How does diaspora mobilization become a causal feature of structural change?
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1. Introduction

National integration policies of host states towards a non-assimilated population will often generate complicated results. This can be seen when considering one specific empirical puzzle—the ambiguous identification of the postcolonial Korean diaspora in Japan (the Zainichi Koreans), who possess legal claims to their Korean homeland but are culturally Japanese. The Zainichi are of particular interest because they represent the only Korean migrant group that has not been granted citizenship by host states, in contrast to ethnic Koreans in China and Russia as well as Korean Americans. The Japanese expected the group to return to Korea en masse at the end of World War II, but North-East Asia’s complicated geopolitical environment meant that the Zainichi were in fact unable to return, and now remain in Japan—still existing in a state of comparative limbo, living outside the protection of Japanese citizenship or Korean law.

Although most of the Zainichi came originally from southern Korea, and retain their Korean nationality, they speak Japanese rather than Korean; their appearance reflects Japanese culture and fashion rather than Korean and they use Japanese names; in other words, they are highly acculturated to Japanese society (Chung 2010). There are still approximately 400,000 Zainichi in Japan who maintain their Korean nationality but have no intention of repatriating to Korea.¹

¹ Myung Ja Kim, PhD Candidate (as of 25 May 2015), Department of Politics & International Studies, SOAS University of London, UK, Email:153301@soas.ac.uk
Existing literature on the Zainichi focuses on their status as a minority within Japan’s domestic political environment, and issues of citizenship only consider the domestic context of Japan (Fukuoka 1993; Ryang 1997; Kashiwazaki 2000; Chapman 2008; Chung 2010). In this article, I differentiate the Zainichi from other Korean or host state minorities in terms of recognition insofar as they maintain a ‘homeland’—either physically or psychologically as a territorial entity—as well as an imagined locus of emotional identification. By taking this approach, the trajectory of Zainichi Korean history can be analyzed from a very different international perspective, and this article will justify its importance and relevance as there is little existing literature in the field of international relations that explores the role of the Zainichi.

Recently, growing numbers of US and Japanese policy makers have begun to focus on the “super-sizing” of North Korea in terms of its continuing military threat (Hughes 2009, p.291). But the transnational space in which the Zainichi diaspora functions has been ignored for a long time, coming to a head only when North Korea launched a three staged Taepo-dong ballistic missile directly over Japanese airspace on August 31, 1998, which sent international shockwaves reverberating across the world, with Japan feeling particularly threatened. New academic research has started to uncover the importance of transnationalism in any threat to national security and regional peace, in Japan’s case by focusing on the role of the pro-North Korean ethnic organization, Chongryun, which became a powerful agency within Japan and provided the North Korean regime with considerable funds and valuable intelligence at the expense of the host state. This article contributes to identifying the Zainichi’s own transnational space—a rapidly altering functional space within the Japanese host state and a space that provides leverage that can be exploited by individuals or collective actors who make up the elites of both the host state and the homeland.

Recent diaspora scholarships also substantiate the increasingly crucial role of diasporas in international politics, explaining that diasporas have emerged as new and potentially powerful actors in terms of shifting political mobilization in the management, escalation and settlement of
interstate conflicts (Tölölyan 1991; Adamson 2002; Smith 2007). Diasporas can also provide influential lobbying activities within their host state in favour of homeland (Shain and Barth 2003)—in more extreme case helping the creation of new transnational nations, as the activities of the Armenian, Tamil, and Croatian diasporas have historically shown (Tölölyan 2007; Skrbis 2007; Esman 2009). But how does a particular ethnic group become engaged in ethnic mobilization in a transnational space, ending up as a diaspora group involving itself in international relations or political struggles? Fiona Adamson calls into question much of the conventional academic wisdom on diasporas, insofar as established literature treats diasporas as effects rather than causes; as “dependent variables” rather than “independent variables”, or as “political projects” as opposed to “agents” or “actors” (Adamson 2012, p.26). If this is the case, how do we explain the fact that the Zainichi diaspora or an entity of “effect”—generated in the process of Japan’s transformation from multi-national empire into homogeneous mono-ethnic nation-state since the end of World War II—has become an “agent” capable of causing structural change?

“Structure” is one of most important and elusive concepts in the social sciences. The language of structure easily explains the shaping of social life into consistent patterns, but seldom explores how these patterns become subject to change over time. Structures shape people’s practices, but those practices in turn constitute and reproduce structures (Sewell 1992, p.4). According to Anthony Giddens, structure is both the medium and the outcome of the constituent practices of social systems. Structure enters simultaneously into the constitution of the agent and social practices, and exists during the generating moments of this constitution, a process Giddens refers to as a “duality of structure” (Giddens 1979, p.5). Dual structures are therefore potentially mutable, and as such Giddens points out that structure must be regarded as a changing process, rather than a steady state.

In the same way, Jeffrey Checkel defines causal mechanisms as pathways or processes by which an effect is produced or a purpose is accomplished. Checkel continues that philosophers
of social science view causal mechanisms as ultimately unobservable ontological entities that exist in the world, rather than in our heads (Checkel 2013, p.10). According to the theories of structuralism or functionalism, an organism’s structure exists independently of its function in a certain specific sense: the parts of the body can still be studied even when the organism dies—after it has stopped functioning. But such is not the case with social systems, which cease to exist when they cease to function: patterns of social relationships only exist insofar as they are organized as systems that have been reproduced over the course of time (Giddens 1979, p.61). Thus mechanisms are not merely intervening variables, but concepts of relation and process in their own right.

Giddens identifies structure as non-temporal and non-spatial; he regards it as virtual, and then conceptualizes it in the form of principles which should be put into practice in the production and reproduction of social life. He contends that social systems exist in time-space and are constituted by social practices. In other words, structures are not the patterned social practices that make up social systems, but the principles that pattern these practices (Sewell 1992, p.6). But the most important point Giddens emphasizes is the significance of the unintended consequences of actions within the process of reproducing social systems, when the concept of a social system refers to a reciprocal relationship in which changes in one or more component parts initiate changes in other component parts, and these changes in turn produce changes in the parts in which the original changes occurred (Etzioni 1968).

Giddens refers to such component parts within social systems as “agencies”, capable of exerting some degree of control over social relationships or possessing knowledge of the schemas that inform social life, offering access to some measure of human and non-human resources (Sewell 1992, p.20). Put differently, “agency” is the actor’s capacity to reinterpret and mobilize an array of resources in terms of cultural schemas other than those that initially constituted the array (Sewell, 1992 p.19). Indeed, Giddens explores the intrinsic relationship between agency and power, defining power relations are always having a two-way function:
however subordinate an actor may be in a social relationship, the very fact of involvement in that relationship gives any actor a certain amount of power over the other. Those in subordinate positions in social systems are often adept at converting whatever resources they possess into some degree of leverage or control over the conditions under which those social systems are reproduced (Giddens 1979, p.6).

If we accept such a complex situation and the series of actions and reactions it includes, then how does the Zainichi diaspora—an entity which is in a subordinate position within a social system—mobilize resources, ultimately becoming an agent capable of causing structural change? Ironically, this agency has been historically interrelated with Japan’s policy strategies towards the divided diaspora groups. So how does the policy strategy of host states allow an entity such as the Zainichi diaspora to transform itself from a dependent variable into an independent variable?

An agency with the causal capacity to transfer energy, information or resources to other entities appears able to change the characteristics of that other entity and its capacities or propensities in ways that will persist until subsequent causal mechanisms act on it. In the following sections, I firstly identify the causal mechanisms that fill the gap between dependent and independent variables; how and when do diaspora groups transform themselves from the ‘effect’ role they have been assigned as a result of geopolitical events into a ‘casual’ agency that can help shape structural change? Using Japan and the Zainichi diaspora as examples, I will attempt to examine how those causal mechanisms have been deeply embedded via policy strategies by the host state towards the diaspora group, forming a template of significance for the unintended consequences of action. The paper will conclude by drawing more general policy implications from the lessons the Zainichi diaspora provides.

2. Causal mechanisms for structural transaction: an unobservable ontological process
Framing is one of the most important processes in social movement literature. As Goffman’s work implies, framing serves as tacit acceptance of knowledge employed by lay actors in the production of social encounters. According to Goffman, a primary framework is one that is seen as rendering what would otherwise be a meaningless aspect of any given situation into something that has meaning (Goffman 1974, p.91). Thus framing can be defined as an alternative view or perspective which may be more receptive to lay persons who have previously accepted beliefs. In other words, framing exists as a schema for strangers to join a movement by sharing the understanding of a world view or a collective identity. Framing is also an identification process, since it implies that actors define what they are fighting for and who they are fighting against (Bakke 2013, p.36).

In order to accept alternative views, however, instead of injecting authenticity into previously accepted beliefs, there should be some prerequisite for this. Oliver Roy argues that radical Islamism emerged because Islam became de-territorialized in such a way as to question and de-stabilise the whole concept of Muslim identity (Roy 2004). In a traditional Muslim society, an individual’s identity is provided and underscored by that person’s parents and social environment: everything, from one’s tribe and kin via the local imam to the political structure of the state, anchors one’s identity in a particular branch of the Islamic faith. According to Roy, identity becomes problematic when Muslims leave traditional Muslim societies by, for example, immigrating to Western Europe. The question of authenticity arises when there is a gap between one’s inner identity as a member of a Muslim cultural community and one’s behaviour vis-à-vis one’s new societal surroundings (Fukuyama 2006). Such an identity crisis can produce a “cognitive opening”, a psychological vacuum which is likely to prompt ideological conversion (Wiktorowicz 2005, p.87).

As Giddens’ dual structures show, if framing is the principle that patterns practice, then prerequisites should exist for the sake of social systems such as social movement function; framing should be put into appropriate times and spaces. In other words, framing is not enough
for bystanders to shake off their certainly in previously accepted beliefs. For the sake of this, it requires a pre-condition that serves to render individuals more receptive to the possibility of alternative views or interpretations in order to mobilize them into collective action. Indeed, the product of modern phenomena will be an *identity crisis*, generated by societies’ confrontation with modernity, which forces un-integrated people to exist in a position that is poised between two cultures, neither of which they can identify with. Such an intensely alienating process has been repeatedly experienced by countless individuals in different societies in different geographical spaces and at different times. As Ernest Gellner shows, modernization is a typical example, in the sense that its process represents the transition from *Gemeinschaft* (community) to *Gesellschaft* (society), which constitutes a tremendous alienating process for those who have failed to catch up with rapid transition (Kang 2011). Hannah Arendt saw this kind of situation—in which the masses have “lost their connection with others and become defined by their rootlessness”—as an indispensable precondition for totalitarian rule. Arendt defines this condition of the masses as “*verlassenheit*”—loneliness—or the state of being abandoned (Arendt 1958, p.478). Indeed, at this point we can begin to understand Europe’s long history of far-right extremism and other varieties of militancy, from violent Marxism to the Irish Republican Army, driving alienated young people to become anarchists, bolsheviks, fascists or members of terrorist organisations.2

In summary, the first stage, the *identity crisis*, emerges when social identity becomes de-territorialized, or a state becomes rootless by losing its connectivity with others, thus fostering *cognitive opening*, leading to the next stage in which an individual becomes willing to accept a framing strategy that social movements have conceptualized. Thus *framing* offers the cognitive tools for making sense of events and experiences by interpreting causation, evaluating the situation and offering proscriptive remedies (Wiktorowicz 2005, p.16). Like Adamson, I argue that the process of diaspora mobilization is determined by the ability of actors to articulate frames that resonate with members of diaspora groups in ways that successfully align the perceptions, values or interests of that diaspora. In particular, successful diaspora entrepreneurs
effectively deploy framing strategies that align the diaspora’s feeling toward kinship with value or their perception to their country of origin by emphasizing guilt or obligation, which ultimately promote remittances to family members or homeland (Adamson 2013, p.70).

How then does a movement persuade a potential member to feel guilty or obliged to the extent of making that movement worth following? This introduces a third mechanism, learning or persuasion. Interests do not remain static; they can change as a result of factors such as political and social learning, persuasion, changes in status and social mobility. In particular, leaders and their organizations use learning or persuasion to shape people’s private preferences through ideological indoctrination, organized group actions, persuasive exhortations and charismatic appeals to impress and inspire one to change one’s beliefs. Organized street activities such as strikes and demonstrations may persuade passive sympathizers and supporters of the status quo that revolution is imminent, thereby altering their thresholds for public action while encouraging them to think that the numbers supporting the revolution are greater than they really are (Crenshaw 1994, p.264). Through lessons and other activities, diaspora entrepreneurs must reinterpret the de-territorialized nature of sacred authority and convince audiences that this reinterpretation is not only legitimate but provides greater authenticity than other alternatives (Wiktorowicz 2005, p. 6). Diaspora entrepreneurs will then observe a critical shift from behaviour motivated by self-interest to norm-guided actions such as civic obligation rooted in a learning process and an educational setting via socialization—although it will be just a few selective incentives that initially attracted interest (Wiktorowicz 2005, p. 27).

Ideology, Giddens conceptualizes, refers to the ideological being understood in terms of the capacity of dominant groups or classes to make their own sectional interests appear universal to others. Such capacity therefore represents one type of resource involved in domination (Giddens 1979, p. 6). In other words, ideology includes the capacity to mobilize resources from human and non-human sources. Non-human resources include objects (animate or inanimate) naturally occurring or manufactured that can be used to enhance or maintain power, such as
factories, arms and land; human resources are physical strength, dexterity, knowledge and emotional commitment, including knowledge of operating the means of gaining, retaining, controlling and propagating either human or non-human resources. Both types of resources combine to form media of power that make up a given society’s fundamental tools of thought, and prop up the various conventions, recipes, scenarios, principles of action and habits of speech and gesture that are constructed using these fundamental tools (Sewell 1992, p. 8). Consequently, the final mechanism is resource mobilization, and in this stage, a mobilized diaspora becomes independent variable (Adamson 2013, p.67). However unequally resources may be distributed, some measure of both human and non-human resources are controlled by all members of society, no matter how destitute and oppressed they may be. Indeed, a mobilized diaspora ultimately becomes an agent empowered by access to resources of one kind or another until that diaspora ceases to exist or remains un-mobilised as a distinct entity (Adamson 2013, p.71).

3. The shift in the Zainichi diaspora from ‘effect’ by state policy into ‘causality’ on structure change (1945–2014)

Japan’s re-emergence as a normal military power has been accelerated by the “super-sizing” of North Korea in terms of the North’s continuing military threat (Hughes 2009, p.291). Japan’s defence posture has grown in an exponential relationship with the North Korean threat, ultimately changing the structure of the alliance between Japan and the US from an asymmetric into a symmetric one in order to contribute constructively to global and regional security. Recently, growing numbers of US and Japanese policy makers have begun to focus on the role of the pro-North Korean ethnic organization, Chungryun, which has long supported North Korea by facilitating trade, sending cash donations, establishing personal contacts and possibly coordinating illicit transfers of narcotics and weapon parts. Academic research has discovered that transnationalism plays an important role in any threat to Japan’s national security and regional peace (Shipper 12/2009), yet the specific causal mechanisms remain poorly understood,
particularly because of the links between diasporic social mobilization and policy strategies by the host state. But in fact the relationship between the Zainichi diaspora and policy strategy is mutable; on one hand, Japan’s policy strategy produces a Zainichi diaspora that manifests itself as an effect variable in terms of Japan’s policy, and on the other, the Zainichi diaspora changes the policy strategy by manifesting itself as a causal variable. Because of the interaction between dual structure mechanisms, the relationship between policy strategy and the Zainichi diaspora ultimately produces significant and unintended consequences, which contribute to structural change by upgrading the regional and global security functions of the US-Japan alliance. By applying the set of causal mechanisms I identified in the previous section and by tracing the policies the Japanese elites adopted in dealing with the Zainichi diaspora in the post-war era (1945–1965), this section will explore how causal mechanisms have become deeply embedded in policy strategy by the host state towards the Zainichi diaspora groups.

3-1. Cognitive opening driven by exclusionary policies

By the end of the Second World War, there were an estimated 2.4 million Koreans living in Japan. The Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers (SCAP) official repatriation programme began in December 1945, by which time tens of thousands of Koreans had already converged on Japan’s southern ports to await transportation. By the end of 1945 more than 1.3 million of them had returned home (Takemae, 2002). By the end of 1946, however, the rate of Korean repatriation had slowed considerably, while the numbers of people immigrating illegally to Japan from Korea was increasing rapidly. Returning Koreans faced a stark reality in their home country, discovering a situation in which Japanese or Japanese collaborators remained in key positions and Korean citizens had less freedom south of the thirty-eight parallel than they had possessed in post-war Japan. The Japanese government, however, having disenfranchised Korean and Formosan residents in late 1945 and written them out of its constitutional draft in early 1946,
now sought to expel as many of them as possible due to the unanimous consensus within Japanese elites that Japanese colonization policies had completely failed to construct a national consciousness amongst Koreans as being “Japanese.”

In the twenty year period after World War II, Japan’s principal security concerns regarding North Korea did not revolve around a direct military threat, since Japan’s security interests vis-à-vis North Korea were largely governed by the US’s massive military presence in Japan and South Korea as well as the American containment policy toward the North (Hughes 2009, p.297). Instead, Japan’s security concerns looked inwards, focussing on the presence of Korean residents in Japan and the perceived fears that they would foment domestic communist insurgency (Morris-Suzuki 2007, p.60-61). Japanese Prime Minister Yoshida’s policy of choice was exclusionary—repatriation or even forceful deportation. In July 1949, Yoshida’s aide Shirasu Jiro visited the US Diplomatic Section and proposed a drastic solution to Japan’s Korean problem, calling for the deportation of 500,000 or 600,000 North and South Koreans. MacArthur rejected the unilateral use of force to remove them, despite refusing to provide Koreans with full Japanese citizenship or even allow them to retain permanent alien status (Takemae 2002). The alien registration system made life more difficult for Koreans in Japan, since they had no way of obtaining rations, jobs or medical care, and lived in constant fear of arrest and deportation. According to Kang Sang-Jung, the Zainichi were in a state of despair. Those Koreans who desired to remain in Japan, around 650,000 of them, were mainly uprooted migrants who had nowhere to go. They were long-term residents with pre-war roots in Japan. Kang argues that in his home town of Kumamoto, over one hundred Korean families lived shoulder to shoulder in shabby makeshift tenements, supporting themselves by keeping pigs and making illicit liquor (Kang 2004). Kang’s family lived in this group.

The stigmatism attached to the Korean community as being unruly, criminal and subversive was partly due to the role of the League of Koreans, or Choren, which was formed shortly after Japan’s surrender under the American occupation. The main function of the league
was to organize and facilitate the repatriation of Koreans and to prepare them by establishing Korean language schools for the younger Korean generations who were unable to speak Korean due to Japan’s pre-existing colonization policy which forbade Korean language schools or Korean-speaking institutions and compelled diaspora members to assimilate themselves to Japanese society, even going so far as to force them to change the structures and language of their names.

*Choren* had many opportunities to advocate on behalf of the Korean diaspora at the time, as Japanese Koreans faced insufficient wages, highly unsafe working environments (such as mining) and severe social discrimination. *Choren* advised the Zainichi on living conditions and negotiated with Japanese employers on labour issues for Koreans. Several important positions within *Choren* were filled by members of the Japan Communist Party (JCP) who were politically radical and active in the independence struggle, with the veteran Korean Communist leader Kim Chong Hae exerting considerable influence on the group (Shipper 12/2009, p.59). This in turn put Koreans increasingly at odds with the anti-leftist Japanese authorities. Confronted by the league’s radical left leanings, the occupation forces made their move, and on 8 September 1949 the league was dissolved without preliminary warning by order of the Ministry of Justice. Many leading *Choren* figures were purged; some went underground, others secretly fled to North Korea or others joined the Japanese Communist Party, which survived the suppression (Ryang 1997). The league’s confiscated properties were placed in the hands of the Ministry of Justice, which sold them in 1950–1951 for a total of about $2.47 million. Much of the league’s wealth had consisted of donations by Korean repatriates who had not been able to take their property with them (Rynag 1997, p.82).

Andreas Wimmer argues that nation-states are the product of four closely interconnected processes of institutional closure: a political process (democracy tied to national self-determination), a legal process (citizenship tied to nationality), a military process (universal conscription tied to national citizenship), and a social process (the institutions of the welfare
state linked to the control of the immigration of foreigners) (Wimmer 2002). According to Wimmer, modern institutions of inclusion (such as citizenship, democracy and welfare) are systematically tied to ethnic and national forms of exclusion. The process of nationalising principles of social inclusion and exclusion depends on a successful compromise between new state elites and the various component parts of society: an exchange of guarantees of political loyalty in return for the promise of participation and security (Wimmer 2002). By including classes formerly marginalized by factors such as class or gender, a new state elite can enlarge its power domain in the name of the nation and the well-being of the citizens.

The polarised conditions prevailing during the Cold War effectively served to underscore the vicious circle of Japan’s mono-ethnic discourse, which legitimized the exclusion of colonial subjects and concealed postcolonial histories, while forcing former colonizing and colonized states alike to adopt unitary national identities. Being excluded from the privileged seats in the theatre of society due to their ethnic background, the Zainichi Koreans, who existed as a minority stranded in their former coloniser’s state, found themselves in an extremely difficult position. In Japan they were discriminated against as “history’s refuse” and forced into a pariah-like role. At the same time, despite the fact that the majority of Koreans in Japan originally came from the southern part of Korea, the South Korean government showed little willingness to accept a further return of Koreans from Japan due to its own struggles with poverty, high unemployment and suspicion about the loyalty and ideological inclinations of the Korean diaspora in Japan. Instead, they were scorned by Koreans as “half Japanese” (panchoppari) or “ethnic dropouts”. Born in the state of their former colonial oppressor and speaking Japanese as their native tongue, second-generation Zainichi Koreans in particular found themselves trapped by the joint forces of ethnicity and history, hanging in a limbo between the suzerain and the colonised nation (Kang 2011).

An interesting parallel can be observed by looking at the sons and daughters of recent migrants who have grown up in Britain and find themselves trapped between two worlds: the
traditional culture of their families and a secular society that does not seem to accept them fully (Wiktorowicz 2005, p.88). At this point the factors this paper discussed in the previous section come into play. This is the stage at which individuals enter into the state of identity crisis discussed earlier, seeking answers to the question, “Who am I?” Indeed, the exclusionary policy employed by Japanese elites toward Koreans in Japan immediately after the war not only produced a de-territorialized and distinct identity but also allowed the diaspora to move towards a state of cognitive opening. But only the ‘agents’—those who are more sure about who they are or can interpret what it means to be a member of the larger community—seem able to answer questions of identity; only they possess the key to cognitive opening.

3-2. Framing for legitimate identity

After the end of World War II, the policy towards the Koreans remaining in Japan precisely reflected the Japanese elite’s strong desire for economic recovery. Japanese Prime Minister Yoshida was especially hostile to any suggestion of a military role on the peninsula. In the same way, the first president of South Korea, Syngman Rhee, openly manifested intense anti-Japanese sentiments, an attitude he clung to until his resignation in 1960. Under such conditions, any policy-making toward the Koreans in Japan was exclusionary. According to Harris Mylonas, exclusionary policies aim towards the physical removal of a non-core group from the host state, and policies under this category include population exchange, deportation, internal displacement, pogroms, or even genocide (Mylonas 2012, p.22). In fact, during the era marked by a complete absence of diplomatic relations between Japan and Korea (between 1959 and 1984), more than 93,000 Koreans were repatriated to North Korea while around 6,000 Japanese migrated there with their Korean spouses. (Shipper 12/2009, p.62).

Yoshida’s enthusiasm for mass deportation could not be followed to its logical conclusion during his administration due to his status quo attitude on foreign policy, which he allowed to
remain unchanged while focusing only on domestic economic recovery. However, during the next administration under Prime Minister Hatoyama (1954–56), the issue of repatriation surfaced once more. Hatoyama’s revisionist foreign policy began to open economic links with some of Japan’s communist neighbours, allowing the numerical reduction of Koreans in Japan in other ways—not by deportation, but by encouraging voluntary repatriation to North Korea (Welfield 1988; Schaller 1997). Indeed, the Japanese government was able to get the approval of the United States as well as the International Red Cross for the mass deportation of the Zainichi Korean population to North Korea in the name of humanity. The opportunity to ride on a wave of revisionism coincidently favoured Japan and North Korea in terms of their own aims, and the repatriation movement began in 1955 when the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) announced its intentions to normalize relations with Japan. Simultaneously a communiqué was issued declaring that all Korean residents of Japan were entitled to North Korean citizenship. In September 1958, the North Korean leader Kim Il Sung publicly announced his country’s decision to welcome all Koreans from Japan who wished to return to the bosom of the fatherland, saying that the North Korean government would offer repatriates from Japan free housing, welfare and education (Morris-Suzuki 2010, p.205). The Chongryun, a pro-North Korean ethnic organization, came into existence at that point, acting as the necessary agent to provide alternative views or perspectives which proved to be more receptive for ordinary citizens with previously accepted beliefs. This framing stage offered cognitive tools for making sense of events and experiences by interpreting the causation, evaluating the situation, and offering remedies for those who found themselves trapped in an identity crisis.

When the Korean War broke out in 1950, former members of the radical group Choren established the underground Democratic Front for Unification of Korea (Minsen) on August 15, 1950 (Shipper, 12/2009, p.60). Over the following years the group engaged in a prolonged internal struggle with supporters of communist internationalism who were striving towards revolution in Japan. The group supported these so-called nationalists, who sought to resist
assimilation into Japan and favoured focussing activities first and foremost on Koreans and the
unification of the peninsula under the North Korean initiative (Ryang 1997, p.91). Although the
debate between communist internationalists and nationalists initially did not run in favour of the
Korean nationalist group, a sudden shift in favour came in the wake of an announcement from
Kim Il Sung. Indeed, Minsen’s preoccupation with revolution in Japan seemed to clash with the
North’s revisionist plan to establish diplomatic relations with Japan, and Minsen was dissolved in
1955 when the DPRK announced its intentions to normalize its relationship with Japan. The day
after the dissolution of Minsen, The General Association of Korean Residents in Japan (Chongryun)
was established by Han Duk-su, who had been an activist since coming to Japan as a student in
1927. Han Duk-su had been jailed numerous times for political protest and had been a leading
figure in Choren.

The Chongryun played a role in alleviating the plight of the Zainichi Koreans, who had
found themselves exposed to discrimination, socioeconomic exclusion and political repression
since the end of World War II. Zainichi Koreans were not considered Japanese citizens who
carried much colonial baggage, nor did they represent ethnic minorities who addressed the
demands of various minority groups. Through contact with Chongryun, some of the Zainichi
diaspora who had found themselves trapped in a long-standing rootless existence moved
towards a state of cognitive opening, led to believe that thanks to the wise guidance of great
leaders like Kim Il Sung, they would be able to recover their human dignity as overseas nationals
of the fatherland, even though they were living outside North Korea on Japanese soil. During
the phase of identity crisis, a framing alignment shaped an identity of empowerment for the Zainichi
by offering them a sense of belonging to a new world, or by answering their question “Who am
I?” in ways that reflected answers given to Muslims who immigrate to Western countries: “You
are not Bobby. You belong to a very great nation, Islam, which has a 1,300-year history of
civilization” (Roy 2004). Sonia Ryang has interviewed several first-generation members of
Chongryun, all of whom shared feelings that would be very familiar to Muslim minorities in Western countries:

You may not believe this, but we were prepared to fight for Japan against the Americans. And some Koreans had already volunteered for the front. I cannot believe it myself. But I had received nothing but imperial education. I was even disappointed when Japan was defeated. Dreadful! But thanks to the wise guidance of the Great Leader, I have recovered my human dignity and done away with my humiliating colonial past (Rynag 1997, p.93).

Throughout its history, Chongryun has functioned as an association for overseas North Korean nationals. The organization officially declared that it would recognize Japan’s sovereignty and not try to interfere in Japanese domestic politics. In exchange, Chongryun was allowed to lobby against several bills aimed at restricting political activities of foreign residents in Japan or putting foreigners’ schools under control of the Ministry of Education, as well as various measures limiting the ownership of Pachinko game parlors, many of which are owned by Koreans and constitute a major source of income for Chongryun (Hicks 1997). However, Sonia Ryang explains that Chongryun’s call for all its members to abide by Japanese law is part of a twofold strategy. On one hand, if Chongryun members abide by Japanese law there would be no excuse for the Japanese authorities to persecute them, but on the other the exaggerated warnings of Japanese deportation of Chongryun members to South Korea—where they would subsequently be imprisoned—increased loyalty to the organization.(Ryang, 1997). Indeed, compared with Choren, which was a kind of civil rights organization, Chongryun actually had very little tangible effect in helping Koreans in Japan as far as everyday relations with the Japanese state was concerned. Advances made were mostly in the way the Japanese government dealt with North Korea, or Chongryun as its representative organization. In fact the repatriation movement drawn up by
Chongryun actually had a more tangible effect on the DPRK. As Adamson argues, in order to tie members of a diaspora to their country of origin, successful diaspora entrepreneurs deploy frames emphasizing guilt or obligation, such as sending remittances to family members (Adamson 2013, p.70). Through a mass repatriation of Koreans to the DPRK, Chongryun was easily able to exploit feelings of guilt, obligation or even enthusiasm regarding sending remittances to family members from Zainichi diaspora, which ultimately became what was referred to as Kim Il Sung’s money pipeline.6

The North Korean nationality ascribed to Chongryun Koreans is in fact an entirely manufactured and symbolic identity. Although Pyongyang declared Koreans in Japan citizens of the DPRK, no consular services ever existed and no passports have ever been issued. Chongryun Koreans have never voted in North Korean elections, nor have they been conscripted into the North Korean army (Ryang 1997, p.124). However, the term “overseas nationals of North Korea,” a term central to Chongryun’s legitimate discourse, became an identity that effectively replaced that of the colonial subject. In addition, despite the fact that the majority of Zainichi Koreans had come from the southern regions of Korea, later to become South Korea, they made a choice to become North Korean nationals even though it might result in their inability to return to South Korea, to the traditional provinces where their ancestors had lived.

A comparatively small organization had been formed in October 1945 in opposition to Choren, and was a predecessor to Korean Residents Union in Japan (Mindan) or the pro-South Korean organization formed in 1948 when the newly established anti-communist South Korean government of Syngman Rhee declared itself. This organization, however, was continuously marred by internal factionalism and its power over the Korean community was essentially negligible until the mid-1960s, when Japan and the Republic of Korea normalized relations. In contrast, the framing strategy played by the Chongryun leadership was successful in solidifying Chongryun’s members as North Korean nationals. This framing process was based on the rhetoric that the Great leader Kim Il Sung’s wise guidance had allowed Zainichi Koreans to become
dignified overseas nationals of their fatherland and prevented them from suffering all sorts of oppression by “enemies”—US imperialism, the South Korean puppet regime that was corrupt and oppressive and the Japanese authorities who were assisting them. Accordingly, through an effective framing alignment, the identity of Chongryun Koreans as North Korean nationals was retroactively affixed to their history.

Indeed by early 1955 this rhetoric was overwhelmingly supported by the majority of Zainichi Koreans, and it was estimated by Japanese authorities that about 90 percent of Koreans in Japan supported the northern regime (Shibaaki 1955). Chongryun Koreans were placed in a position of self-contained co-existence with and within the Japanese state, in which they would keep their dialogue with Japanese authorities to the absolute required minimum. This has allowed Chongryun a reasonable degree of autonomy, tacitly created and maintained through bargaining with the Japanese government since 1955. The frequent accommodation policies employed by the Japanese host state during the Cold War era—especially when the US commitment to the Asia-Pacific region became weak—has in fact been driven by this bargaining deal between Japan and the Chongryun diaspora organization under the guidance of Kim Il Sung since North Korea’s own establishment in 1955.

3.3. Learning or persuasion through language and ideology

According to Sonia Ryang, North Korean identity was not as stable from the beginning as we might imagine it would have been; it took years to become fixed and further decades to be reinforced (Ryang, 1997 p.107). How then was Chongryun able to maintain its emotional pressure so successfully and keep a loyal base of members?

Firstly, an institutionalized system of education is the most viable mechanism for the reproduction of cultural signifiers, especially language, which Chongryun deems necessary for the preservation of a Korean identity, and more specifically an identity as overseas citizens of the DPRK. Prior to a drastic revision of the curriculum in 1993, the education in Chongryun schools
since 1955 had been heavily based on the North Korean system which promoted the teaching of the Korean language as it is used in North Korea, the North Korean version of Korean history and knowledge of North Korean society (Ryang, 1997 p.24). Chongryun’s autonomous school education system effectively paved the way for Korean children to receive Korean language education, since there are only a few Mindan schools and Korean ethnic education at Japanese schools is rare, and if available at all is more of a symbolic extracurricular activity (Aoki 2000). Thus the education system legitimizes Chongryun, manifesting itself as a necessity in the eyes of students who wish to preserve a Korean identity despite being Japanese-speaking second, third or fourth generation Korean residents of Japan. The language controlled by Chongryun provides an effective learning mechanism which persuades its own self-perpetuation by encouraging a potential joiner to feel ethnic guilt or a sense of obligation. One interviewee from within the Zainichi diaspora answered my question about their identity. “I think presently only Chongryun Koreans preserve their identity. For us, being Korean is an essential part of what we are; therefore preserving our Korean culture, language and heritage is worthwhile and very important.”

8 The learning mechanism used education to legitimise Chongryun’s claim as the true representative of Koreans in Japan, solidified Chongryun’s members’ identity as North Korean nationals and guaranteed the survival of the organization itself.

The second learning mechanism helps to build a system of ideological formation. Formal education was clearly recognized as a mainstay of establishing and maintaining the hegemony of dominant state ideologies by which the power bloc attempts to retain control. The right and desire to have legitimate ethnic schools be part of formal (compulsory) education were denied (Inoguchi 2000, p.147), but under the new Japanese Constitution, the education of foreigners’ children in Japan could be done independently from the Ministry of Education. Thus Koreans schools became accredited by the Ministry of Education as miscellaneous schools and therefore lost their right to financial assistance from the Japanese government. Paradoxically though, it was advantageous for the Korean schools to remain free from interference. Chongryun school
education openly involves the systematic training of individuals and the implementation of control through study meetings and other tactics (Ryang 1997, p.107). The worship of Kim Il Sung and strict adherence to the rhetoric of his Juche ideology has remained central to all Chongryun cadre education programs since the 1970s. Juche literally means “subject”, although it is often translated as “self-reliance”. According to Kim Il Sung, “establishing Juche means that the people approach the revolution and construction in their own country as masters.” In 1977 a Juche philosophy program was set up at Chongryun’s Korea University in Tokyo for the production of Juche specialists (Ryang 1997, p.107). Most graduates go on to work as officials within Chongryun. Thus the education system, combined with and underscored by Juche ideology, has perpetuated itself into the Chongryun organization, and has maintained its existence by means of learning mechanisms.

Although the suppression of Korean ethnic schools was a move towards securing the Japanese state’s re-formation and hegemony, its exclusionary policy—based on Japan’s post-war nation-building ideology of mono-ethnicity—allowed North Korea supporters within the Zainichi diaspora to create a mono-ethnic Chongryun staffed and run by people who identify themselves as overseas nationals of North Korea. According to Tilly, once a categorical distinction has established between true members of a nation and their diasporic kin, people either side of the boundary have no choice but to organize their routine lives around this distinction (Tilly 1999). Tilly defines this as a process of adaptation—the daily routines such as mutual aid, courtship, political influence and information gathering systems, all are aimed at fortifying nationalism (Tilly 1999, p.174). Once Juche ideology had permeated the Chongryun organization, it became necessary to solidify the logical necessity of the leadership of Kim Il Sung. This was followed by adaptation, which entailed everything from hanging Kim’s portrait in every room of a Chongryun building to the chanting of his praises at the beginning of discussion sessions and study groups. By emphasizing Chongryun activities as being in the service of Kim Il Sung and the fatherland, Chongryun’s officials can use them to appeal to their affiliates’ patriotism.
while self-righteously denying any interest in personal advancement, claiming instead to work for the sake of the fatherland, the nation, and compatriots at large (Ryang 1997, p.102).

3-4. Resource mobilization

Any system of ideological formation, such as Juche ideology and language control, successfully enhances the capabilities of dominant groups or classes to make their own sectional interests appear to others as universal ones. Once they have succeeded in achieving this, the next step is to mobilize resources—human and non-human types. Chongryun’s main activities since its inception have been the establishment of an ethnic Korean education system, the organization of the DPRK-sponsored repatriation movement in the 1960s, the creation of a Korean owned system of banks and credit unions (Chosen Ginko) and the DPRK-Japan Trade Association, as well as maintaining its own publishing houses such as the Chosun Shinbo. Such activities have been mobilized gradually in order to strengthen political ties between Chongryun and North Korea. Simultaneously, Chongryun has begun to represent itself as a North Korea’s “money pipeline,” especially after the collapse of the Soviet Union and the cutbacks in Chinese aid to North Korea (Eberstadt 1996). This has become the subject of extensive debate among US officials, especially concerning the question of how much money is involved and where it goes (to individuals or the regime).

Because of North Korea’s secretive nature, it has been difficult to assess the extent or impact of political interaction between Chongryun and the North Korean government. According to a recent US Congressional research report, Japanese political leaders have avoided confrontation with Chongryun out of fear of provoking reactions from Pyongyang and out of sensitivity to accusations of racial discrimination. The Japanese government’s ambivalent attitude towards the North Korean regime, however, was driven by Japan’s “two-Korea” policy, which has inevitably affected Japan’s treatment of Korean nationals. Rather than referring to this
rather sensitive policy, more relevance was officially accorded to the policy of *Seikei Bunri* (separation of economics from politics), under which Japan officially recognizes the ROK but not the DPRK while allowing Japan to continue to trade with both. With no official normalization between Japan and North Korea, the headquarters of the *Chongryun* has come to be used as a *de facto* embassy for North Korea, which has in turn allowed Japan to promote an accommodation policy by maintaining the cultural specificities of the diaspora group. During the Cold War era, North Korean ideologies became bargaining chips between South Korea and Japan. For Japan, the pro-North Korean diaspora was a useful political instrument when the cohesion of the asymmetric alliance between the US, Japan and South Korea became weak. During the period of normalization between Japan and Communist China (1971–1972), the Japanese government’s approach to the pro-North Korean diaspora group was characterized by a range of policies that could be categorized as accommodation. During this period, for the first time since the end of World War II, the issue of the pro-North Korean residents’ re-entry visas was implemented, allowing them visit North Korea for family reunions even though no diplomatic relations lay in place between Japan and North Korea.

Under the rigid political ties between *Chongryun* and the North Korean government, combined with Japan’s accommodation policy, the system of hard currency flow to North Korea was established. It operated continually until the test launch of the Taepodong missile over Japan in August 1998 by North Korea and the admission by Kim Jong Il in September 2002 that North Korea had abducted several Japanese nationals. Since the mid-1990s, Japan’s defence posture has been significantly affected by the rise of the perceived North Korean threat, provoking a shift from low-profile post-war security policies toward a position as a more normal military actor and US alliance partner (Hughes 2009, p.292).

Recent studies explore how the perceived threat from North Korea has provided Japan with the impetus to enhance its defensive posture (Funabashi 1999; Hughes 2009; Sakata 2011), yet very few studies have tried to explore how much of the material resources for the North
Korean military regime was raised among the diaspora population within Japan, which by that time had become an independent variable by contributing to the North’s missile and nuclear capabilities. This in turn exerted a political and military threat to the solidarity of the US-Japan alliance and pact, thereby threatening to undermine the very foundation of Japan’s post-war security policy. Until the fall of 2002, Japan had been a significant source of North Korea’s foreign exchange and had acted as an important hub for transferring high-tech equipment to North Korea that could be used to develop the North’s nuclear weapons program. Chongryun has been implicated in these transfers as a North Korean agent in various ways.

Remittances from Japan to the DPRK are the North’s single most important source of hard currency. Before Japan’s economic bubble collapsed in the early 1990s, US officials estimated that up $1 billion a year could have been transferred to North Korea from Japan, but by all accounts, that estimate has decreased with the economic downturn in Japan and the death of President Kim Il Sung.\footnote{Most observers now agree with Nicolas Eberstadt’s estimation that even at their peak, remittances generally were below $100 million annually (Eberstadt 1996).} In terms of the main resources for the perpetuation of the remittances, Apichai Shipper argues that the North Korean regime has been effectively utilizing the Koreans who were repatriated to North Korea as an instrument to maximize loyalty from family members who had remained in Japan as members of Chongryun (Shipper 12/2009, p.63). Former residents of Japan who had moved to North Korea between 1959 and 1985 under relocation campaigns regularly receive money and goods from their relatives in Japan as aid packages (Han 2005). In addition, if Chongryun Koreans wanted to invite their repatriated families over to Japan, they had to pay approximately 2 million yen (US $20,000 at the exchange rate of $1:100 yen) for a one-week visit (Ryang 2000; Shipper 12/2009, p.63).

Illegal remittances to North Korea through several credit associations such as Chogin (Korean bank) also contributed heavily to providing financial support for DPRK. The banks were later accused of allowing Pyongyang sympathizers to use fictitious or borrowed names to
create bogus accounts which were then used to channel cash to North Korea whilst offering preferential loans to people who donated large amounts to the North Korean cause (Nishioka 2003). The banks also lent money in excess of collateral, which often took the form of land and buildings either owned by or affiliated with Chongryun. Most of Japan’s Chogin credit unions eventually collapsed when the banks began failing as their non-performing loans increased, necessitating the infusion of public funds to protect ordinary depositors. Japan’s Financial Services Agency authorized the transfer of operations of several failed credit unions to four new lenders with the stipulations that the unions sever ties with Chongryun. More than $3.3 billion in public funds was pumped into the replacement credit unions in 2002 alone.13

The Japanese market was also a major destination for the North Korean government’s suspected drug-running operations. President Bush, in his annual report to Congress, asserted that state agents and enterprises in the North were heavily involved in the narcotics trade. The Mangyongbong passenger ferry that links Japan and North Korea was suspected of carrying illicit shipments of drugs, although the boat’s main purpose was to transport Zainichi Koreans who were visiting their relatives to North Korea. The international drug-trafficking trade between Japan and North Korea may have provided up to $7 billion in cash profit for the North Korean regime.14 According to the Yomiuri newspaper, a North Korean escapee said that he had smuggled narcotics for the regime on the ferry, handing over the goods to Chongryun members who would then pass the drugs on to Japanese gangsters for sale.15 Reported indications of ties between North Korea and the Japanese crime syndicates are on the rise, although documentation of links specifically with Chongryun remains scant.

As well as acting as a money pipeline and being suspected of drugs trafficking, Chongryun has also been involved with at least one other non-ethnic Korean company selling military technology to North Korea. Some Japanese firms associated with Chongryun have been implicated in illicit plans to transfer high-tech equipment to North Korea that could be used to develop the North’s nuclear weapons program. One such example is Meishin, a Tokyo-based trading
company run by members of Chongryun which has admitted that it exported three transformers to North Korea via Thailand, instruments that regulate electrical current and can be used for uranium enrichment as well as missile development. Also, a former North Korean missile scientist testified on May 20, 2003 at a US Senate hearing that more than 90% of the components used in Pyongyang’s missile program had been smuggled in from Japan by Chongryun aboard the Mangyongbong (Shipper 12/2009, p.66). A senior member of a science and technology organization affiliated with Chongryun reportedly coordinated price negotiations and product specifications. After the Japanese Coastguard exchanged fire with and then sank a North Korean spy ship in December 2001, officials discovered Japanese-made radar and other precision devices in the recovered vessel, raising questions about Japanese firms supplying equipment to the DPRK military.

Recently, some critics have suggested that Japanese politicians may intentionally allow the transfer of cash remittances or high-tech material between Chongryun and North Korea to continue, encouraging contact because of the politicians’ own involvement with the Japanese underworld. Such accusations have increased in number since the end of Cold War, yet before that time, government agencies largely ignored the money flow from Japan to North Korea, allowing the ferry links to operate with little enforcement of safety measures and few cargo inspections while allowing Chongryun to maintain its tax-free diplomatic status for years (Nishioka 2003). In 1969 President Park complained to President Richard Nixon, saying that “most of the equipment carried by North Korean guerrillas who have infiltrated South Korea, such as their radios and shoes, are made in Japan. Although we made a protest against this, they continue to sell these items to make a profit.” The record of talks between Nixon and Park Chong Hee suggests that the ambivalent attitude of the Japanese government toward the North Korean regime—encouraged under the two Koreas policy—had contributed to the increasing North Korean threat. In other words, the ambivalent stance toward North Korea had resulted in an accommodation policy towards the pro-Pyongyang Zainichi diaspora, turning a blind eye to the
Chongryun’s role as Kim Il Sung’s money pipeline. This stance continued until the end of 1990s when Japan finally recognized the imminent North Korean threat and moved towards accepting the earlier US proposal for Japan to destroy the pipeline of funds to North Korea. The perceived threat from North Korea converted Japan’s fundamental long term strategic trajectory, allowing the country to move towards becoming a more normal military actor and a partner in the US symmetric alliance.

4. Policy Implications and Conclusion

What lessons can we learn from the examples provided by the Zainichi diaspora? In the case of this specific example, how has the mobilisation of the Zainichi diaspora become a causal feature of structural change? It is important to understand why the pro-North Korean diaspora enjoys a greater degree of mobilization than the pro-South Korea diaspora toward their putative homelands. Like Chongryun, Mindan is also actively engaged in promoting ethnic attachment to South Korea in similar ways, but on a much smaller scale.

Firstly, in terms of education, in 1957, the South Korean government began funding educational programs at Mindan schools to counter propaganda from the North Korean regime aimed at Korean communities in Japan. Unlike Chongryun, however, most Mindan schools are not for the children of Zainichi Koreans, but for the children of South Korean diplomats and businessmen who are temporarily living in Japan.

Secondly, in comparison with Chongryun, the scale of Mindan’s monetary transfer is insignificant. There has been an exchange of gifts and financial assistance between Mindan and the South Korean government. For example, Mindan sent total $52 million to South Korea between 1963 and 1995, which was aimed at supporting of the 1988 Seoul Olympics ($45 million), various construction projects ($2.5 million) and as relief for national disasters in South Korea. Yet the scale remains far less than that between Chongryun and the North Korean regime.
Chongryun sits at the heart of a fund-raising effort that sends at least $100 million to North Korea every year (Eberstadt, 1996). Furthermore, the Mangyongbong, North Korea’s controversial ship, was built only after a Chongryun donation of $32 million for that specific purpose as a gesture of goodwill marking Kim Il Sung’s 80th birthday in 1992. Unlike Chongryun, Mindan do not rely on repatriated families, as members can freely visit and leave South Korea (Shipper 12/2009, p.64).

This situation is intimately related to Japan’s policy toward the divided diaspora populations. Japan’s exclusionary policy toward the Zainichi diaspora and its repatriation program initiated a mobilization mechanism, thereby providing a foundation for the kin of Zainichi diaspora to create a tangible link with North Korea. From the perspective of the Japanese authorities, there was not a great deal of difference between the two countries at first, as Japan had no formal diplomatic ties to either of the Koreas. The Japanese government supported the repatriation program as a way to reduce its own economic stress and to rid the country of ethnic minority residents who were regarded as indigent and vaguely communist (Morris-Suzuki 2007). Furthermore, the Japanese government required Koreans who were repatriated to North Korea to renounce their right to re-entry into Japan when they left. However, the 93,000 Koreans who were repatriated to North Korea between 1959 and 1984 have become instruments by which diaspora entrepreneurs such as Chongryun deploy framing strategies emphasizing guilt or obligation, thereby encouraging the steady flow of remittances to family members.

Japan’s exclusionary policy changed partially in 1965 when Japan and the Republic of Korea normalized relations. Despite the historical antagonism between Japan and South Korea, the US was promoting a strong desire to establish a friendly and cooperative relationship between Japan and South Korea, and supported an early conclusion to the negotiation of the Japan-ROK Treaty in order to lighten the US’s own economic and defence burden in Asia (Okonogi 1985, p.22). In a time of strong alliance cohesion, the 1965 normalization treaty between Japan and South Korea was accompanied by an agreement on the legal status of South
Korean nationals in Japan, under which permanent residence would be granted. The Zainichi Koreans had to prove that they were South Korean nationals individually in order to receive permanent residence status, and most of the pro-North Korean diaspora did not qualify. Only those who registered as allied nationals received permanent resident status in Japan, as well as becoming entitled to rights and benefits that had been previously closed to them. With this status they would be guaranteed protection under Japanese law, they would be exempt from deportation and would be able to enjoy the benefits of Japan’s national health insurance scheme. Indeed the normalization treaty between Japan and South Korea exactly reflected the point at which the external and internal factors coincided to play a key role; the former in a role of encouraging competition within the diaspora and the latter as an enhancement of the external security environment during the Cold War.

At the outset, however, the normalisation treaty was not welcomed by many Zainichi Koreans in Japan. South Korean citizenship was considered little more than a symbol that clearly verified the bearer’s alignment with South Korea over North Korea. The policy was seen as being aimed at producing as many Japanese Koreans as possible who also possessed a South Korean passport, rather than welcoming the diaspora as a whole into Korean co-ethnicity. Having said that, after the treaty was signed many Koreans began officially changing their citizenship, and by 1970 the number of Koreans registered as South Korean nationals had increased to 52%, a figure that is growing to this day (Hicks 1997). This was in sharp contrast to those who did not register as South Korean nationals—the pro-North Korean diaspora. Here, the exclusionary policy set up and maintained a strong link between the Zainichi diaspora and North Korea, whilst holding North Korean Zainichi in a kind of legal limbo until 1982, when Japan created a new category of permanent residence for them under the heading of “exceptional permanent residence”. This meant that Japan had allowed the North Korean diaspora to exist in an ambiguous legal position for 16 years. Japan’s integration policy since 1965 has gradually brought produced a more tangible effect on the relationship between Japanese society and the
Zainichi diaspora, allowing and encouraging its members to gravitate toward South Korea, successfully minimizing their potential for mobilization towards their own homeland.

In contrast, exclusionary policies easily facilitate the mobilisation of social movements against discrimination, at the same time consolidating the identity of ethnic minorities. However, it should be emphasized that social mobilization is not a by-product of something inherent to the cultural system a particular culture has produced. Instead it relates to the loss of a sense of belonging, eventually helping to facilitate a plan to act on natural resentments that have been sparked off by state policies towards particular ethnic groups in the international environment within which they have emerged and have been reproduced. Interesting parallels in the treatment of minorities can be observed from examining the history of Japanese Americans, a similar example of a minority that suffered severely under an exclusionary policy within a host country—the USA. On the eve of World War II, culturally vibrant and stable Nikkei communities (Japanese diaspora) were well rooted in the American Pacific Northwest. All this changed on December 7 1941, when the Japanese attacked the US naval base at Pearl Harbor, bringing the United States into World War II as an enemy of Japan. The end of March 1942 marked the start of the forced confinement of more than 110,000 Japanese Americans by the US army. Two-thirds of those incarcerated were US citizens, while the rest were resident aliens who had been in the country for at least eight years but had been denied the right of naturalization. The American exclusionary policy led to the construction of an identity within the Japanese ethnic community, which organized efforts to protect and promote their collective ethnic interests (Fiset and Nomura 2005, p.11). This process indicates how an eroded and neglected Japanese diaspora community regained its vitality and fought repressive post-war measures imposed upon them by the USA.

It is also obvious that the exclusionary policy resulted from the interstate relations between their homeland and host country. The US entry into World War II not only put interstate relations with Japan onto an enemy footing but also encouraged its policy towards enemy aliens
to become an extremely strict exclusionary one. During World War II, the Japanese diaspora group was considered as a potential enemy whose members may at any moment be called upon by their mother country to take up arms against America. In the post-war period, however—especially in 1952—the McCarran-Walter Act removed race as a barrier to naturalization in the United States (Fiset and Nomura, 2005, p.9). The key issue here is that this act came into force just a year after the US and Japan agreed to sign a security treaty in 1951, along with a subsidiary agreement that authorised US forces to use bases in Japan for Korean operations. The newly emerging interstate alliance between the US and Japan allowed host state, the US, to change its attitude to the Japanese diaspora from a strict exclusionary policy into one of accommodation.

The lessons we should learn from this experience would encourage us to recommend policy makers to pursue policies of accommodation rather than exclusion in order to avoid paying the more expensive cost that exclusionary policies might bring in the long run. Given the fact that there are thousands of minority ethnic groups living in roughly 195 countries today, mostly concentrated in post imperial and post-colonial territories, it is hard to de-politicise such ethnic groups (Mylonas, 2012, p.195). That is why the lessons from the history of the Zainichi diaspora can be used to underline an important recommendation—that state policy makers should enhance interstate alliances through regional integration targeted not only for security and political purposes but also to support moves towards cultural or social cooperation in order to prevent exclusionary policies. In so doing, they will need to prepare a definitive answer to the discussion surrounding the question “who are we?”, and provide positive examples that define what it means to be a member of the larger community in order for diasporic populations not to find themselves gravitating towards a more powerful agent who expresses a greater certainty about their identity.
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