people don’t necessarily agree and support an authoritarian regime by just having lived through one and that propaganda doesn’t automatically change peoples values. Also propaganda doesn’t have to be about indoctrination but it can be about show of strength to prevent rebellion in a less-democratic environment. Having said this, South Korea is an interesting case when it comes to resilient authoritarian values. South Korea has laws that gives it right to restrict and control what will be published and what should be shown on the internet and in the media. Previous research has predicted that people who live under authoritarian regimes can either be indoctrinated or resilient of its influence and so one hypothesis and a counter-hypothesis will be tested in this paper:

H1: People who have lived under authoritarian rule tend to oppose censorship
H2: People who have lived under authoritarian rule tend to support censorship

4. Background

4.1 The Case

In order to answer the question stated in the introduction (do people who have lived through non-democratic rule become more likely to support censorship?), this paper will be conducting a case study of South Korea as democracy with authoritarian legacies still in play

50 Park et al., p. 345-353.
51 Park et al., p. 356-361.
in modern times. The former theories that have been presented has been from countries with 
non-democratic regimes, so it would be interesting to see how it applies on a country that has 
had a different type of complex authoritarian regime background. To be able to conduct this 
research, I argue below that South Korea is a least-likely case.

South Korea is a country that has once been under authoritarian rule and then became a 
democracy and still have laws that prevents the full use of freedom of speech. The theory I am 
testing is that the inhabitants of countries with former authoritarian rule should be more 
supportive of censorship. Due to the fact that South Korea still have a law/policy that gives 
the government means to censor the public and the fact that it has not been removed, could 
indicate that there are still people that support censorship. Therefore this is an interesting case 
to explore because many people might assume that being supportive of censorship would not 
occur in a democracy. South Korea is a least-likely case because of its history and because of 
the complex ideology the different regimes have presented. In the previous authoritarian 
regimes of South Korea, they did not have such strong ideologies in comparison to Soviet’s 
communist regime would have. The South Korean presidents wanted, like many other 
countries, to have a modernised society and a growing economy which they deemed they 
could only have by controlling the people and working as a collective community. Asian 
values might be a factor and be the underlying ideology for the South Korean presidents and 
its citizens. This can be argued is why South Korea would not be the strongest candidate for 
regime socialisation, in the sense of indoctrination and therefore a least-likely case for regime 
socialisation. The least-likely logic is about testing a theory in an environment that is least 
suitable for the theory to succeed. If however this theory would succeed in an environment 
that has less beneficial circumstances, it may suggest that the theory could be applicable on 
other cases too that have even better circumstances.\(^{52}\) This study may disclose more about 
how authoritarian legacies survive in democratic countries and how it affects people in other 
countries. By testing this on South Korea, which is a democratic country with free and fair 
elections, it might give insight to other democratic countries which have the same 
circumstances as South Korea. In this case, South Korea will be used as a case study to see if 
it is indeed Individual experiences that shape values of people and to test the validity of my 
theory in a least-likely environment.

4.2 South Korean Political History from 1945 - 1988

After being under Japanese rule from 1910 to 1945\(^{53}\), Korea became divided into North 
Korea, which was occupied by Soviet, and South Korea, which was occupied of the U.S. and 
the Korean War broke out in 1950-1953. This was eventually ended with a cease fire with the

\(^{52}\) Jan Teorell and Torsten Svensson, Att Fråga och att svara: samhällsvetenskaplig metod (China, 

\(^{53}\) Asia for educators, Korea as a Colony of Japan, 1910-1945.
support of both the Soviet and the U.S.\textsuperscript{54} During this difficult time, South Korea had Syngman Rhee as president which he continued to be until 1960. He was the first president of South Korea after their release from Japanese Rule and faced many difficulties.\textsuperscript{55} Although he had an education from the US and advocated for democracy, during his reign, his regime held a strong authoritarian hold over South Korea.\textsuperscript{56} He held a firm contempt toward Japan but still enforced its previous installed bureaucracies. President Syngman Rhee ruled with a tough hand and did not tolerate opposition, therefore he cleansed the National Assembly from any threat against him. He had strong support from the police and other military forces which helped him hold onto power for many years. He was not however able to prevent the election which would result in his exile in 1960.\textsuperscript{57} After the Rhee regime, there was a short period of time where Yun Po Son was president but that was cut short by a military coup by General Park Chung Hee.\textsuperscript{58}

As stated earlier President Park took his power by force through a military coup which he staged in 1961.\textsuperscript{59} With Park Chung Hee followed an era of authoritarian regime where he and his followers took the nation, which was fearful of an attack by North Korea, and held it under control by emphasising nationalism and pride of its country. With little to no opposition Park took power and he focused heavily on restoring South Korea and modernising the country’s economy and also emphasising on the importance of education. He wanted to change South Korea and make it more nationalistic, but also a more modern society.\textsuperscript{60} President Park began to tighten his rule over South Korea and declared martial law\textsuperscript{61} and one month later in 1972, President Park installed the Yushin regime, which would give him more influence within the judicial and legislative power and this also meant giving himself a lifelong presidency.\textsuperscript{62} He would also get more control over the labour unions which he

\textsuperscript{54} Jon V. Heuvel and Everette E. Dennis, Trends and developments in the media of South Korea. Elite Media Amidst Mass Culture: A Critical Look at Mass Communication in Korea (Colombia University, 1994), p. 4 ff.

\textsuperscript{55} Britannica Academic, Syngman Rhee.


\textsuperscript{57} Britannica Academic, Syngman Rhee.

\textsuperscript{58} Britannica Academic, Yun Po Son.

\textsuperscript{59} Kim, Byung-Kook, Byung-joon Jun, Pyong-Guk Kim, Ezra F. Vogel, Chang Jae Baik, Jorge I. Domínguez, Yong-Sup Han, Sung Gul Hong, Paul D. Hutchcroft, and Hyug Baeg Im, Park Chung Hee Era : The Transformation of South Korea (Harvard University Press, 2011), p. 575.

\textsuperscript{60} Kim et al., p. 586.

\textsuperscript{61} Britannica Academic, Park Chung-Hee.

\textsuperscript{62} Kim et al. p. 233.
managed by deposing and arresting union leader he disliked.\textsuperscript{63} He went on leading South Korea for around 20 years until his presidency ended in 1979 when he got assassinated.\textsuperscript{64}

After the death of President Park Chung Here, Choi Kyu Hah was his replacement but this presidency was also cut short by military leader Chun Doo Hwan, who took over in 1980.\textsuperscript{65} President Chun Doo Hwan also declared marshal law, as his predecessor, and spent his time trying to immobilise democratic protests. During his time he changed the constitutions so the election process of the president.\textsuperscript{66} President Chun’s main goal was to maintain his military-backed authoritarian regime and he suppressed and restricted many during this time in South Korea.\textsuperscript{67} Although South Korea seemed to flourish economically, there were still tensions hanging in the air which erupted in 1987, when there were demonstrations orchestrated by students. They advocated for better working conditions and wanted political reform.\textsuperscript{68} The democratisation process begun during the later years of President Chun and there were many factors that influenced the process, the political oppositions that grew stronger and the pressure form the US government to change into a democracy.\textsuperscript{69} There was many protests during this time especially around the murder scandal, where the government tried to cover up the death of an student activist, who had died during a police investigation.\textsuperscript{70} This forced President Chun resigned was replaced by Roh Tae Won, who had the wish to democratise South Korean politics.\textsuperscript{71}

Today South Korea is a declared democracy with political pluralism, among them there are the two largest parties that consists of the conservatives and the liberals.\textsuperscript{72} The president is now Moon Jae-in from the Democratic Party, who is a human-right activist lawyer, who created a more softer approach toward North-Korea with the hopes that one day the two countries may unite.\textsuperscript{73}

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{63} Kim et al. p. 593.
\item\textsuperscript{64} Britannica Academic, Park Chung-Hee.
\item\textsuperscript{65} Britannica Academic, Choi Kyu Hah.
\item\textsuperscript{66} Uk Heo and Seongyi Yun, Another View on the Relationship Between Democratization and Intra-Military Division in South Korea (Armed Forces & Society, 2014), p. 386.
\item\textsuperscript{67} Junhan Lee, Political protest and democratization in South Korea (Democratization. The Neglected Democrats: Protracted Transitions from Authoritarianism, 2000), p. 183
\item\textsuperscript{68} Heuvel et al., p. 5
\item\textsuperscript{69} Lee, p. 183
\item\textsuperscript{70} Lee, p. 188
\item\textsuperscript{71} Britannica Academic, Roh Tae Woo.
\item\textsuperscript{72} Freedom House, South Korea.
\item\textsuperscript{73} BBC, South Korea Country Profile.
\end{itemize}
4.3 Freedom of Press

During the years of authoritarian regime in South Korea, the media has been restricted and controlled in 3 major and different ways by the government. During the Rhee-era, Park-era and the Chun-era. When President, Syngman Rhee got elected president he promised freedom of speech to its citizens but failed and instead implemented a policy which made leftist newspapers and periodicals restrict its content and activity. He also felt that the media was a threat to the government and continued diminished their power by shutting down major newspaper stations and also giving out guidelines on what should and could be printed in the media. Failing these restrictions or not having the proper documents meant jail-time or arrests for many journalists.\footnote{Ian Howard, Korean Media Bias and Government Intervention in Media (SAIS US-Korea, 2009), p. 64.}

During President Park the media was also heavily restricted and reduced. When he took over, he also shut down 49 out of 64 dailies and thereby increased the influence of the government. With this type of atmosphere in South Korea, many chose to self-censor themselves in order to protect oneself. He removed the licensing system that had been founded by President Rhee in order to better keep track of the media and after implementing martial law, he banned people from assembling and people were not allowed to politically demonstrate or broadcast demonstrations. These were just some of the restrictions put upon the media by President Park. He furthered his reduction of the influence of the media by implementing more policies to diminish the right of freedom of speech. He claimed that many publications and distributions of media in relations to a youth group called ‘National Federations of Democratic Youths and Students’, were controlled by North Korea and thereby a threat to the South Korean government. President Park did not just restrict the media by formal ways with policies but also by informal ways as in pressuring businesses to withdraw their advertising from the major newspapers so that the newspapers would lose their sponsors.\footnote{Howard, p. 64.}

During the Chun administration, the media continued being oppressed by the government as its predecessor had done for many years. Though Chun also talked about freedom of speech, he limited this so-called “freedom” so that the media could be held responsible if a person deemed that their reputation could have a negative effect of the writings in the press. The media could also be held accountable if they violated social ethics or morals. This made it very hard for the press to express freedom of speech and during this time there were little criticism towards the sitting government. Same as during the Rhee administration, the media had to follow the controlled guidelines that had been authorised by President Chun and there were also many independent broadcasting stations that were being taken over by the state. One policy, the Basic Press Act of 1980, had the power to give the government reason to shut down different media channels. During both president Park and Chun the media endured a lot
of scrutiny and as a result it were only 32 daily newspapers left with hundreds of journalists who either resigned or were in jail or had to be forced out of their jobs.\(^\text{76}\)

### 4.4 National Security Act

Since 1948 the National Security Act has been active and used by the South Korean government. The purpose of this law is to counter any threats against the security of South Korea.\(^\text{77}\) Specifically to find communist sympathisers and “anti-state” activities, that could be seen as a threat to South Korea’s security.\(^\text{78}\)

Amnesty International have reported an increase of 95.6% over the years of 2008 to 2011 of the number of people who have been interrogated in regards to the NSA. Amnesty continues in their article to tell about the abuse of power: ‘The NSL is being used as a smoke screen to hound critics of the government, with serious consequences for this targeted’. NSA which also is referred to as NSL (National Security Law), has been critiqued by the UN since 1992 and the most contested clause have been article 7.\(^\text{79}\)

> “Any person who praises, incites or propagates the activities of an antigovernment organization, a member thereof or of the person who has received an order from it, or who acts in concert with it, or propagates or instigates a rebellion against the State, with the knowledge of the fact that it may endanger the existence and security of the State or democratic fundamental order, shall be punished by imprisonment for not more than seven years.”\(^\text{80}\)

Article 7 has been challenged during the 1990 and has been changed but only slightly, which has been criticised by the public. Many people have been prosecuted because of this law and people have claimed it to be an abuse of power from the government. Multiple journalists, publishers, academics, have been arrested, even ordinary citizens who have made comments under the influence of alcohol, have been arrested for breaking the NSA.\(^\text{81}\)

There have been cases of people getting arrested for breaking the NSA, that have been getting international attention. In an article by the New York Times, they write about 24 years old photographer, Park Jung-geun, who was arrested but later released in January 2012, for breaching the NSA. According to the allegation, Mr Park had resent “100 posts from an official North Korean Twitter account”. These posts contained phrases for North Korea and
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\(^{80}\) Statues of the republic of Korea, National Security Act: article 7.

\(^{81}\) Krav, p. 633.
statements of shipping “uranium and plutonium” to North Korea. Mr. Park denied these allegations and said that these posts where to ridicule the North Korean government. The individuals who gets detained by the government for violating the NSA, are being ill-treated, Mr Park confirmed that after the whole debacle, that he needed to get help for the physical and mental exhaustion endured during the arrest. Another example of where the NSA have abused its power is where a bookseller named Kim Myeong-soo was sentenced to prison in February, 2012, for also breaching the NSA “(...)by owning and selling the ‘wrong’ book.” These books held information on North Korea, marxism and some had the word ‘revolution’ in the title. Although these books were in the National Assembly library, the court deemed Mr. Kim’s possession and intent to sell, a threat to the security of State.

5. Methodology and Data

5.1 Quantitative Methodology
In order to answer the question stated in this paper, this study will, with the help of a quantitative method, analyse the data taken from East Asian Barometer (EAB). What usually characterise quantitative methods are the usage of statistics and surveys to determine peoples generalised values. It uses "hard data", in this case the data taken from EAB. This paper will use bivariate and multivariate linear regression to be able to find the correlation between the dependent variable and the independent variable. These linear regression analysis will give me the tools to see if there is a correlation between my variables and to be able to isolate and control for any external variables to see if my theory is valid. The analysis will be done with a statistic programme called “R”, that will produce the linear regressions to see if the connection between the two variables are statistically relevant. The study will use cross-sectional data taken from EAB. The data is from wave 3 from 2011, and it is from the South Korean population. The number of observations in the data are 995. In the multivariate linear regression analysis, the following variables will be tested as control variables to isolate the correlation between the independent and the dependent variables. The control variable are: gender, education, income and Asian values.

5.2 East Asian Barometer
The data that is being used is from the East Asian Barometer, which is an organization funded by the Centre for East Asia Democratic Studies and they have conducted a series of value surveys. They have been a major contributor to the East Asia democratisation research and have made many important discoveries within the field of political science. It is not only
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the first cross national survey that is mainly focused on democratisations in East Asia, it is also the first lead by East-Asian scholars. Their objective is to:

• “To generate a region-wide base of scientifically reliable and comparable data.”
• “To strengthen intellectual and institutional capacity for research on democracy.”
• “To disseminate survey results to academics and policy circles.”

The survey provided by EAB is found to be suitable because of its extensive empirical research data in the area for which this study needs.

5.3 The Dependent and Independent Variable

The support for censorship is operationalised into question 76, which is the dependent variable. All the variables are taken from the EAB’s 3 wave survey and with South Korean respondents. The respondents got to chose which of the two statements they agreed with more:

• Statement 1. The media should have the right to publish news and ideas without government control.
• Statement 2. The government should have the right to prevent the media from publishing things that might be politically destabilising.

This question is recoded in “R” into NA, 0 and 1 for easier interpretation. NA stands for the non-answers of the question: ’Can’t choose’, ‘Decline to answer’ and ‘Do not understand the question’. 0 is for statement 1, against censorship and 1 is for statement 2, the support for censorship. Because this is a dummy variable, it is good to know that, when aggregated, it measures the probability of being supportive of censorship. So when analysing the dependent variable in the linear regression the increase that occurs in the x (independent) variable, regime socialisation, will affect the probability of the y (dependant) variable, support for censorship. This question is the operationalisation of the term censorship.

The independent variable is of variable SE3, the respondents age, which is categorised and coded into 3 part. The year of birth has been calculated so it is clear which birth years belong outside, within or partially within the age span of 17-25, which is the age-span that correlates with the political socialisation theory; impressionable years:
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• 0 - People who have not had their impressionable years during the authoritarian period of South Korea

• 1 - People who have partially had their impressionable years during the authoritarian period of South Korea.

• 2 - People who have had their full impressionable years during the authoritarian period of South Korea

5.4 The Control Variables

The following are the control variables of this study and they are here to ensure that the correlation between the independent variable and the dependent variable is not spurious and to estimate the correlation independent of these other variables. These variables have been recoded to make it easier for interpretation. I have chosen these control variables with the help of Park et al.\(^\text{91}\) where they have used similar control variables in their research on democracy and authoritarian regime. The first is Gender (SE2) and it has been coded into 1, female and 2, male. The second one is Education (SE5) has been recoded to 0 (No formal education), 1 (Incomplete primary/elementary), 2 (Complete primary/elementary), 3 (Incomplete secondary/high school and Incomplete secondary/high school: technical/vocational type), 4 (Complete secondary/high school and Complete secondary/high school: technical/vocational type), 5 (Some university education), 6 (University education completed) and 7 (Post-graduate degree). The third one is Income (SE13) has been coded to NA (Decline to answer), 1 (Lowest level), 2 (Low level), 3 (Middle level), 4 (High level), 5 (Highest level).\(^\text{92}\)

The last control variable is Asian values and they are also taken from the article: ”Do AsiaValues Deter Popular Support For Democracy”, to see if these so called “Asian Values” have an effect on the political preference in South Korea. The study by Chong-Min Park and Doh Chull Shin has used EAB’s survey from wave 1 and used 15 questions as a definition for what Asian values are. They divided these 14 questions into two subgroups: Social and political values. In Social values they had 8 questions and they were put into pairs of two: Social Hierarchy, Social Harmony, Group Primacy and Anti Pluralism. The political values had 6 questions that also were put into pairs of two: The Family-State, The Moral State and Anti Adversarial politics. Of these 14 questions this paper will only choose 1 from each subcategory, in total 7, due to the different surveys and for simplicity. The questions are statements which the respondents got to choose on how much they agreed or did not agree with on a scale of 1 to 9. In the analysis the questions have been divided into the groups of the category they originally belonged to in the article by Park et al.\(^\text{93}\)
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In all the questions the respondents got to choose between the following answers: strongly agree, somewhat agree, somewhat disagree, strongly disagree, do not understand the question, can’t choose and decline to answer. These answers have been recoded for more simplicity in interpreting the results. The three last alternatives, do not understand the question, can’t choose and decline to answer, have been recoded to NA. The rest follows the given order 1-4, where 1 is strongly agree and 4 is strongly disagree. The first part of the statements belongs to the Social values: the statement of the ‘Social Hierarchy’ category is: “Even if parents’ demands are unreasonable, children still should do what they ask.” (Q55). The next statement is from the ‘Social Harmony’ category: “A person should not insist on his own opinion if his co-workers disagree with him.”(Q60). The third statement is from the ‘Group Primacy’ category: “For the sake of the family, the individual should put his personal interests second.”(Q55). And the last statement is from the ‘Anti Pluralism’ category: “If people have too many different ways of thinking, society will be chaotic.”(Q147).94

The second part of the statements belongs to the Political values: the statement of the ‘Family-State’ category is: “Government leaders are like the head of a family; we should all follow their decisions.”(Q141), the statement from the ‘Moral State’ category: “If we have political leaders who are morally upright, we can let them decide everything.”(Q146) and the last statement from the ‘Anti adversarial politics’ category: “When judges decide important cases, they should accept the view of the executive branch.”(Q144).95

5.5 Validity and Reliability
The theoretical definition of censorship, the dependent variable, is as explain in the introduction: “(...)the content of what is publicly expressed, exhibited, published, broadcast, or otherwise distributed is regulated or in which the circulation of information is controlled.”.96 The validity measure the closeness of the theoretical definition to the operationalisation.97 In this case the operationalisation is the question 76 with its two statements in the EAB survey from wave 3 and this would give a picture of the support for censorship in South Korea. This reflects the thought process of having ones media outlet being control or not by the government, which in this case is what this study want to measure.

The reliability for the dependant variable would, in this case, be rather problematic because it has to to with values. If one wanted to do the collection process all over again, one might not get the same answers because values might change and it might be difficult to find the same people that did the original test. Reliability is testing if the same outcome will occur if
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the data collection would be done again, in this case the collection process of EAB.\textsuperscript{98} Also because this study only have one question that defines censorship, the reliability lowers. The reliability would become better if I would have had more questions that defined censorship but due to the time limit of this essay, I decided to only have one. Also, the fact that I have nearly 1000 observations also increases my reliability because of the larger number.

The independent variable, regime socialisation, would have a rather high reliability because it is measured in age and therefore rather easy to replicate because age would not change. However the validity could be a problem because I have chosen age as my operationalisation for the degree of regime socialisation. Some may experience more regime socialisation than other people and that I have not measures. Because age does not measure how much experience a person have endured by living under a non-democratic regime but rather just the time spent in it, this could pose a problem between the theoretical definition and the operationalisation.

\textsuperscript{98} Teorell et al., p. 59.
6. Analysis
6.1 Empirical Analysis

Table 1. Regression-analysis. Dependent variable: Support for Censorship
t-value is in the parenthesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regime socialisation</td>
<td>0.03348</td>
<td>0.020000</td>
<td>0.031421</td>
<td>0.021522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.222)*</td>
<td>(1,158)</td>
<td>(1.977) *</td>
<td>(1,213)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-0.005027</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.006495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-1,178)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0,224)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-0.022520</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.023788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.882)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1,908)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>0.013486</td>
<td>0.012913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1,153)</td>
<td>(1,094)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Hierarchy</td>
<td>-0.026814</td>
<td>-0.020283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.433)</td>
<td>(-1,044)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Harmony</td>
<td>-0.016103</td>
<td>-0.011621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0.791)</td>
<td>(-0.551)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Primacy</td>
<td>0.045914</td>
<td>0.048826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2,130)*</td>
<td>(2,177)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti Pluralism</td>
<td>-0.033030</td>
<td>-0.037177</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-1,800)</td>
<td>(-1,941)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Family-State</td>
<td>0.008854</td>
<td>0.013094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0,482)</td>
<td>(0,683)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Moral State</td>
<td>-0.003760</td>
<td>0.003060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-0,215)</td>
<td>(0,168)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti Adversarial Politics</td>
<td>-0.076392</td>
<td>-0.068771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-4,201)***</td>
<td>(-3,647)***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.24820</td>
<td>0.337049</td>
<td>0.567847</td>
<td>0.571421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R²</td>
<td>0.003473</td>
<td>0.003694</td>
<td>0.03147</td>
<td>0.02865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***=p<0.001 **p<0.01 *p<0.05 .=p<0.1
7. Results and Discussion

In the bivariate linear regression, we can see that the b-coefficient in model 1 is 0.03348 and that it is a positive correlation between experience and support for censorship is statistically significant at the 95% confidence level. As we can see, an increase of 1 on the regime socialisation (x) scale leads to an increased probability of supporting censorship (y). This means that going from 0—people who have not endured an authoritarian regime during their impressionable age, to 1—people who have partially had their impressionable age during an authoritarian regime, will increase the probability of supporting censorship by 3.3%. This result support my first hypothesis about people who have lived through a non-democratic regime would support censorship. Because the dependent variable is dichotomous, the results shows the probability of a person who supports censorship.

However, as we can see in the multivariate linear regression, the variable for regime socialisation decreases in model 2 and 4. In model 2 we see no significant correlation between the independent variable and the dependent variable. But here we can see that the dependant variable, regime socialisation has drastically changed from model 1 where the coefficient were 0.03348 to 0.02000 in model 2, when we controlled for the variables: gender, education and income. Therefore we can suspect that these control variables have an effect on the x and y variables. We also see that education, with a negative b-coefficient of 0.0225, do have statistical significance on a 90% confidence level which could indicate that it is a mediator between regime socialisation and support for censorship. In model 2, there could also be a matter of the correlation being spurious or it could be because there is an indirect effect from the control variables.

In model 3, b-coefficient is 0.031421 which shows that the dependant variable remains much the same in comparison to from model 1. This can tell us that but to the fact that the change is so small, the controls variables: Asian values are independent from the correlation between the x and y variable. So when controlling for the variables: Asian values we find that they do not affect the correlation between regime socialisation and support for censorship substantially and there fore we can see that Asian values that is being measured, have a direct effect on the y -variable: the support for censorship.

Back to the relationship between the control variables: gender, education and income and how they correlates to our independent and dependant variables. Like I mentioned earlier and according to Teorell and Svensson, this relationship can be explained by either it being spurious or there being an indirect effect or because of an underlying variable of the control variables. Deciding which one of these is the explanation to this study is a rather difficult task, this would require further research into the matter to find the casual mechanism. In model 4, we see how the correlation between the independent and dependent variable have decreased after I took all the control variable in consideration. In comparison to model 1 and
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3, model 4 show that the relationship between the two x- and y-variable is no longer statistically significant and the positive b-coefficient estimate, 0.021522, is closer to the one in model 2. This shows the relationship between regime socialisation and support for censorship has been confounded by gender, education and income and that Asian values do affect support for censorship but that it is independent from regime socialisation. Although here we do see that education gains statistical significance on a 90% confidence level and that would be interesting to do further research on to see how education affect regime socialisation. Here it seems that 1 increase on the education scale means a decreased probability of 2.4%, of people supporting censorship.

One could argue that gender and income are underlying variables because of the time order. Being of female or male sex does come before the influence of authoritarian regimes and when considering the age span within the impressionable years theory a person would have some kind of income in that household either from a job or by the support of a parent. All these can be said to be have happened before the time a person is being influenced by the authoritarian government and therefore could be an underlying variable. Education on the other hand can be seen as a mediator, because it had a significance on a 90% confidence level it tells us that the higher the level of education you get the less is the probability that you will be for supporting censorship. This could act like a mediator between regime socialisation and support for censorship. Education would probability occur during the impressionable years and that would have an effect on a person’s ability to receive the influence from a non-democratic regime. According to the results from model 2 and 4, we can see that the more education you get the less you would support censorship. These are some arguments for the results given in table 1, although this study can not show the proper chronicle order of these event, for that I would have to do further research on the matter.

8. Conclusion
The question that I asked in the beginning of the paper was: Do people who have lived through non-democratic rule become more likely to support censorship? In the bivariate regression analysis the results do support my first hypothesis, but when testing the hypothesis with the control variables it loses its statistical significance. This can be because the relationship between regime socialisation is spurious or it is because there is an indirect effect or being an underlying variable between the support for censorship and regime socialisation and the control variables: gender, education and income. By isolating the independent and the dependant variable with the control variables, I was able to conduct that the effect (x) was not the only reason for the cause (y). Asian values show that they have an independent effect on support for censorship, which can be seen in table 3. The results show that the least-likely logic did not prevail in this case, the population of South Korea did not show more support for censorship if they had spent their impressionable years in an authorial regime when taking the control variables into account and this could then not be generalised to other countries.
Because of the time and size of this paper, I had to limit myself to testing one dependant variable. I do believe I could have improved my reliability by using more than one question when testing for regime socialisation, this would have given me more data to work with and to get a better measurement of regime socialisation. I also could have tested the control variables separately to see if there any of the control variables, gender, education and income would have an individual effect on regime socialisation when shown in model 4, education seem to have an significance on a 90% confidence level. This could have shown a different result if tested alone with regime socialisation and support for censorship.

Having found that my theory is not supported by empirical data, does make me wonder if the previous research, that has been done within this field, is generalisable to Asian countries. The situation in South Korea might be deemed a complex circumstance that can not be explained with research from mostly European and Western areas. Here, Asian values might play a bigger role when doing research on Asian countries, that Western ideas and theories might be lacking when talking about the Eastern population due to the fact that there are two separate culture and that might result in the population having a different way of relating to words and different views on life. It would have been interesting to continue to see how Asian values have affected other Asian countries, if they experience the same occurrence in their democratisation process.
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