

■ Article]

ENTREMONS. UPF JOURNAL OF WORLD HISTORY
Universitat Pompeu Fabra | Barcelona
Número 6 (gener 2014)
www.entremons.org

The Korean Diaspora in Manchuria – Korean Ambitions, Manchurian Dreams, Japanese Realities

Frank JACOB
Würzburg University
Jacob.m.a84@googlemail.com

abstract

The modern history of Korea was determined by the Japanese expansionist ambitions from the forced opening of the Korean peninsula in 1876 until the end of the Second World War in 1945. Like a red line we can trace these Japanese ambitions; from the discourse about an invasion of Korea (Seikanron) in 1873, bypassing the opening of Korea, the war with China in 1894-1895 and the Russo-Japanese War, which had been fought to gain a hegemonic position in Korea, the Katsura-Taft-agreement, by which the United States and Japan drew the borders of their imperialist aims in Asia, to the step-by-step annexation of the Korean state, which became part of the Japanese empire in 1910. The main aim of the Meiji policy had been the total control of the neighboring country.¹ Between 1905 and 1910 the Japanese government enforced Japanese rights in Korea by decreasing the independent status of the Korean government.² The Koreans themselves were not able to stop this development and the international community was not willing to interfere in favor of the Korean state, even when a delegation attended the peace conference in the Hague in 1907.

keywords

Japan, Korea, Manchuria, diaspora

This was the reason for an increasing diasporic emigration of Korean people, especially to Manchuria, where they found a new home. But this new environment would not remain safe for long. The Koreans, who had been forced to leave, were facing several problems in their new home. The following presentation will outline the situation in their new home in the Manchurian borderlands. First, there will be an analysis of the reasons why the Koreans emigrated to Manchuria.

¹ Deuk-sang Kang, *Chôsen dokuritsu undô no gunzô. Keimô undô kara San-ichi undô he*, (Tôkyô: Aoki Shoten, 1984), 5.

² *Ibid.*, 8.

Furthermore, the new Korean settlers' problems will be outlined. After that, it will be shown that the situation of the emigrated Koreans became a paradoxical one, because most of the Koreans were seen as stateless rebels by the Japanese, and agents of Japan's imperialism by the Chinese and Russian Manchurians.

Due to this situation, the new home was not destined to be a safe one for long. The outbreak of the Wanpaoshan Incident in 1931 changed the whole situation. In Manchuria the different ethnic groups were not able to live in peaceful harmony. That fact provided an opportunity for Japan to interfere in Manchuria as well, because the Japanese saw the Koreans as Japanese citizens and the Manchurian incident was a direct consequence of the tendency to anti-Korean violence in Manchuria. Following a description of the Wanpaoshan Incident, which is mostly unknown in Western historiography, the Japanese position will be taken into consideration. The new home of the Korean emigrants would become a new sphere of Japanese influence. Finally, the Koreans would lose their new home again to the ambitions of the Japanese, but in 1945, when the Japanese had to leave again, most Koreans were forced to leave Manchuria as well. The period of the Korean settler movement in Southern Manchuria came to an end and after 50 years their new home outside the Japanese sphere of influence became dangerous again. But why did the Koreans choose Manchuria in the first place?

The geographical and historical settings

Korea had been of essential importance to Japanese foreign policy since 1868. When Toyotomi Hideyoshi (1537-1598)³ laid the ground for expansionist ambitions, by trying to invade the neighboring country in the late 16th century, and since the forced opening of Japan in 1853, the expansionist forces of Japan demanded a second invasion. As early as 1873, just two decades after Japan's own opening by foreign imperialism, the Japanese government discussed a plan to invade Korea (*seikanron*)⁴. It was decided that the time was not yet suitable, but just three years later Japan became the driving force behind the opening of Korea.

Since the late 1870s Japan had tried to enlarge its influence on the Korean peninsula, which seemed to be to near to Japan's southern island, Kyûshû, where nationalist forces feared an invasion of Japan from southern Korea.⁵ Due to this, the Japanese need for security was the reason for the increasing expansionist engagement in the neighboring country. Japan waged war against China in 1894/95⁶ and against Russia in 1904/05⁷ to protect its influence. The victory against the tsarist empire in 1905 secured the

³ Mary Elizabeth Berry, *Hideyoshi* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982).

⁴ The party voting for an invasion was assembled by Saigô Takamori. Cf. Charles L. Yates, *Saigo Takamori: The Man Behind the Myth* (New York: Kegan Paul International Limited, 1995).

⁵ Due to this fear nationalist tendencies remained tremendously strong in Southern Japan, where secret societies like the Gen'yôsha (Black Ocean Society) demanded a more aggressive Japanese foreign policy. Cf. Frank Jacob, *Die Thule-Gesellschaft und die Kokuryûkai* (Würzburg: Königshausen&Neumann, 2013).

⁶ S. C. M. Paine, *The Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895: Perception, Power, and Primacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

⁷ For a short introduction see Geoffrey Jukes, *The Russo-Japanese War 1904-1905* (Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2002).

unchallenged Japanese control and, as a consequence, several treaties were made in the following years until the final annexation of Korea in 1910 tightened the control over the Korean Hermit Kingdom.⁸

The Korean population was Japanese⁹ step by step and many Koreans left their homes to seek a new fortune in Manchuria. This bordering territory was the homeland of the Manchu, a branch of the Tungusic people, who took over the rule of China and founded the Ching dynasty¹⁰, which ruled the Chinese empire from 1644 until 1912. In 1668 the new rulers prohibited the settlement of common Han Chinese in their homeland in order to secure their base of power, but in the late 19th century this prohibition was abolished and Chinese settlers moved to the northern territory. There they met with fleeing Koreans and Russians, who settled there as a consequence of Russia's expansionist ambitions in the Far East. What developed was a multi-ethnic state, in which Koreans made up the majority in some of the provinces of the Manchurian no-man's-land, and were seen as Japanese subordinates after 1910. Due to this, the Japanese government and especially the military were eager to enforce their influence in this territory, because one had received the Russian rights of the South Manchurian Railway after the end of the Russo-Japanese War. The railway became a tool for Japanese imperialism and the Koreans were used as a scapegoat. The Kwangtung Army¹¹ was willing to create a Japanese sphere of influence in Manchuria as well and provoked the Mukden Incident in 1931¹², after which Manchuria was occupied. Finally, the puppet state of Manchukuo¹³ was created in 1932 to control the area and the Koreans became part of the Japanese empire again. Pan-Asianism, "an ideology that served not only as a basis for early efforts at regional integration in East-Asia, but also as a cloak for expansionism and as a tool for legitimizing Japanese hegemony and colonial rule"¹⁴ was used to justify Japanese rule, because Japan was described as a helping guide who was merely interested in Asian freedom. But there were more aggressive readings of Japanese Pan-Asianism as well, because in truth, Japan was mainly interested in securing its own hegemonic position in Asia. With regard to the development of the Korean diaspora in Manchuria, the Japanese expansionist tendencies and ambitions were responsible for the start of the movement itself as well as the reintegration of the emigrated subordinates into the Japanese colonial empire in

⁸ For a survey of this process see Peter Duus, *The Abacus and the Sword: The Japanese Penetration of Korea* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

⁹ Uchida Jun, *Brokers of Empire: Japanese Settler Colonialism in Korea, 1876-1945* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2011).

¹⁰ Richard Joseph Smith, *China's Cultural Heritage: The Qing Dynasty, 1644-1912* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1994).

¹¹ Bernard Jowett, *The Japanese Army*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 1999).

¹² Long-hsuen Hsu and Chang Ming-kai, *History of the Sino-Japanese War (1937-1945)* (Taipei: Chung Wu Publishing, 1971) gives a detailed introduction on the reasons of the Second Sino-Japanese War.

¹³ Louise Young, *Japan's Total Empire. Manchuria and the Culture of Wartime Imperialism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).

¹⁴ Sven Saaler, "Pan-Asianism in modern Japanese history: overcoming the nation, creating a region, forging an empire," in Victor J. Koschmann and Sven Saaler, Eds. *Pan-Asianism in Modern Japanese History. Colonialism, regionalism and borders* (London/New York: Routledge, 2007): 1-18, quotation 1.

later days. The rule of the Japanese would last until 1945 when the empire met its end, and the Koreans had to face a second diaspora.

Emigration to Manchuria

Manchuria was traditionally a "largely borderless terrain"¹⁵ in the North of Korea to which people could travel free and without restrictions. This free transition was responsible for the creation of "deep historical links between the two regions"¹⁶, which became more attractive with the expansion of the imperialist Japanese ambitions in Korea. Most of the Korean population which decided to leave their home country were peasants who were looking for a better life on their own soil, but critics and opponents were leaving Korea as well to find a new home in the urban centers of Manchuria.¹⁷ The northern border remained uncontrolled and was the easiest route to a non-Japanese future. It was the ideal place for a new home in the north.

Since the last half of the 19th century, when the Qing dynasty abolished the prohibition of 1668 to settle in their traditional homeland, more and more people from China, Korea and Russia moved to a region which was open for reinterpretation and reinvention.¹⁸ Through the Japanese economic expansion, the Korean market became commercialized and there emerged a gap between the powerful, rich landowners and the poor peasants, who were not able to succeed in the transformation process.¹⁹ Due to the Japanese railway construction in Manchuria, many Koreans moved to Manchuria, where they were able to become settling farmers, who were followed by their families and other people who thought they could start a new life following their agrarian tradition.²⁰

By 1910 171,543 Koreans had emigrated to Manchuria, but this number increased to 219,217 by 1919. The annexation of Korea and the Japanization forced many Koreans into exile. Due to this, more and more people left Korea. But they were not just forced; some were even encouraged to provide a reason for a more aggressive Japanese foreign policy in Manchuria, because they would not be just settlers, but Japanese citizens, for whose sake Japan was able to intervene in China. Due to this, between 1932 and 1940 around 732,000 Koreans left for the Northern state of Manchukuo, where

¹⁵ Michael Kim, "The Lost Memories of Empire and Korean Return from Manchuria, 1945-1950: Conceptualizing Manchuria in Modern Korean History." *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 23:2 (2010): 195-223, especially 197.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Hyun Ok Park, *Two Dreams in One Bed: Empire, Social Life, and the Origins of the North Korean Revolution in Manchuria* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005).

¹⁸ Michael Kim, "The Lost Memories of Empire and Korean Return from Manchuria, 1945-1950: Conceptualizing Manchuria in Modern Korean History." *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 23:2 (2010): 195-223, here 205-206.

¹⁹ Gi-Wook Shin, *Peasant Protest & Social Change in Colonial Korea* (Washington: University of Washington Press, 1996), 27-30.

²⁰ Jae Eun Kang, *Manshû no Chôsenjin paruchizan. 1930 nendai no Tôman – Nanman wo chûshin toshite* (Tôkyô: Aoki Shoten, 1993), 17.

their number reached 1,400,000 in 1940. By 1945 over 2,160,000 Koreans were living in Manchuria.²¹

But the Koreans in exile were not just a favorable parameter in the Japanese plans for foreign intervention. Since 1907, when the Korean delegation to The Hague was unsuccessful in convincing the world of Korea's status as a sovereign country, military actions had been taken by several guerilla forces, which were supported by their political leaders, who had emigrated to Manchuria previously. In 1908 up to 1451 incidents were registered.²² The annexation of Korea created another wave of emigration in 1910, as well as the March 1st Movement in 1919. The oppression of the revolutionary movement in Korea after the First World War led to another emigration wave, which was politically motivated.²³

In contrast to this forced emigration, the Japanese started, in the aftermath of the Second World War, to encourage the Koreans to leave their home country. They were seen as a tool of the ambitions of the Japanese to broaden their influence in Manchuria, because the Korean people had been Japanese citizens since 1910. So Japan constructed a Japanese minority in its future target region. In addition to this, the leaving crowds made room for Japanese settlers in Korea. In 1919 alongside the political emigrants many people were supported in their wish for emigration. Consequently, 45,000 Koreans left for the north.²⁴ Japanese contemporary historians went even further when they propagated a singular history of both regions, the so-called *Mansenshi*, after the Russo-Japanese War.²⁵ This propagation made it clear that both regions needed to be unified under Japanese rule. Again, historiography was instrumentalized by the Japanese expansionist ambitions. But despite these constructions of a united ethnic heritage, the situation of the Koreans in their new home in Manchuria was a very paradoxical one.

²¹ Ku Dae-yeol, *Korea under Colonialism: The March First Movement and Anglo-Japanese Relations* (Seoul: Seoul Computer Press, 1985), 17 and Michael Kim, "The Lost Memories of Empire and Korean Return from Manchuria, 1945-1950: Conceptualizing Manchuria in Modern Korean History." *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 23:2 (2010): 195-223, here 203 and 215.

²² Ku Dae-yeol, *Korea under Colonialism: The March First Movement and Anglo-Japanese Relations* (Seoul: Seoul Computer Press, 1985), 3.

²³ For the Movement of March 1st see Deuk-sang Kang, *Chôsen dokuritsu undô no gunzô. Keimô undô kara San-ichi undô he*, (Tôkyô: Aoki Shoten, 1984), 19; Kawase Takaya, *Shokuminchi Chôsen no shûkyô to gakuchi. Teikoku Nihon no manazashi no kôchiku* (Tôkyô: Seikyûsha, 2009), 122-123; Richard S. Kim, "Diasporic Politics and the Globalizing of America: Korean Immigrant Nationalism and the 1919 Philadelphia Korean Congress," en *Asian Diasporas. New Formations, New Conceptions*, ed. Rhacel S. Parreñas and Lok C. D. Siu (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007), 201-224.

²⁴ Ku Dae-yeol, *Korea under Colonialism: The March First Movement and Anglo-Japanese Relations* (Seoul: Seoul Computer Press, 1985), 7.

²⁵ Michael Kim, "The Lost Memories of Empire and Korean Return from Manchuria, 1945-1950: Conceptualizing Manchuria in Modern Korean History." *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 23:2 (2010): 195-223, here 201.

A Paradoxical Situation

The Koreans who sought a new home far away from Japanese rule were successful. They introduced paddy farming in their new area of residence and monopolized the rice trade in a very short time. Having belonged to a traditional agricultural society in former times, the settlers were able to use their broad knowledge of farming to produce a larger amount of rice, which made them prosperous. Regarding the economic importance of the new settlers in the Manchurian borderland, it was not just farmers, but also industrialists, who were interested in this new economic sphere. They invested in new factories and were eager to sell their products to the new market of old customers. In particular, Korean products were successfully exported to the Korean settlers in Manchuria.²⁶

The Manchurian Koreans were good customers, but they were not seen as Koreans in a governmental sense anymore. By 1945 there were up to 600,000 Koreans in Manchuria who were just stateless. They had found a new home far away from the political control of their Japanese enemy, but when the Japanese founded the new multi-ethnic state of Manchukuo after the Manchurian Incident in 1931, these people were not able to be a part of the new state. To become a citizen, they needed to be registered in colonial Korea. Due to the fact that most Koreans had left their homes as a consequence of the annexation, they were not registered there, and now, were unable to become citizens of Manchukuo. Finally, they were stateless again and their home became Japanized once more.²⁷

However, this was not the only paradoxical factor of Korean life in the new homeland. While they had left as suppressed people who were searching for a free home, they were seen by their Chinese and Russian neighbors to be agents of Japanese imperialism in Manchuria. Consequently, the increasing immigration of Korean farmers was considered to be a negative trend for the future of Manchuria itself. In the long run the diasporic situation of Korean people was double-sided. The Koreans lost their home in the south to settle in the north, where they were welcomed with stereotypes regarding the Japanese empire, which made aggressors out of victims. This situation would be responsible for the worsening of the Manchurian position in general. Violence could not be prevented for long.

This trend was increased by cultural differences between the new settlers and the Chinese communities. Even if there had existed long-term relations between China and Korea, the common population feared the new and strange element. The settlers spoke another language, dressed like Koreans, had their own cultural habits and were not willing to integrate in a new state system, but wanted to maintain their own way of living in the new setting. They did not leave Korea to start a promising life in another culture or another country. The settlers had left Korea because they were no longer

²⁶ Michael Kim, "The Lost Memories of Empire and Korean Return from Manchuria, 1945-1950: Conceptualizing Manchuria in Modern Korean History." *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 23:2 (2010): 195-223, especially 220.

²⁷ Ibid.

allowed to be typically Korean in their own country, which had become a victim of Japanese imperialism and Japanization.

The Wanpaoshan Incident

The Wanpaoshan Incident (Manpôzan jiken)²⁸ provided the reason for further Japanese expansion in a northern direction; the Manchurian Incident of 1931. But especially in this case, what happened and what was reported were two totally different stories. Next to the Manchurian city of Changchun, on 1 July 1931 Koreans started to dig out a ditch around the land they had leased from a Chinese broker. The Chinese farmers were angry about these actions and protested, because they thought the ditch would be going through their own land. They met in protest at the ditch, causing the Japanese consular police to fire some shots, but no one was injured.²⁹ The problem was finally not the event itself, but the way the press reported it. Korean and Japanese newspapers embellished the story and people in Korea were informed that many people had died during the incident. This led to an anti-Chinese riot all over Korea and what followed was described by the Chinese Journal P. T. Times on 28 August 1931 as "the most shocking exhibition of mob barbarity in recent history".³⁰

Especially the Chinese traders in Korea – there were 24,000 in 1920 – were the victims of this excessive press campaign. They were attacked, 142 people died all over Korea, 546 were wounded and the economic damage cost 4.1 million Yen. The traders finally decided to leave the hostile environment again.³¹ The vacuum created by their leaving was filled by Japanese and Korean traders, who consequently took over the former Chinese positions.

In Japan, ultranationalist groups like the Black Ocean Society (Gen'yôsha) and the Amur-Society (Kokuryûkai) organized the Mediation Union (Kaiketsu dômeikai), which would provide a solution to the societies' pan-Asianist agenda. The groups longed for a harmonic Manchuria, in which Japan would take the lead over the other ethnic groups. In July the union met around ten times and propagated the idea of a multi-ethnic state in Manchuria.³² Due to this argumentation, the Koreans were used as a reason for Japanese intervention, which would bring peace to Manchuria in general, and the Wanpaoshan region in particular.

²⁸ 21 Shôwa 6 nen, 8 gatsu, 28 nichi kara Shôwa 6 nen 8 gatsu 31 nichi, Gaimushô gaikô shiryôkan B-A-1-1-113; Mansen mondai ni kansuru, 1931, Bôeikenkyûjo, Kaigunshô-kôbun-bikô S6-140-4242; Shimada Toshihiko, *Kantôgun. Zai-Man rikugun no dokusô* (Tôkyô: Chûô Kôronsha, 1965), 99-100; Yamakawa Akira, *Nihon no senreki. Manshû teikoku no tanjô – Kôtei fugi to Kantôgun* (Tôkyô: Gakushû Kenkyûsha, 2001), 49-51.

²⁹ Michael Kim, "The Hidden Impact of the 1931 Post-Wanpaoshan Riots: Credit Risk and the Chinese Commercial Network in Colonial Korea." *Sungkyun Journal of East Asian Studies* 10:2 (2010): 209-227, here 210.

³⁰ 21 Shôwa 6 nen, 8 gatsu, 28 nichi kara Shôwa 6 nen 8 gatsu 31 nichi, Gaimushô gaikô shiryôkan B-A-1-1-113.

³¹ Michael Kim, "The Hidden Impact of the 1931 Post-Wanpaoshan Riots: Credit Risk and the Chinese Commercial Network in Colonial Korea." *Sungkyun Journal of East Asian Studies* 10:2 (2010): 209-227, especially 209-215.

³² Mansen mondai ni kansuru, 1931, Bôeikenkyûjo, Kaigunshô-kôbun-bikô S6-140-4242.

Japan's Instrumentalization of the Manchurian Koreans

The Japanese nationalists and military circles had seen expansion as the only solution to the problem of the growing population. They claimed a more aggressive foreign policy, and the ideas became more radical. Hashimoto Kingorô, a founding member of the Cherry Blossom Society (Sakurakai), a radical secret society whose members belonged to the Japanese military, explained the problem at the end of the 1930s in the following way:

We are like a great crowd of people packed into a small and narrow room, and there are only three doors through which we might escape, namely emigration, advance into world markets, and expansion of territory. The first door, emigration, has been barred to us by the anti-Japanese immigration policies of other countries. The second door, advance into world markets, is being pushed shut by tariff barriers and the abrogation of commercial treaties. What should Japan do when two of the three doors have been closed against her?³³

The members of the Black Ocean society, the Amur-Society, and many other nationalist organizations propagated an indirect expansion by using the ideology of Pan-Asianism as a camouflage for their real aims as well as acting directly by using force. In this context, Pan-Asianism was a "tool for legitimizing Japanese hegemony and colonial rule"³⁴ mainly "based on the Japanese belief that the Japanese share common physical traits with their continental neighbors, Koreans and Chinese, or that they belong to an East Asian world system with historical roots."³⁵

The Japanese believed that Manchuria was a special sphere of Japanese influence, where raw materials could be collected for the economy in Japan, and the South Manchurian Railway of Gotô Shimpei was used as a tool of indirect expansion in this area.³⁶ To secure this area for Japanese interests, the Korean emigrants were used as justification to solve the problem of the Korean peninsula (kanshima mondai) because the emigrated Koreans, who made up almost 60-95% of the Manchurian population in

³³ Hashimoto Kingorô, "The Need for Emigration and Expansion," en *Japan 1931-1945. Militarism, Fascism, Japanism?, Problems in Asian Civilizations*, ed. Ivan Morris (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1963), 64-65, here 64.

³⁴ Sven Saaler, "Pan-Asianism in modern Japanese history: overcoming the nation, creating a region, forging an empire," en *Pan-Asianism in Modern Japanese History. Colonialism, regionalism and borders*, ed. Victor J. Koschmann and Sven Saaler (London/New York: Routledge, 2007), 1-18, here 1.

³⁵ Miwa Kimitada, "Pan-Asianism in modern Japan: nationalism, regionalism and universalism," en *Pan-Asianism in Modern Japanese History. Colonialism, regionalism and borders*, ed. Victor J. Koschmann and Sven Saaler (London/New York: Routledge, 2007), 21-33, here 21.

³⁶ Ramon H. Myers, "Japanese Imperialism in Manchuria: The South Manchuria Railway Company, 1906-1933," en *The Japanese Informal Empire in China, 1895-1937*, ed. Peter Duus et. al. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 101-132, here 125; Yamakawa Akira, *Nihon no senreki. Manshû teikoku no tanjô – Kôtei fugi to Kantôgun* (Tôkyô: Gakushû Kenkyûsha, 2001), 46.

some of the four provinces – especially in the southern provinces of Manchuria the rate was extremely high –, were seen as a dangerous political factor to the north of Japan's borders.³⁷ Uchida Ryôhei, the chair of the Amur-Society, published a memorandum in 1920 in which he asked for Japanese intervention against the Koreans in Siberia and Manchuria. Regarding the nationalist argument of the memorandum, the Korean population was the reason for the unrest in Korea itself.³⁸ Later, in June 1931 the Amur-Society and the Greater Japanese Production Party (Dai-Nihon seisantô) organized meetings with the Manchurian Youth League in Japan, where the Pan-Asianists of both regions met to discuss the foundation of the Pan-Asianist future of Manchuria.³⁹ During this time, Uchida received 50,000 Yen through military channels to make the Manchurian case public and to propagate a needed Japanese interest in this region. By doing this, Uchida maintained a close relationship with the military, which is traceable since 1901, when his society was founded.

Finally, the military decided the fate of Manchuria, which was occupied during the Manchurian Incident⁴⁰ in September 1931, and the creation of Manchukuo put an end to the borderless and informal zone in the north of Korea. Again, the Korean emigrants were caught by Japanese imperialism, which brought them under colonial control again.

Conclusion

All in all, it could be concluded that the Koreans were forced to leave their homes on the Korean peninsula due to the changes enforced by the Japanese rule. They found a new home in Manchuria, a no man's land in the north of Korea. There, the Koreans were able to build new homes, where the more experienced farmers were successful and occupied the economically important field of the rice trade. But the Japanese knew that a sizeable independent Korean population might be a danger to the colonial rule in their home country. Furthermore, the Koreans could be used as a scapegoat for Japanese expansion in this area.

Nationalist societies enforced action against these dangerous factors, and the multi-ethnic region of Manchuria would be united under Japanese hegemony; a thought that was propagated by using Pan-Asian slogans of unity and prosperity. The antagonism of the Korean and Chinese settlers in Manchuria finally laid the ground for another annexation. The Wanpaoshan Incident provided a reason for intervention, and the military started the Manchurian Incident just two months later to put an end to the

³⁷ Jae Eun Kang, *Manshû no Chôsenjin paruchizan. 1930 nendai no Tôman – Nanman wo chûshin toshite* (Tôkyô: Aoki Shoten, 1993), 18.

³⁸ Ku Dae-yeol, *Korea under Colonialism: The March First Movement and Anglo-Japanese Relations* (Seoul: Seoul Computer Press, 1985), 269.

³⁹ Hiroharu Seki, "The Manchurian Incident 1931," en *Japan Erupts. The London Naval Conference and the Manchurian Incident, 1928-1932, Japan's Road to the Pacific War*, ed. James William Morley (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984), 139-230, especially 181-182.

⁴⁰ For the Manchurian Incident see Jae Eun Kang, *Manshû no Chôsenjin paruchizan. 1930 nendai no Tôman – Nanman wo chûshin toshite* (Tôkyô: Aoki Shoten, 1993), 28-29.

independent state in this area. Manchukuo was founded and the Koreans were ruled by the Japanese once again.

It seems ironic that the Koreans, who suffered so much under Japanese rule, were forced to leave the region again after 1945, because the Chinese and Manchurian people thought they had been advocates of the harsh Japanese regime. The collapse of the Japanese empire was responsible for one of the largest migration movements in the aftermath of the Second World War.⁴¹ These experiences were not just Korean, because the Japanese settlers were forced to leave their new homes as well and were now able, possibly for the first time, to better understand the Koreans' fate.⁴² The Korean diaspora was Japanese-made, and the new home in the north was not far away from the Japanese expansionist aims. The Koreans were forced again under suppression, and later experienced again a second forced emigration.

References

Unpublished Sources

21 Shôwa 6 nen, 8 gatsu, 28 nichi kara Shôwa 6 nen 8 gatsu 31 nichi, Gaimushô gaikô shiryôkan B-A-1-1-113.

Mansen mondai ni kansuru, 1931, Bôeikenkyûjo, Kaigunshô-kôbun-bikô S6-140-4242.

Bibliography

Mary Elizabeth Berry, *Hideyoshi* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1982).

Ku Dae-yeol, *Korea under Colonialism: The March First Movement and Anglo-Japanese Relations* (Seoul: Seoul Computer Press, 1985).

Peter Duus, *The Abacus and the Sword: The Japanese Penetration of Korea* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

Fujiwara Tei, *Nagareru hoshi wa ikite iru*. (Tôkyô: Hibiya Shuppansha, 1949).

Hashimoto Kingorô, "The Need for Emigration and Expansion," en *Japan 1931-1945. Militarism, Fascism, Japanism?, Problems in Asian Civilizations*, ed. Ivan Morris (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company, 1963), 64-65.

Hiroharu Seki, "The Manchurian Incident 1931," en *Japan Erupts. The London Naval Conference and the Manchurian Incident, 1928-1932, Japan's Road to the Pacific War*, ed. James William Morley (New York: Columbia University Press, 1984), 139-230.

Long-hsuen Hsu and Chang Ming-kai, *History of the Sino-Japanese War (1937-1945)* (Taipei: Chung Wu Publishing, 1971) gives a detailed introduction on the reasons of the Second Sino Japanese War.

Frank Jacob, *Die Thule-Gesellschaft und die Kokuryûkai* (Würzburg: Königshausen&Neumann, 2013).

⁴¹ Michael Kim, "The Lost Memories of Empire and Korean Return from Manchuria, 1945-1950: Conceptualizing Manchuria in Modern Korean History." *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 23:2 (2010): 195-223, here 203.

⁴² Fujiwara Tei, *Nagareru hoshi wa ikite iru*. (Tôkyô: Hibiya Shuppansha, 1949) is describing the way of Japanese settlers back to Japan after 1945. It seems to be paradox, but due to the harsh memories, the diasporic experiences of the Japanese and Koreans became the same in the aftermath of the collapse of the Japanese empire. Due to this, Fujiwara's book became a bestseller in Korea as well, even it was written by a Japanese.

- Bernard Jowett. *The Japanese Army*, 2 vols. (Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 1999).
- Geoffrey Jukes, *The Russo-Japanese War 1904-1905* (Oxford: Osprey Publishing, 2002).
- Deuk-sang Kang, *Chôsen dokuritsu undô no gunzô. Keimô undô kara San-ichi undô he*, (Tôkyô: Aoki Shoten, 1984).
- Jae Eun Kang, *Manshû no Chôsenjin paruchizan. 1930 nendai no Tôman – Nanman wo chûshin toshite* (Tôkyô: Aoki Shoten, 1993).
- Kawase Takaya, *Shokuminchi Chôsen no shûkyô to gakuchi. Teikoku Nihon no manazashi no kôchiku* (Tôkyô: Seikyûsha, 2009).
- Michael Kim, "The Hidden Impact of the 1931 Post-Wanpaoshan Riots: Credit Risk and the Chinese Commercial Network in Colonial Korea." *Sungkyun Journal of East Asian Studies* 10:2 (2010): 209-227.
- Michael Kim, "The Lost Memories of Empire and Korean Return from Manchuria, 1945-1950: Conceptualizing Manchuria in Modern Korean History." *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* 23:2 (2010): 195-223.
- Richard S. Kim, "Diasporic Politics and the Globalizing of America: Korean Immigrant Nationalism and the 1919 Philadelphia Korean Congress," en *Asian Diasporas. New Formations, New Conceptions*, ed. Rhacel S. Parreñas and Lok C. D. Siu (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007), 201-224.
- Miwa Kimitada, "Pan-Asianism in modern Japan: nationalism, regionalism and universalism," en *Pan-Asianism in Modern Japanese History. Colonialism, regionalism and borders*, ed. Victor J. Koschmann and Sven Saaler (London/New York: Routledge, 2007), 21-33.
- Ramon H. Myers, "Japanese Imperialism in Manchuria: The South Manchuria Railway Company, 1906-1933," en *The Japanese Informal Empire in China, 1895-1937*, ed. Peter Duus et. al. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1989), 101-132.
- S. C. M. Paine, *The Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895: Perception, Power, and Primacy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).
- Hyun Ok Park, *Two Dreams in One Bed: Empire, Social Life, and the Origins of the North Korean Revolution in Manchuria* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005).
- Sven Saaler, "Pan-Asianism in modern Japanese history: overcoming the nation, creating a region, forging an empire," en *Pan-Asianism in Modern Japanese History. Colonialism, regionalism and borders*, ed. Victor J. Koschmann and Sven Saaler (London/New York: Routledge, 2007), 1-18.
- Shimada Toshihiko, *Kantôgun. Zai-Man rikugun no dokusô* (Tôkyô: Chûô Kôronsha, 1965).
- Richard Joseph Smith, *China's Cultural Heritage: The Qing Dynasty, 1644-1912* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1994).
- Gi-Wook Shin, *Peasant Protest & Social Change in Colonial Korea* (Washington: University of Washington Press, 1996).
- Uchida Jun, *Brokers of Empire: Japanese Settler Colonialism in Korea, 1876-1945* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2011).
- Yamakawa Akira, *Nihon no senreki. Manshû teikoku no tanjô – Kôtei fugi to Kantôgun* (Tôkyô: Gakushû Kenkyûsha, 2001).
- Charles L. Yates, *Saigo Takamori: The Man Behind the Myth* (New York: Kegan Paul International Limited, 1995).
- Louise Young, *Japan's Total Empire. Manchuria and the Culture of Wartime Imperialism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).