

The Movement of Intellectuals in and out of Modern East Asia

(updated 6-10-15 – subject to change)

Chair and Discussant: John Lie, University of California, Berkeley

Yu-Ling Huang (National Taiwan University)

Mobility of Knowledge and Policy: American Behavioral Sciences and Family Planning Programs in Taiwan and South Korea in the 1960s

This paper examines the increasing influence of American behavioral sciences on the population establishment and their imprints on the large-scale fertility control programs in Taiwan and South Korea during the 1950s and 1960s. Historians of American social sciences note that the postwar emergence of behavioral sciences was a product of Cold War ideology and intellectual agenda; yet, the American behavioral sciences' impact on the academics and policy-making of foreign countries is less studied. Behavioral science studies of postwar population control emphasized biomedical aspects while ignoring the role of social knowledge in programs. Drawing on archival materials and published population studies, I engage with this literature using the approach of social knowledge in transnational practices. I investigate the work of Drs. Bernard Berelson and Ronald Freeman, two American behavioral scientists who designed and guided the Taichung Study of Taiwan and of Koyang, Korea—two exemplary family planning programs in the less-developed world in the 1960s. Berelson, a communication scholar on the Population Council, and Freedman, a sociologist at the University of Michigan, believed that behavioral sciences—with their focus on how motivation, incentive, communication tools, and social networks affect human behaviors and social change—could contribute to solutions for social problems relevant to sex, reproduction, and family. Meanwhile, due to geopolitical and bio-political concerns, the technocrats in Taiwan and South Korea sought effective measures for reducing fertility rates. The American behavioral sciences lent cultural authority to family planning programs, while the authoritarian regime's governing capacity to infiltrate the society made “social experiments” like the Taichung Study and Koyang Study possible.

Vladimir Tikhonov (University of Oslo)

Russian Revolutionaries in Japan and China, 1880s to 1900s

By the late nineteenth century, both Russia and Japan occupied comparably peripheral positions inside the capitalist world system. One difference, however, lay in the modes of integration into the world system that these two countries came to choose. Russia's integration was conducted by the absolutist Tsarist monarchy. In contrast to the antiquated absolutist Russia, Japan had to adopt some elements of constitutional order, a difference that was by no means lost on the Russian revolutionaries. The struggle for constitutionalism had been continuing for almost a century in Russia without Tsarism giving much ground until the 1904–1905 revolution; in Japan, however, constitutionalism arrived in a couple of decades after the onset of full-on modernization in 1868, albeit on a limited scale. For many radicals in Russia, Japan was thus an example of a more desirable path for a “catch-up modernization” scenario. Seen from this angle, the tacit collaboration between the Japan-based revolutionary exiles (Sudzilovsky, etc.) and the Japanese authorities during the Russo-Japanese War (1904–1905) was hardly unprincipled on the part of the former. At the same time, Russian revolutionaries were fond of prospects of a revolution in China, in the hope that even a purely political change in the giant Asian country would advance the course of the worldwide change towards a socialist system. Chinese revolutionaries, including Sun Yat-sen, in turn saw the Russian 1905–1907 revolution as an inspiration for China and the shared Russian Populists' hopes to bypass the capitalist stage of development. In the course of these Japanese-Chinese-Russian encounters, the outlines of the future non-capitalist “catch-up” developmental models became clearer.

Jooyeon Rhee (Hebrew University)

Richard E. K. Kim and His Ontology of Exile: Focusing On *Lost Names*

This paper explores diasporic experience and the imagination of displacement and cultural identity by focusing on the life and works of Korean American writer Richard Kim (1932–2009). It attempts to answer how Kim’s literary exploration of displacement can lend us valuable insight into how one struggles to find a place to speak about selfhood in between multiple borders—be they national, linguistic, or ideological—and how his contemplation on the condition of exile deepens our understanding of diasporic identity. Kim produced works that embody personal and collective memories of colonialism, the Korean War, and migration. While I refer to his other works, in this paper I focus on his novel, *Lost Names* (1970), in which he narrates the inner struggle of individuals against a power beyond the colonial force: he resists the trauma that manifests itself in the self-defeating concept of *han* that is deeply rooted in Korean people’s experience of traumatic historical events. By looking at Kim’s fictional autobiography as a creative way of reflecting his contemplation on the relationship between individuals and their history, this paper explores the aesthetics of the novel that embodies one intellectual’s ontological endeavor to make a meaningful connection between self and others.

Ingyu Oh (Korea University) (with Sang Soon Kang)

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

The war between Japan, China, and Korea in the sixteenth century marked a form of modern international warfare that contributed towards the creation of a modern style intellectual diaspora among the Korean and Chinese intellectuals who spent time in Japan as war prisoners, collaborators, and/or migrants. 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 in the late sixteenth century. Kang spent two-and-a-half years in Japan. During his imprisonment, Kang was able to socialize with Japanese intellectuals, including Fujiwara Seika and Akamatsu Hiromitsu, who wanted to discuss Neo-Confucianism with him. Yet, after his return to Korea, he faced severe discrimination from his fellow Korean intellectuals, who were now suspicious of his previous behavior in the enemy country. Academics and court politicians refused to accept him into the main Seoul circles, and his life was therefore confined to solitary scholarly work such as writing books about Japan and teaching disciples.