



Culture and Empathy

International Journal of
Sociology, Psychology, and Cultural Studies

ISSN: 2635-6619 (Online) Journal homepage: <https://cultureempathy.org/>

Internal Diaspora: Kang Hang’s Japan Experience and Intellectual Isolation in Joseon.

Ingyu Oh, Kansai Gaidai University

To cite this article: Ingyu Oh. 2019. “Internal Diaspora: Kang Hang’s Japan Experience and Intellectual Isolation in Joseon. *Culture and Empathy* 2(1): 18-31. DOI: 10.32860/26356619/2019/2.1.0003.

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.32860/26356619/2019/2.1.0003>.



Published online: 25 Mar 2019.



[Submit your article to this journal](#) 

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at

<https://cultureempathy.org/terms-and-conditions>

Internal Diaspora: Kang Hang's Japan Experience and Intellectual Isolation in Joseon

Ingyu Oh, Kansai Gaidai University

Abstract

This paper examines the life of Kang Hang (1567–1618), a wartime prisoner who was taken to Japan during the second invasion of the Hideyoshi army in Korea. Contrary to popular belief, Kang was a Confucian hero who taught the Japanese neo-Confucianism and escaped to his homeland to prove his patriotism, I find that Kang had been surrounded by transnational diasporic groups of Koreans, Chinese, Westerners, and cosmopolitan Japanese. While neglecting Korean diasporic networks in Japan, especially a large number of Korean women who had been brought to Japan either as slaves or wives of noble Japanese men, Kang socialized with Japanese intellectuals, including Fujiwara Seika and Akamatsu Hiromitsu in order to gain financial and political support for his return to his imaginary homeland, where he thought he would be welcomed by his friends and king. Yet, after his return to Korea, he faced severe discrimination from his fellow Korean intellectuals who were suspicious of his life spent in the enemy country.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 5 January 2019
Revised 20 February 2019
Accepted 05 March 2019

KEYWORDS

Joseon, Hideyoshi, Kang Hang, Intellectual diaspora, Post-diaspora networks, *Ganyangrok*

The historical and the ethnographic impulse of *The Polish Peasant*-and most glaringly the place of personal narratives-has largely sunk with only a few traces – John Lie (1995)

Introduction

Contrary to dominant historical reports and their nationalistic analyses (see *inter alia*; Bak 1996; Yi 1999; Yu 2007; Kim 2009), Korean migrants to Japan during the 16th century maintained post-diaspora networks with their motherland, Joseon, despite political, economic, and technological barriers to traffic and communication. Such migrants were not stereotypically loyal Korean subjects who detested Japan and sought to return to Korea. Rather, their situation was much similar to that of the Korean Japanese today, who still maintain post-diaspora networks with

North Korea, despite the ongoing domestic and international sanctions on those who communicate with this totalitarian regime. Korean prisoners of war from Hideyoshi's 16th century invasion to Joseon (1592-1598) did not lose their ties with their homeland. Indeed, historical evidence suggests that these Korean captives in Japan maintained informal relations with their friends and relatives left in Korea. Formal channels of envoys and tourists to Japan and Korea maintained this bridge between the Koreans and their families and friends, while the strategically placed island of Tsushima always willingly (or unwillingly) assumed the role of a formal "go between," delivering news from each country.

The existence of this post-diaspora network suggests that most Korean artisans who had decided to remain in Japan, made their choice together with information garnered from informal communication with their motherland (such as transnational letters, ideas, and words of mouth). These informed and intentional decisions to stay in Japan (rather than returning through various channels such as escape, prisoner exchange, or release) were therefore based on the hope of at least retaining the means and right to communicate with Korea. This 16th century Korean diaspora was also diverse in terms of its class, gender, and knowledge/skill bases: highly skilled pottery artisans often intentionally decided to remain in Japan, while some intellectuals were anxious to return to Korea. Among these intellectuals who decided to return was Korean prisoner Kang Hang (1567–1618). Instead of becoming a Japanese aristocrat, Kang chose to be eventually released by authorities and safely returned to Korea after two and half years of asylum as a war prisoner in Japan.

Kang's mindset was very similar to other intellectual yangban people; he falsely believed that his Confucian nation would welcome him back if he tried to escape and return to Korea. While his memoirs indicate that Kang knew he should have killed himself rather than being captured alive in an enemy nation, he also strongly believed that he would be welcomed back by Korea and preferred such a path to that of remaining in Japan as a Confucian scholar in the *bushi* class. However, upon his return to Korea, he quickly noticed that the entire yangban class along with the king himself were not very interested in learning about his life in Japan or his knowledge about Japan (except for a couple of incidents when he was called upon to share his experiences overseas). Dismayed by this bad treatment, Kang refused to continue his public appointment as a schoolteacher in Daegu. Unlike some of the other returnees from Japan, Kang then maintained a strong political network with *Seoin* (or the Western Clique, headed by Seong Hon) and therefore, given this strong background, the Joseon court did not completely silence him despite his active and prolific writings and teachings. Due to the Western Clique's concerted efforts, Kang was finally restored to the central bureaucratic status and appointed to the position of *chameui* (Grade Three official in the central court) in 1668, fifty years after his death.

In this paper I present Kang's intellectual diaspora as the first of its kind in Korea. It occurred during the 16th century Korean transition from a hegemonic Chinese Confucian regional order to a form of East Asian transnational modernity spread amongst diverse powers from

Manchuria, Japan, and the West. Kang's intellectual diaspora represents the beginning of the nationalistic diaspora in East Asia, especially for those who settled (or failed to settle) in Japan as an aftermath of war or colonization. To distinguish Kang's intellectual diaspora from the mainstream nationalistic depictions of him, I outline the diverse existences of Korean migrants in Japan after the war. Each classified group established their own unique identity in Japan and this ultimately determined whether they decided to return to Korea or remain in their new home. As a means to demonstrate the "transnational" nature of Kang's life in Japan I then focus on Kang's "global everyday," a close analysis of which gives a very different impression from the dominant nationalistic portrayal of his life as a prisoner. I shed light on Kang's new status as an intellectual diasporic traveler who socialized with different groups of intellectuals and his transition from a Joseon subject to a transnational actor. Finally, I analyze how Kang's life back in his motherland can be characterized as part of an internal intellectual diaspora and an individual who had finally lost his transnational ties with associates in Japan.

Intellectual Diaspora

Two decades ago, Lie (1995) lamented the lack of ethnographic and historical studies of migration in academia. American sociology was too concerned with providing quantitative results from testable hypotheses. There was very little qualitative reasoning to connect individual issues to wider social problems and individual affairs with historical narratives. Two decades later, migration studies have been saturated by economic analysis, deploying vague slogans such as "brain drain," "brain gain," "brain circulation," "innovative migration," "intellectual property rights and migration," and "intellectual diaspora" (see *inter alia*; Khoshkish 1966; Chang 1992; Kilminster & Varcoe 1996; Lucero-Prisno 2005; Mondal & Gupta 2008; McAusland & Khun 2011; Naghavi & Strozzi 2011; Kolesnikova et al., 2014). While such economists were debating the pros and cons of "intellectual diaspora" in tangible economic terms, others tried to connect sociology with economics. Their new focus was on "transnational networks" and international migration. Such theorists claimed that an intellectual diaspora assists their nations of origin because these "intellectual nomads" maintain strong transnational networks with others inside their motherlands (see *inter alia*; Bhagwati 1979; Meyer & Brown 1999; Brown 2002; Meyer & Wattiaux 2006; Grossman 2010).

These economic studies differ from earlier historical studies of intellectual migration. In studying the movement of European Jews and German scientists to America, exemplified in the works of Fleming and Bailyn (1968) and Fermi (1968), earlier historical studies of intellectual migration emphasized the process of acculturation, exploring how European Jewish intellectuals influenced American culture, especially in academia (Camurri, 2014). As the wife of an Italian physicist and Nobel Laureate, Laura Fermi's work, published in 1968, examined the problematic generalized perception of immigrants held by American scholars, including the highly suspect

1947 report on intellectual exiles written by Davie (1947). In a similar vein, Fleming and Bailyn (1968) tried to emphasize different patterns of intellectual migration from Germany, France, Austria, and Italy, focusing upon notions of acculturation.

Recent studies of intellectual migration in anthropology, sociology, and literature have not yet fully benefitted from the legacy of ethnographic emphases on historically specific diasporic experiences (see *inter alia*; Hielbut 1983; Coser 1984; Jay 1985; Conway 2001; Snowman 2002; Kettler & Lauer 2005; Rose 2005; Stephan 2005; Frank 2009). Despite their new methodological and theoretical foci, these studies fall into the trap of an excessive generalization of the concept of “exile” without paying careful attention to historically specific waves of intellectual migration. In such analysis the concept of “exile” has become a mere metaphor for postmodern life and/or transnational global reality, where all forms of exiles throughout history inflict a universal level of trouble and pain upon the exiled (Camurri 2014).

Between economic quantification and sociological generalizations, this study seeks to reclaim the distinctive relationship between countries of origins and countries of destinations in the study of intellectual diaspora. Just as “the North” as a destination cannot be generalized for all immigrants, so “the South” cannot be overly simplified for all emigrants. The experience of German Jewish scientists in 1940s America is very different from that of Chinese scientists in 2010s America. The knowledge or skills demanded by different host countries in different historical epochs is also diverse. What the U.S. required from scientific émigrés from Europe in the 1940s was not the same as that required from Korean émigrés by Japan in the 1590s. A transnational intellectual migrant also continuously develops, adapts, and tests his/her transnational identities. This takes the form of scientific discoveries, academic writings, teachings, and artistic creativities in various historical times and places. Confucian scholars armed with Confucian nationalism from Korea in the 16th century, for example, occupied a very different transnational space to that of Jewish scientists who survived the holocaust and were rescued during the Second World War. Yet despite these examples and case studies the ways in which different host nations and home nations treat transnational intellectual nomads have not been fully explored.

Finally, the paper will analyze the cause of such diverse patterns of intellectual diaspora in different historical phases and countries. This will address why some migrants decide to stay in a host nation, leave for another host nation, or permanently return to their home countries. While the consequence of intellectual diaspora can be both tragic and painful, the transnational experience can also be very beneficial and so occurs differently from one group of migrants to another. The experience of transnational diaspora is a process of acquiring new knowledge while overcoming difficulties with local acculturation and retaining home country values. We need to know how and when local diasporic networks can support individual and group happiness during one’s diaspora, whether permanent or short term.

A Highly Skilled Intellectual Diaspora in the 16th Century Japan

In order to answer some of the questions outlined in the preceding section, a new diaspora study first and foremost must reconstruct and outline diasporic communities that existed in history. The Korean diasporic community in 16th century Japan was not an isolated ethnic enclave. Just as American universities offered positions to European intellectual émigrés, this Korean community served the Japanese public as an institution of artistic and intellectual activities, producing goods for both transnationals and local Japanese. This highly skilled community even fundamentally changed the Japanese pottery industry and later, with the importation of Korean and Chinese Confucianism, also changed the Japanese elites' view of academia and scholarly work. These Korean and other transnational communities (including Chinese war captives and various other intellectual migrants) therefore became centers of academia and industrial innovation in Japan. Such Korean and Chinese transnational communities also served as centers for communication liaisons between Japan and their homeland. Such communications included recruiting Korean and Chinese workers who would migrate into Japan as either seasonal or permanent migrant workers. These communities maintained nationalistic rituals including Confucian style ancestor worship, shamanistic rites, and, most importantly perhaps, their traditional clothes, food, and language.

Those forcibly brought to Japan by Hideyoshi's army, especially by the *daimyōs* from Kyūshū, Chūgoku, and Shikoku, were classified into scholars and religious thinkers (intellectuals), artists and craftsmen, ordinary people (*chōnin*), and slaves (including prostitutes and other female captives who fell into concubinary). Slaves made up the majority, as the Japanese army and slave traders had systemically abducted people during the second invasion by Hideyoshi's army. The slave traders assembled Korean slaves in Nagasaki where they were often re-sold to China, Indochina, and even to Europe (Soeda 2006; No 2009). Francesco Carletti, an Italian merchant who visited Nagasaki in 1597 wrote:

The country of Korea is said to be divided into nine provinces, the names of which Cioseien, which is the capital province and gives it's name to the city in which the King resides, Quienqui, Conguan, Honliay, Cioala, Hienfion, Tioneion, Hanquien, Pianchien. From these provinces, but particularly from those nearest to the coast, had been brought as slaves a large number of men and women of all ages, among them some quite pretty children. These were all being sold indifferently at a very cheap price, and I bought as many as five for a little more than twelve scudi (No, 2009: 190).

Although it is well known that many Korean women who were brought to Japan became Catholics, it is not commonly known that some of the male slaves turned into transnational merchants (No, 2009). European missionaries in Nagasaki tried hard to raise funds to purchase

Korean slaves, freeing them after their conversion to Catholicism. One estimate is that Westerners freed more than 3,000 Korean slaves in Nagasaki alone (No, 2009: 202). Jo Wanbyeok was one of the five slaves purchased by Carletti. Wanbyeok was later freed by him and became a merchant under the supervision of a Kyoto merchant, Suminokura. Together they travelled Vietnam at least three times. Wanbyeok later returned to Korea and wrote a book, *Namyang Gyeonmunrok* [Travel Records of the Southern Seas], which heavily influenced other Korean intellectuals including Yi Sugwang, An Jeongbok, and Jeong Sasin (No, 2009: 199-200).

Although Nagasaki provided transnational opportunities for many Korean captives, other settlements and communities such as those in Kagoshima Prefecture remained very much an ethnic enclave isolated from local Japanese society. Although linguistically and culturally adjusted in Japan, these Korean pottery artisans had to wear traditional Korean hairstyle, clothes, and marry only among themselves:

The settlers wore [Korean] hairpins and had long and thin faces with tall heights. They didn't look lowly at all. From old days, they were banned from marrying Japanese partners, even though they fell in love. They were not allowed to make a samurai style hair. After five to six generations, the situation hasn't changed a lot (No, 2007: 336).

Furthermore, as a means to distinguish these individuals and communities from the Japanese, the local *daimyō* banned these Koreans from adopting Japanese names, fearing that their appearance, culture, and language resembled those of the Japanese too much. The colonial policy of forcing Japanese names onto Koreans during the 1940s therefore is a stark contrast to that of the earlier Edo policy of differentiation rather than assimilation (No, 2007; Hattori, 2008). This preservationist approach towards the Korean community by the *daimyō* derived partially from their need to preserve a group of Korean translators and interpreters for their ongoing communication with Korea and Koreans. For example, Tsushima *hanshū* always visited the Korean pottery community in Naeshirogawa, Kagoshima Prefecture. During his *sankin kōtai* visit to Edo, he held a big party with prizes given to both male and female residents of the Korean pottery community. The local *daimyo* also strongly encouraged villagers to learn and maintain the Korean language. Satō Seiyū, for example, recorded in 1780 that:

From old days, they have learned their language. Although I cannot understand their pronunciations, their language sounds similar to old Japanese. A long time ago, when Koreans came to Satsuma after a shipwreck, these villagers went out there to translate. The drifters were largely surprised, saying, “we finally arrived here after storms and waves, and we meet our own people who wear our clothes and speak the same language. We didn't know there was another Korea in the world. Japan is really a big country.” From this incident, they were given the mission of learning Korean and providing translation and interpretation services (No, 2007: 336-337).

Since these Korean villagers were employed as interpreters and brokers for illegal trading between Korea and Satsuma, this “ethnic enclave” cannot have been completely isolated from the rest of the world (Hattori, 2008). Indeed, Korean citizens were allowed to communicate with Koreans and Korea for *daimyō*’s needs and their own needs (which included recruiting marriage partners and pottery workers from Korea). This is because Naeshirogawa was the largest institutional settlement for Korean pottery artisans. Their innovations revolutionized the Japanese pottery industry, including starting the first porcelain production in Japan which combined Korean artisanship with advanced Chinese glazes and so contributed towards improving both Chinese and Korean porcelains (Nishimura 2011). However, neither China nor Korea could motivate such artisans better than Japan. Many of the Korean pottery workers therefore decided to remain in Japan, despite avenues opened allowing them to return to Korea. Furthermore, in the 18th and 19th centuries, the *bakufu* and *daimyō* governments continued to strengthen the porcelain industry in Naeshirogawa by sending more Korean artisans to Japan, some from other areas of Japan and others who most likely came from Korea (Watanabe 2007: 21).

While slaves and artisans could enjoy a transnational existence in Nagasaki and Naeshirogawa, most intellectuals and religious thinkers who remained in Japan during the Edo period were included in the *bushi* or samurai class. The majority of the Korean descendants in the *bushi* class were scholars, artists, and highly skilled craftsmen. Only a small minority were recruited into the military as commissioned officers and generals. Among the Korean descendants who entered the Japanese samurai class, the Nogi family is the most famous. The family originated from a captive from Joseon who became a naturalized Japanese in the Chōfuhan (present day Yamaguchi Prefecture). This individual maintained a close intellectual tie with Kang Hang, Akamatsu Hiromichi, and Fujiwara Seika (Soeda 2006). The Nogi family also served as a means of communication for Joseon officials with help from the Tsushima *hanshū* (*daimyō*), who later sent one of his sons to the Nogi family to become their son-in-law (Soeda 2006).

Kang also spent time with Korean scholars in Ehime who were, like him, also forcibly brought to Japan at around the same time. Kang, Noin, and Yang Mongrin also spent time in asylum in Shikoku. Whereas Kang eventually returned to Korea with help from his Japanese friends, Noin escaped to Korea via China (No 2012). In addition to these three scholars, Gim Seokbok, Seo Guk, and a number of others whose names are not known also lived in Ehime. For reasons unknown, some of these scholars (including Kang) could visit Kyoto and meet Korean emissaries, who occasionally visited Japan to take Korean prisoners back home. According to remaining writings, Korean scholars received far better treatment than ordinary people or slaves:

When we [Kang’s family] were imprisoned in the castle of Ōzu, we were put in the same house with my two older brothers and their families. We were assigned to different rooms under the same roof. The enemy dispatched one male and one female servant who prepared rice, soup, and fishplates every morning and evening (No 2012: 402).

This diary report by Kang reveals that, along with other scholarly or *yangban* class people, his family enjoyed physical comfort, though they were not free to go back to Korea. Other diary entries also indicate that these scholars were able to meet together with some freedom of movement. According to Kang, about 2,000 Korean captives were living in Ehime, with earlier settlers being far more acculturated to Japan than relatively newer arrivals (No, 2012). In Ehime Kang was able to socialize with Japanese scholars or Buddhist monks who have travelled Korea before or during the war:

The temple's monk told me, "I am from Hizen and have been to Seoul before the war with Japanese envoys." [...] He treated me with good Confucian manners and wanted me to write a poem on his fan. I wrote one Chinese poem on his fan (No 2012: 404).

Kang's intention through his socialization with "good" Japanese intellectuals vis-à-vis "evil" Japanese samurais, was to ask for help to return to Korea. Unlike artisans who had maintained links with their homeland while also developing their own institutional basis of education, learning, innovation, and industry in Japan, many of the intransigent Confucian scholars tried hard to return to Korea, believing that their Confucian motherland was morally superior to Japan and would welcome them wholeheartedly upon their return. These Confucian scholars also showed no sympathy or concern to those they left behind: many Korean women brought to Japan as wives and/or concubines of Japanese samurais had to quickly adjust to their new life in Japan raising their Japanese-Korean children. While Kang did try to maintain networks with the returnees who came back to Korea with him, he soon discovered that they would not be welcomed by his motherland (No 2012).

Kang's Global Everyday in Japan

Having reconstructed the Korean community in Japan during the 16th century, I now move on to Kang's "global everyday" in Japan. This intellectual environment ultimately gave him the opportunity to eventually return to Korea. Given that the China and Korea Town [*tōjinmachi*] had grown significantly in Kyūshū since the 11th century (Hattori, 2008), there is a high possibility that Kang socialized with Japanese, Korean, and Chinese intellectuals in Ehime and Kyoto. Fujiwara Seika was a prominent means through which Kang was able to create opportunities and engage with other intellectuals at that time. Fujiwara was a revolutionary intellectual among his contemporaries in Japan. Unusually, he admired Chinese and Korean academic and cultural achievements more than he did their Japanese counterpart (Azuma, 2009). For instance, during the visit by Korean envoys [*tsūshinshi*] in 1590, Fujiwara sought friendship with the Korean emissaries, including Hwang Yun Gil and Kim Seong Il. Furthermore, when the Chinese legates arrived in Kyūshū for peace talks with the Hideyoshi government in 1593, Fujiwara exchanged written conversations with the Ming delegates during his meeting with the Chinese. Finally, in

1596, during Hideyoshi's second invasion in Korea, Fujiwara attempted to take a boat from Satsuma to sail to China (Azuma 2009).

Fujiwara's first meeting with Kang occurred in 1598, two years after his failed attempt to visit China. In his memoir (written after his return to Joseon), Kang recalled that Fujiwara wrote the following in their first meeting:

I regret that I was born in Japan during this [awful] period, after failing to be born in China or Korea. In 1596 I went down to Satsuma to cross the sea to reach China, although my disease caught me in the middle and I had to come back to Kyoto. After my disease was healed, I tried to go to Korea, but this time Hideyoshi's invasion in Korea prevented my trip (Azuma, 2009: 50).

Fujiwara's Confucian-inflected version of cosmopolitanism derives from the concept of universal "*li*." This Confucian principle enables people from different countries to conceive all human beings equally and therefore allows them to understand the "other" as their own. This is evident in Fujiwara's own writings: "Japan is natural [*li*], and so are Korea, Vietnam, and China" (Azuma, 2009: 50). Such ideas are also evident in Fujiwara's rules of engagement, which he wrote for merchants travelling to Vietnam on trade missions from Japan: "as long as they are Confucian, Japanese merchants must respect them, even though their language and culture differ from ours" (Azuma, 2009: 51).

Kang's "global everyday" in Kyoto was also enriched by his association with Akamatsu Hiromichi, who, despite his status as a warlord working closely with Hideyoshi, was pro-China and Korea as much as Fujiwara was. Kang wrote:

The military officials of Japan are all thieves, but only Hiromichi has a heart like a human. In Japan there were no Confucian-style mourning rites. Only Hiromichi has done the three years of mourning for the death of his mother, and he greatly enjoys the institutions of Tang China and the rites of Joseon. Even for trivial matters such as clothing and food, he is trying to learn from Tang China and Joseon. Hiromichi is in Japan, but he is not Japanese (Kang, 2013[1658]: 95).

Kang ultimately failed to understand that Japan was a culturally diverse society, one that was strikingly different from his own Confucianism-dominated Korea. Such mis-understanding reinforced his *yangban*-inflected belief that Joseon was a culturally and morally advanced nation in which he really belonged. Kang therefore became a traveler who had realized his purpose in Japan and quickly returned to his version of civilization upon completing his mission. His purpose in Japan was to spy on the enemy country for his king, to whom he tried to show his allegiance and loyalty through sending letters directly to the royal throne.

While spying on enemy life, Kang also actively raised funds for his return to Korea with his family members. He needed a relatively large sum of money, and so Akamatsu commissioned Kang for a number of Confucian book translations in order to raise funds for the move (Azuma 2009). It is therefore clear that by the time Kang was raising the travel money he was no longer a war prisoner but was considered to be one of the *bushi* class members who could travel freely even back to his motherland. This is much akin to the Korean founder of the Nogi family, who in fact frequently visited Kang and his two older brothers to share intellectual debates and news from Korea (Soeda 2006).

Kang's translated books also increased awareness of Confucian universalism ("*li*") among Japanese elites and intellectuals. Akamatsu himself built personal shrines for Confucius and actively preached for the introduction of the Chinese and Korean style *Gwageo* system (selecting public servants through education and examinations of Confucian classics). The debate around the *Gwageo* system aroused interests among rulers and intellectuals in Japan, yet it was never fully approved as a state-level institution (Azuma 2009).

Kang's global everyday was therefore that of a transnational diasporic traveler who maintained a strong tie with his homeland through the various channels available to him. Furthermore, the diverse and multicultural society of Edo Japan allowed Kang freedom to communicate with his motherland, Japanese intellectuals, and other Korean colleagues who were also taken into Japan. However, given that Kang was operating in a strict status-obsessed and hierarchical society, there is little evidence of Kang associating with other Koreans from the artisan or commoner status, not to mention the women who were brought to Japan as wives or concubines. It is safe to assume that he would have detested the treatment of Korean artisans as *yangban* in Japan (Hattori 2008).

Kang's Return and Internal Diaspora in the Imaginary Motherland

There are few available records detailing Kang's departure from the transnational intellectual diaspora he met in Ehime and Kyoto. However, there is ample evidence as to how he masqueraded after his return to Korea, an imaginary motherland that was supposed to be culturally and morally superior to Japan. Most of his life after the return was garbed in the language of "apologies" to the king, his fellow Korean intellectuals, and even his disciples. He evidently also realized that he could not return to Japan or retain ties with the friends he made there. Joseon's stance was firm: no Korean shall visit or live in Japan or maintain personal ties with the Japanese. Just like the Korean returnees to North Korea from Japan, who found themselves trapped in a totalitarian nation without any hope of revisiting Japan, Kang's post-diaspora life in Korea commenced the construction of an internal diaspora within his own motherland.

In order to try and avoid such a fate, Kang had written and sent several reports and letters to his king from Japan. Due to this effort, the king showed an initial interest in meeting with Kang to gather fresh and detailed information about Japan from his first hand experiences. Kang's effort to please his king continued after his return; he wrote a book, called *Ganyangrok* [A Record of Shepherding], in which he tried to justify his life in Japan. The book uses the famous analogy of sheep shepherding in order to express his loyalty to his king. Instead of killing himself, as dictated by the Confucian law, Kang argued that he would better serve his motherland by providing inside information about Japan for the benefit of his country, which was still under the constant threat of another invasion.

Nationalistic explanations of Kang's return focus upon *Ganyangrok* as evidence of his allegiance to his king and nation. However, Kang's changed views of Japan didn't help him convince the Seoul elites (and ultimately the king) of a possible attack by the Japanese in the near future. Kang warned the king that Japan would invade Korea again (Kang 2004[1654]: 163-164) as highlighting the threat was the best strategy to realize his new goal in Korea. He didn't forget to add that Tshushima would also help Japan to invade Joseon again (Kang 2004[1654]: 116-167). Finally, he argued that Japan had better institutions of military, artisanship, and agriculture:

Japan's custom is to create the world's best by promoting the best technician in all fields of engineering. Such trivial works as ting timbers, concretizing walls, and roofing require the best technician. Furthermore, stamping, writing documents, and other paperwork also prefer the world's best technicians, and if they fix any problems, clients pay them with 30-40 gold or silver coins (Kang 2004[1654]: 168-169).

By demonstrating his expertise in these Japanese matters, Kang tried to promote himself as a transnational intellectual in his homeland. He even attempted to suggest ways of strengthening the Korean military. However, none of the Seoul elites or the king himself paid attention to such predictions, and Joseon was to face a devastating invasion from Manchuria in 1636, eighteen years after Kang's death.

Kang's internal diaspora in his home province of Jeolla was uneventful and serene. One of his disciples later published Kang's essays with a new title of *Ganyangrok* in 1665, thirty years after the Manchurian invasion in Korea in 1636. We do not know whether Kang was tempted to return to Japan during his internal asylum in Korea. However, from the beaches in his home province at the Southern point of the Korean peninsula he would certainly have seen ships setting off to Tsushima and Kyūshū. Joseon and its Confucian nationalism were not ready for his transnational intellectual diaspora and its expertise.

Conclusion

Sixteenth century Japan was arguably the first East Asian country to recognize the importance of the intellectual diaspora. They actively kidnapped and forcibly brought highly skilled Korean workers to Japan, along with some of the scholars and women from the *yangban* class. In order to utilize them to their full effects, Japan created skill-based Korean villages or towns. These Korean, Chinese, and Western diaspora communities have certainly enhanced Japan's culture, knowledge, and engineering skills. The country continues to be a leading Asian nation that utilizes and exploits transnational intellectuals to a very high degree. From the 16th century to the present day Japan continues to provide one of the leading institutional and cultural environments for the transnational intellectual diaspora, just as America did for its European intellectual émigrés in the 20th century. It is therefore essential for us to regard modern Japan as a global migration destination especially from China and Japan. The reason highly skilled migrants remained in Japan without permanently returning to Korea is closely tied to Japan's new modern identity in East Asia.

As is evident from studying the pottery industry, Korea has always prided itself in educating and producing highly skilled technicians. However, Korea has most often failed to retain such workers, as the social hierarchy of Confucian nationalism tends to promote national talent based upon social networks, family backgrounds, and school ties rather than merit. Even when such skilled technicians and intellectuals returned to Korea, the country did not take kindly to the returnees, fearing that such new knowledge would destroy their elite power basis in Seoul. Kang's case is the beginning of the modern era in East Asia in which Japan became the leading nation to espouse transnationalism, tolerance, and multiculturalism as part of its national interests.

Simultaneously, Japan has been a place of nurturing nationalistic diaspora for intellectuals and non-intellectuals who tend to form imaginary views of their motherland. Despite continuous warnings and systematic hindrance, these diasporic travelers returned to Korea, where they faced fatal consequences of not being able to meet their families and other loved ones. Furthermore, their internal diaspora in their own motherland appeared much more life threatening and harsh than their diasporic experience in Japan. Whereas those remained in Japan could build diasporic institutions of innovation and knowledge centers for local Japanese, those who returned to Korea were banned from the centers of knowledge and learning despite their superior transnational experiences and knowledge.

Further studies must construct theories of intellectual diaspora based upon both historical and contemporary cases that link individual problems to social issues and personal affairs to history. A study such as an ethnographic method utilizes empathy, not quantitative standards, to measure the pleasure, pain, and happiness in transnational intellectual nomadism.

Ingyu Oh is Professor of Hallyu Studies at Kansai Gaidai University, Osaka, Japan. Previously he was Professor of Hallyu Studies at Korea University, and currently, he is the president of the World Association for Hallyu Studies. His recent books include an edited volume on East Asian leadership (Routledge) and a forthcoming monograph on the South Korean economy (Agenda).

Reference

- Azuma, Jūji. 2009. "Edoshoki ni okeru gakujuku no hatsuden to chūgoku, chōsen: Fujiwara Seika, Gang Hang, Matsunaga Shakugo, Hori Kyōan, Hayashi Razan, Hayashi Kahō ra o megutte." *Higashi Ajia Bunka Kōshō Kenkyū* 2: 47-66.
- Bak, Gyunseop. 1996. "Ganghang i ilbon jujahak e kkichin yeonghyang." *Ilbonhakbo* 37(11): 251-267.
- Bhagwati, Jagdish N. 1979. "International Migration of the Highly Skilled: Economics, Ethics and Taxes." *Third World Quarterly* 1(3): 17-30.
- Brown, Mercy. 2002. "Intellectual Diaspora Networks: Their Viability as a Response to Highly Skilled Emigration." *Autrepart* 22(2): 167-178.
- Camurri, Renato. 2014. "The Exile Experience Reconsidered: a Comparative Perspective in European Cultural Migration during the Interwar Period." *Transatlantica* 2014(1): 2-14. URL: <http://transatlantica.revues.org/6920>.
- Chang, Shirley L. 1992. "Causes of Brain Drain and Solutions: The Taiwan Experience." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 27(1): 27-43.
- Conway, Martin (ed.). 2001. *Europe in Exile: European Exile Communities in Britain, 1940-1945*. New York: Bergham Books.
- Coser, Lewis. 1984. *Refugee Scholars in America: Their Impact and their Experiences*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Davie, Maurice R. 1947. *Refugees in America: Report of the Committee for the Study of Recent Immigration from Europe*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Fermi, Laura. 1968. *Illustrious Immigrants. The Intellectual Migration from Europe 1930-1941*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fleming, Donald and Bailyn, Bernard (eds.). 1969. *The Intellectual Migration: Europe and America, 1930-1960*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Frank, Tibor. 2009. *Double Exile: Migrations of Jewish Hungarian Professionals through Germany to the United States, 1919-1945*. Oxford-Wien: Peter Lang.
- Gim, Seonhi. 2009. "Ilbon jujahak yeongu e daehan ilgochal." *Ilbonmuhwa Yeongu* 30(4): 347-364.
- Grossman, Martin. 2010. "Diaspora Knowledge Flows in the Global Economy." Paper presented at E-Leader Budapest, Hungary.
- Hattori, Hideō. 2008. "Zenkindai nihon no chainataun, koriataun." Paper delivered at the Dongbukasia Munhwahakhoi. Seoul, Korea.
- Hielbut, Anthony. 1983. *Exiled in Paradise: German Refugee Artists and Intellectuals in America, from the 1930s to the Present*. New York: Viking Press.
- "Ilbon Ehime hyeon eui imran poro e gwanhan yeongu." 2012. *Ileoilmunhak* 54: 391-412.
- Jay, Martin. 1985. *Permanent Exiles, Essay on the Intellectual Migration from Germany to America*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Kang, Hang. 2004[1654]. *Ganyangrok: Joseon Seonbi Waeguk Poroga Doida*. Seoul: Bori.
- Kettler, David and Lauer, Gerhard. 2005. *Exile, Science, and Bildung: The Contested Legacies of German Emigré Intellectuals*. New York: Palgrave.
- Khoshkish, A. 1966. "Intellectual Migration: A Sociological Approach to 'Brain Drain'." *Journal of World History* 10: 179-195.
- Kilminster, Richard and Varcoe, Ian (eds.). 1996. *Culture, Modernity and Revolution: Essays in Honour of Zygmunt Bauman*. London: Routledge.
- Kolesnikova, Julia, Ricaud, Camille, Kamasheva, Anastasia, Zhao, Yue. 2014. "Current Trends of Realization of the Intellectual Capital and Problems of Intellectual Migration." *Procedia Economics and Finance* 14: 326-332.
- Lucero-Prisno, Eliseo. 2005. "Brain Drain – Brain Gain: Intellectual Discourse or Discord?" In *Essays from the World Science Forum Budapest 2005*, pp. 87-93.
- McAusland, Carol and Kuhn, Peter. 2011. "Bidding for Brains: Intellectual Property Rights and the International Migration of Knowledge Workers." *Journal of Development Economics* 95(1): 77-87.
- Meyer, Jean-Baptiste and Brown, Mercy. 1999. *Scientific Diasporas: A New Approach to the Brain Drain*. Management of Social Transformations (MOST) Program.
- Meyer, Jean-Baptiste and Wattiaux, Jean-Paul. 2006. "Diaspora Knowledge Networks: Vanishing Doubts and Increasing Evidence." *International Journal on Multicultural Societies* 8(1): 4-24.
- Mondal, Debasis and Gupta, Manash Ranjan. 2008. "Innovation, Imitation and Intellectual Property Rights: Introducing Migration in Helpman's Model." *Japan and the World Economy* 20(3): 369-394.
- "Nagasaki hyeon eui imran poro e gwanhan yeongu." 2009. *Ilbon Sasang* 16: 189-213.
- Naghavi, Alireza and Strozzi, Chiara. 2011. "Intellectual Property Rights, Migration, and Diaspora." FEEM Working Paper No. 60.2011.
- Nishimura, Masaya. 2011. "Tōjiki kenkyū o bunkakōshōgaku ni ōyōsuru tameni: Kyūshū, Okinawa chihō o reini." In *Shūen no Bunkakōshōgaku Sīrīzu 4: Tōjiki Ryūsū to Seikai Chiiki*, pp. 87-95. Osaka: Kansai University.
- No, Seonghwan. 2007. "Naeshirogawa eui joseon dogong maeul e gwanhan ilgochal." *Ileoilmunhak* 36: 331-345.
- Rose, Peter I. (ed.). 2005. *The Dispossessed: An Anatomy of Exile*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Soeda, Hitoshi. 2006. "Jinshin teiyū waran ni okeru chōsenjin hiryo no matsuei: Nogi Maresuke no yuisho." *Kaikōtoshi Kenkyū* 1:101-114.
- Snowman, Daniel. 2002. *Hitler's Emigrés: The Cultural Impact on Britain of Refugees from Nazism*. London: Chatoo and Windus.
- Stephan, Alexander. 2005. *Refugee and Reality: Feuchtwanger and the European Émigrés in California*. New York: Rodopi.
- Watanabe, Yoshirō. 2007. "Kagoshimaken Hiokishi Miyama shozai no Kaeigannen meisekihi." *Kagoshimadaigaku Hōbungakubu Kiyō Jinbungakkaronshū* 65: 17-24.
- Yi, Donghi. 1999. "Sueun Ganghang eui aeguk jeongsin gwa ilbon eui jujahak jeonpa." *Yugyosasang Munhwa Yeongu* 12: 183-206.
- Yoo, Yonggyu. 2007. "Bushidō eui sasangeok baegyeong gwa jeongae gwanjeong e daehan gochal." *Ilbonmunhwa Yeongu* 21(1): 119-129.