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1. Introduction

When we look at the Soviet Union and the Japanese empire, it is striking that both states sought to find recognition with the Western powers around the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-05, but two decades later, had constructed an ideology that made it possible to create “occupational legitimacy” without the recognition of these Western powers. Russia and Japan were continually frustrated with the imperialistic hypocrisy of the West that accumulated during the Versailles negotiations in 1919. We can observe a breaking point for the Russians when Europe and the United States intervened in its Civil War (1917-1922) by supporting the “whites”¹. The Japanese government rejected the West when it refused to recognize Japanese occupation in Manchuria. Subsequently in February 1933, Japan left the League of Nations². Given these historical circumstances, it is remarkable how little academic attention has been paid to these two empires and their similarities. Rather, Japan has often been compared to Nazi and fascist regimes of Germany and Italy during the 1930s due to their common fascist state structure³. In a different context, Susan C. Townsend already shows how valuable comparative studies are when one looks at repressive measures in “mainland” Japan in the 1930s and the Soviet regime of Brezhnev in 1964. When we look at the Manchukuo state of 1932-1945, Japanese state-builders were not only informed by their own colonial experiments with nationality, but also by Chinese Republican and Soviet ideas and challenges⁴.

What is more, it would be too simplistic to refer to the Soviet Union as “communist” and the Japanese empire as “fascist”, and therefore ideological opposites. Apart from the fact that ideology is easily oversimplified and overstereotyped, it is also impossible to give a single definition of “an ideology”.

¹ The whites were anti-Bolshevik supporters of the former Tsarist government, landowners and generals


Ideologies themselves have an inherently dialectical character, while complex social processes means that “ideologies overlap, compete and clash, drown or reinforce each other”\(^5\). This means that “communism” would not just only be “communism” since in the Soviet Union, for example, we can find characteristics of nationalism and imperialism too. In the colonial context, Japan used ideologies like Asianism to make an appeal to the societies they occupied. As Ethan Mark shows, Asianism in the interwar period used Marxist-Leninist critiques of Western capitalism and imperialism\(^6\). Although this discussion refers to quite a number of ideas and ideologies, it is important to remember that they are multi-faceted in nature.

In this dissertation I will conduct a comparative analysis between the Soviet Union and Manchukuo in relation to ethnic policies, mainly but not exclusively, in the interwar period. Both colonial powers, Japan and the Soviet Union constructed policies to win support for their government in the territories they “occupied”.

Furthermore, Japan and the Soviet Union both sought ways to deal with the multinational or multicultural nature of their empire in which they were forced to acknowledge and foster ethnic minority rights\(^7\). One can argue that the creation of a multinational policy was almost unrealistic when one considers trends at the time: the disintegration of the multinational Habsburg and Ottoman empires and the rise of ethnically driven nationalism\(^8\). Moreover, during the interwar period, the idea of national self-determination preached by President Woodrow Wilson and Lenin’s appeal to anti-colonialism, made it harder and harder for imperial powers to justify their domination\(^9\). At the same time, there was a need to survive and compete in the capitalist world- or, as in the case of the Soviet Union, to be economically competitive with capitalism. This meant the maximization of territory of the state in


\(^7\) Duara, 2003: 252


order to access resources and markets; building a military and security system; and imperial claims upon territories and people. In addition, the increasing international tension and protectionism during the Great Depression heightened the appeals of notions of imperial autarky and self-sufficiency, a world carved up into exclusive “blocs”.

Manchukuo and the Soviet Union are reflective of a trend where in the inter-war period older colonial relationships in many parts of the world were formed by experiments in limited political or electoral representation, nationalist forms and developmental agendas, as the discourse of a supranational brotherhood. Although this trend opposed traditional imperialist forms, it also had the potential to develop into new modes of domination. In Manchukuo, Pan-Asianism, imperial citizenship, and multi-nationalism were all Japanese expressions of these political forms. In the Soviet Union, sovereignty claims were made upon regions and groups with weak links to the center, and subsequently developed similar political policies.

As Foucault has argued, in order for a government to strengthen itself, it uses techniques and practices that seek to define, regulate, control, mobilize, and expand the capacities of its most basic source of power: bio-power, or what came to be called “population”. Governmentality, which signifies improvement, increase of wealth, health and the welfare of the population become the major goals of the government. The two faces of Manchukuo, both repressive and developmental, were expressed by many modern non-democratic states, like fascist Italy, Nazi Germany, and the Stalinist Soviet Union. Through politics of improvement, a strategy of persuasion was implemented in order to make (imperial) dominance

---


12 Duara, 2003: 24

acceptable, and even desirable\textsuperscript{14}.

As we shall see, crises, whether domestic, international or both, determined to a great deal the creation, shift, or break away from ethnic policies. Therefore, important question to keep in mind are: what did the Soviet Union want from its non-Russians? What did the Manchukuo state want from the non-Japanese? What did the state need them for? But also, what kind of internal and domestic forces challenged the state in such a degree that it needed to secure the loyalty of the peoples?

Regarding the Soviet Union I will deal with the 1920-1930s, whereas for the Japanese I will make a distinction between pre- and post 1937. The distinction between these periods refers to a moment in time when such a crisis occurred, that it affected the state in its treatment of the “ethnically different population”. As we shall see, the Manchukuo state and the Soviet Union seem to have almost gone in opposite directions. The Soviet Union made large concessions to their non-Russian population in the 1920s, whereas the 1930s came to represent a stricter approach. On the other hand, while Japanese were able to have more privileges than the non-Japanese population, such acts became increasingly intolerable after 1937, even though violence against the population persisted. The concessions the Manchukuo state and the Soviet Union made were mostly practically informed- what worked rather than what was from an ideological standpoint “the right thing to do”. What is more, whatever compromise and concessions they made, it would never compromise their power.

Finally I would like to clarify why, from all the territories in the Japanese empire, I chose Manchukuo to be compared to the Soviet Union. Like in the Soviet Union, Manchukuo constituted a contradiction between alliance based on nominal independence and the imperialist power structure. In Korea and Taiwan, Japan forged policies based on assimilation and exclusion. This would have different implications for identity projects, when especially from the 1930s onwards, the imperialization or kominka movements in the colonies sought to make imperial Japanese subjects out of the colonized. These kinds of projects were officially rejected in Manchukuo. Manchukuo was a reflection of global imperialism in the inter-war years, in which

direct rule and exploitation by an outside force gave way to indirect rule, collaborative arrangements with local elites, self-government, quasi independence, and other means to secure imperialist interests\textsuperscript{15}. As we shall see, the Soviet government implemented similar policies.

Although this is a comparative study, the main focus will be on Manchukuo due to a lack of proficiency in Russian as well as length constraints. I hope that despite this, I can offer new and valuable insights concerning ethnic policies created by both states. In the Soviet case, ethnic policies may be less complex than they seem, since the creation of the Soviet state and the establishment of power was much more chaotic than in the case of Manchukuo. What is more, the Soviet Union covered a larger territory with many more ethnic groups. Readers who want to have broader background knowledge, may refer to \textit{A Vision Unfulfilled, Russia and the Soviet Union in the Twentieth Century} (1996)\textsuperscript{16}, and \textit{The Affirmative Action Empire, Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923-1939}\textsuperscript{17}. Regarding Manchukuo, they may refer to \textit{Japan’s Total Empire: Manchuria and the Culture of Wartime Imperialism} (1998)\textsuperscript{18} and \textit{Sovereignty and Authenticity, Manchukuo and the East Asian Modern} (2003)\textsuperscript{19}. The latter two, offer us valuable insights concerning the interaction between “mainland” and “empire”, and the questions of nationalism and modernity in relation to Manchukuo.

\textsuperscript{15} Duara, 2003: 246-247


\textsuperscript{17} Martin, Terry (2001) \textit{The Affirmative Action Empire, Nations and Nationalism in the Soviet Union, 1923-1939}. US: Cornell

\textsuperscript{18} Young, Louis (1998) \textit{Japan’s Total Empire, Manchuria and the Culture of Wartime Imperialism}, ed. Louis Young. US: University of California Press

2. A Soviet Glimpse

One of the ways the Bolsheviks established power and prevented the dissolution of the multinational empire was to find a balance between force and concession. As we shall see, in the short and long term, these measures proved to be successful\textsuperscript{20}. This chapter will focus on the nationality policies the Soviet Union enforced towards its ethnic minority population. The first half of the chapter will focus on the consolidation of Soviet power during the 1920s, and its subsequent concessions in nationality policy. The 1920s will cover the subthemes \textit{Reflections on Nationalism, State Structure and Uneasiness}. The second half of this chapter will focus on the 1930s, which reflects a turning point in the nationality policy of the Soviet Union. The 1930s symbolize a step back in the concessions it made towards its ethnic minority population. This was partly due to domestic and international unrest and pressure, but also by disappointments in the results of its implementation during the 1920s. The 1930s will cover the subthemes \textit{Turning Point} and \textit{Revision and Rehabilitation}.

2.1 The 1920s

\textit{Reflections on Nationalism} The Soviet Union was the first empire in which a positive nationality policy was implemented. The new government was the first of the old European multi-ethnic states to deal with nationalism in such a way. The Soviet government promoted the national consciousness of the ethnic non-Russian minorities, and established for them institutional forms of a nation state\textsuperscript{21}. It is therefore even more interesting to note that when the Bolsheviks came to power in 1917, they had not yet formulated a nationality policy. There was a slogan that propagated the rights of nations to self-determination, but this slogan was created to recruit ethnic support for the socialist revolution, not to provide a model for the governing of a multi-ethnic state. Lenin and Stalin were greatly surprised and disturbed by the unexpected strength of nationalism as a mobilizing force during the


Revolution and the Civil War. The collapse of the Habsburg Empire made even bigger impressions. Lenin and Stalin understood that it was dangerous to be viewed by their population as an empire. This confrontation with nationalism made the Bolsheviks formulate a new nationalities policy, which was implemented in the constitution of 1923. Their ultimate goal was to “assume leadership over what appeared to be the inevitable process of decolonization and carry it out in a manner that would preserve the territorial integrity of the Old Russian Empire”.

Nationalism among the ethnic minorities was thus the driving force in the creation of the nationality policy. Initially, Lenin called nationalism a “bourgeois trick”, in which it had the potential to forge above class alliances in the pursuit of national goals. This meant that it had the potential to undermine the “communist” goal of a world revolution in which all proletariat would be united. Thus the Bolsheviks regarded nationalism as a masking ideology. Even though the Soviet government eventually adopted a policy to encourage nationalism, they remained highly suspicious of it. Despite seeing nationalism as a threat, Lenin and Stalin also argued that by granting the ethnic minorities forms of nationhood, the Soviet state could split the above-class national alliance for statehood. By taking autonomy from the national bourgeoisie, nationalism would eventually transform into Soviet autonomy. Class division would then naturally emerge which would allow the Soviet government to recruit proletarian and peasant support for their socialist agenda.

Stalin argued that nationalism in the Soviet Union would be “national in form, socialist in content”, but did not elaborate on the exact meaning. This was intentional, since the Bolshevik plans for transformation of the country did not allow characteristic religious, legal, ideological, or customary outlooks that could

---

22 Martin, 2001:1-2 and 19-20

23 According to communist rhetoric, class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie would occur over the unequal distribution of means of production. The political, social, and economic conflict between the two classes would lead to a revolution and the subsequent establishment of a communist state with public ownership of the means of production. However, above class alliances would signify an opposite trend in which class struggle did not take place. Consequently, no communist revolution, let alone establishment of a communist state, was secured.

24 Martin, 2001: 4

25 Martin, 2001: 4

26 Martin, 2001: 5
undermine Soviet sovereignty\textsuperscript{27}.

Lenin also saw non-Russian nationalism as a response to Tsarist oppression and therefore he further stimulated distrust of the “Great Russians”. Lenin argued that nationalism of the oppressed had a “democratic content”, in which national grievances could be expressed and therefore needed support. By granting ethnic minorities a degree of autonomy and self-expression, Soviet power would seem “native”, “intimate”, “popular”, and “comprehensible”. In this way, non-Russians would look at Soviet power and her organs as the product of their own efforts and desires. Negative association with foreign rule would be disarmed as native languages would make Soviet power understandable and national cadres who “understood “the way of life, customs, habits of the local population”, would make Soviet power seem indigenous rather than an external Russian imperial force. Nationalism of the oppressor, in other words where the Russians were referred to as Great Power Chauvinists, had to be actively discouraged\textsuperscript{28}. As Terry Martin shows, it is precisely this step that preserved the national structure of an old empire. Although the Soviet Union rejected the idea of a state bearing people, the Russians remained so in a way. Only Russians were not granted their own territory and their own Communist Party. Rather, the party asked the Russians to accept a formally unequal national status to promote unity of the multinational state. The hierarchal distinction between state bearing and colonial peoples was thus “reproduced, but reversed, as the new distinction between the formerly oppressed nationalities and the former great-power nation. Russians were now literally asked to bear the burden of empire by suppressing their national interest and identifying with a non-national affirmative empire.” Martin calls this ironically the “highest stage of Imperialism\textsuperscript{29},\textsuperscript{30}. In this light, it is therefore important to stress that the nationality policy was never an independent Bolshevik

\textsuperscript{27} Martin, 2001: 12-13

\textsuperscript{28} Martin, 2001: 6-12

\textsuperscript{29} The “highest state of imperialism” signifies a condition where it is not the center that suppresses the periphery, but rather itself. It denies itself privileges like a party and territory, to not inflame anti-Russian sentiments but also to preserve the status quo. In this way, it maintains the structure of an empire, while proclaiming its not. The irony is that denial of the existence of an empire is the highest form of developing one

\textsuperscript{30} Martin, 2001: 19-20
goal and many regarded it as a “temporary if necessary evil”\textsuperscript{31}. By creating this policy it sought to prevent the emergence of anti-Russian nationalism and thereby concentrate on other goals like industrialization, nationalization of the means of production, abolition of the market, collectivization of agriculture, and the creation of socialism (abroad)\textsuperscript{32}.

\textit{State Structure} The party was structured in such a way that it had the ability to re-educate, transform and modernize the Soviet citizen. Although the revolution represented a unitary people, the socialist construction recognized their weaknesses. The state became all knowing and an educator that would “lead people out of the darkness into which their continued attachments to the old order and its norms had cast them”\textsuperscript{33}. Goal rationality, like the fusion of a multi-ethnic Soviet identity by the promotion of nationalism or economic reforms such as the NEP, served as a way to legitimate the party’s activities\textsuperscript{34}. It was thanks to the Party that “new nationalities were created out of tribes that had earlier never dreamed of national existence and who transferred in just six years through all the stages of development, which for other peoples required thousands of years”\textsuperscript{35}. It was under this kind of rhetoric that modernization campaigns were started in all national territories: transportation was modernized, public health systems were established, agriculture was mechanized and the economy industrialized\textsuperscript{36}.

Within the Soviet system, political governance was based on the following principles. First and foremost the supportive principle of the autonomy of a national territory that represented a governmental structure. This governmental structure was divided in spheres of competence between federal and republic jurisdiction, but was clearly in favor of the federal. Secondly, a cadres policy where local positions were

\textsuperscript{31} Martin, 2001: 20
\textsuperscript{32} Martin, 2001: 20
\textsuperscript{36} Simon, 1991: 4
opened up to ethnic minorities while important and influential positions were reserved within the republics for Russians and other Slavs. The non-Slavic role within the republics in the federal apparatus was limited while non-Russians were not represented in the Party in proportion to their representation in the total population. Finally, a wide gap existed between the constitutional rights of a union republic within the federal system and the freedom to exercise those rights in “reality.” In a way, these principles were reflective of Lenin’s opinion that “national demands were subordinate to the interests of the class struggle as far as the proletariat was concerned.”

The Soviet government also divided its population between the eastern and western nationalities. This distinction referred not as much to the geographic aspect as the developmental. The majority of the Soviet ethnic minorities were judged to be culturally backward. The western “advanced” nationalities consisted of Ukrainians, Georgians, Armenians, Jews, Germans, and of course, the Russians. Like Takashi Fujitani has shown in his research, and as we shall see in the next chapter, this type of “neo colonial racism” demonstrates that even though the Soviet Empire rejected racism and the hierarchy of races, this did not mean that racism disappeared. “Neo colonial racism” or “inclusionary racism” did not stress the essential inferiority of the eastern nationalities but rather their cultural and historical backwardness. What is more, Marxism-Leninism-Stalinism rested on the theory that the rights and status of a nationality group did not depend on ideals like democracy and equality, but rather on an order of preference by factors such as location, size, stability, and the dominance in the area by a nationality group. Stalin arranged the Soviet nationalities

---

39 Simon, 2001: 21
40 Martin, 2001: 23
hierarchically based on their recognition. Recognition was expressed through the right to a separate flag, a republic anthem, and written constitution\(^{42}\).

When it came to economic policies, these were decided by the Party on a federal level. This resulted in the implementation of a non-equal economic development policy, and therefore many national and autonomous regions suffered from economic inequality\(^{43}\). While not all national minorities faced the same situation throughout the USSR, most of them were unable to protect themselves as they were economically weak, and represented by political elites who depended on the central government. Furthermore, most regions had a population that was no longer dominated by agriculture, but also had not yet produced a proletariat. Although they were no longer illiterate, most of the populace in non-Russian regions were not universally educated. It was under these circumstances that Stalin could expand the command economy\(^{44}\) in accordance with a military model\(^{45}\).

The right to autonomy in the non-Russians territories was subject to two requirements: the issue of the state’s unity was not open to discussion, and the autonomous republic had to recognize the central party leadership’s monopoly on power. Although this meant that no political self-determination could be granted, the impact on the nationalities policy should not be underestimated. All citizens were equal before law and permitted linguistic autonomy and as such non-Russian language literature and media was on the rise\(^{46}\). National elites were trained and promoted to leadership positions in governments, schools, and industry in their new territories. In these territories, the national language was declared the official language of the government and in most cases this made the creation of a written language necessary if one did not yet exist. However, in the technical, agricultural, and economic fields, ethnic minorities remained underrepresented. This can be partly


\(^{43}\) Huttenbach, 1990: 6

\(^{44}\) An economy where supply and price are regulated by the government rather than market forces. Government planners decide which goods and services are produced and how they are distributed


\(^{46}\) Simon, 1991: 3-4
blamed on the fact that it took time to translate educational books into national languages and therefore most of the courses were taught in Russian. As a result, it was mostly Russians who occupied specialist positions. Furthermore, the educational standards in the non-Russian territories were extremely low, especially if they did not have a national script before integration into the Soviet Union47. Despite these setbacks, the Soviets did make genuine efforts to integrate non-Russians into technical schools and colleges. Non-Russians got preferential treatment when it came to enrollment. Based on a quota system, the faculties had to open up spots for non-Russian nationals in their own and Russian territories. The standard for the entrance exams was even lowered for the applicants48. Furthermore, the Soviet state financed and promoted the production of books, journals, newspapers, movies, operas, museums, and folk music ensembles in the non-Russian languages49. Hence, the Soviet government devoted considerable resources to the promotion of national self-consciousness of its non-Russian population. Assimilation policies were even strongly discouraged50. However, this does not mean that there was no surveillance from the government concerning its implementation. When deemed necessary, suppressive or violent measures were taken to prevent the development of a type of national self-consciousness that could have separatists’ tendencies51.

Uneasiness Towards the end of the 1920s, there was a growing uneasiness with the nationality policy and the national self-consciousness that it had promoted. The introduction of national languages developed national identities, but simultaneously differentiated nations from each other52. People became more loyal to their own “nation”, which blocked the path to a unitary state and society, and weakened Soviet patriotism. In this regard, no fusion of nationalities could evolve

47 Simon, 1991: 57
48 Simon, 1991: 54-55
49 Martin, 2001: 1-2
51 Martin, 2001: 22
52 Simon, 1991: 47
with Homo Sovieticus\textsuperscript{53} as its end goal\textsuperscript{54}. A new strategy was proposed, where the Brotherhood of the Peoples was promoted. This campaign sought to actively foster a more multi-ethnic unity. One of the ways of doing this was by visits of non-Russian delegations to Moscow. This city did not represent the capital of Russia, but rather characterized the center of the proletarian revolution\textsuperscript{55}. The Brotherhood of the People was the ideal symbol for the Cultural Revolution, which had started in 1928 and lasted until 1931. The goal of the revolution was to create international proletarian solidarity against internal class enemies and the Great-Power Chauvinists\textsuperscript{56}. Although the Brotherhood of the Peoples stands for an intimate family tie, according to communist theory it was strongly associated with class militancy. It did not try to portray domestic affection, but rather public solidarity. From this period onwards, the actions in the Soviet Union towards ethnic groups varied from establishing, reviving, encouraging, preserving, recognizing, tolerating and nullifying nationalities on the one hand. On the other, nationalities faced internal exile, resettlement, assimilation, expulsion and genocide\textsuperscript{57}. Although the number of disciplinary measures against non-Russian functionaries suspected of “local nationalism” increased considerably after 1927, at the Sixteenth Party Congress in 1930, Stalin continued to propagate that Great Russian Chauvinism was the main threat to the Party concerning the nationalities question. Nevertheless, this standpoint was officially abandoned in late 1933. Stalin declared that the dispute over the “main threat” was “formal” and “pointless”. As a consequence, the media dealt less and less with the threat of Russian nationalism, and more often portrayed the dangers of “local nationalism”, which was now referred to as “bourgeois nationalism”\textsuperscript{58}.

\textsuperscript{53} The idea that the Soviet system was able to create a better kind of human being

\textsuperscript{54} Huttenbach, 1990: 6


\textsuperscript{56} Martin, 2001: 442

\textsuperscript{57} Allworth, 1990: 35-38

2.2 The 1930s

*Turning Point* The 1930s were increasingly dominated by fear, unrest, anxiety and the prospect of war. None of the great promises made during the enthusiastic period (1928-1932) of the First Five-Year-Plan were kept. These included the development of socialism, the elimination of classes, a solution to the nationalities issues, and the surpassing of capitalism. Revolutionary enthusiasm within the Party had died out, while collectivization and famine had destroyed all revolutionary spirit. Furthermore, the emigration movements dramatically confronted the Soviet government with failure of the Piedmont Principle. According to this principle, the western national minorities ought to be attractive communist examples for their ethnic counterparts beyond the Soviet Union. However, they (for examples, Germans and Poles) had been attracted by their respective “home” countries, and had rejected the Soviet fatherland in an embarrassing way. Additionally, the non-Russian territories offered more violent resistance to collectivization than the Russian center. Such resistance was strongest in the border regions. This was at a time when Hitler openly threatened with foreign intervention in order to separate Ukraine from the Soviet Union. The emigration of non-Russian minorities and uprisings worried the government about the loyalty of the non-Russian periphery as well as the security of the border regions. All in all, the gap between the revolutionary utopia and reality was huge. Stalin’s solution was to replace “reality” with an “illusion”. This meant not developing socialism, but declaring it developed. Consequently, this also affected the nationality policy. Whereas in the 1920s Lenin

---


60 Simon, 1991: 148-149

61 Martin, 2001: 321


63 Martin, 2001: 321

64 Simon, 1991: 157
and Stalin created these policies to confront separatist forms of nationalism, in 1933 Stalin stated that the policies had failed:

“I spoke about the vitality of the vestiges of capitalism. One should note that the vestiges of capitalism are much more vital in the realm of nationalities policy than in any other area. They are more vital because they have the possibility to mask themselves very effectively in a national costume”\(^{65}\).

Stalin enforced a nationality policy that assumed the Soviet Union had already entered the phase of national assimilation. The “unreliable” periphery had convinced Stalin that Russians and Russification were more reliable ways of establishing authority than the national elites\(^{66}\). As we shall see, despite repressive measures against separatist movements, the nationality policy kept on promoting national identity\(^{67}\).

**Revision & Rehabilitation** Between 1933 and 1938, the status of the Russian nationality in the RSFSR\(^{68}\) was raised considerably. For the ethnic Russians, this was good news. Most Russians party members resented the fact that they had to make sacrifices for the ethnic minority population\(^{69}\). This meant that ethnic minorities in the Russian Regions of the RSFSR had to accustom themselves to a Russian environment. On the other hand, ethnic Russians could finally feel at home in their own republic\(^{70}\). Nevertheless, this move threatened the foundations of the Soviet nationality question in which Russians suppressed their national self-expression in order not to inflame unrest among the non-Russian population. Stalin was aware of this, and although Russian national self-expression was revived, this did not mean that non-Russian national self-expression was being disregarded. Actually, the promotion of non-Russian identity was reinforced after 1933\(^{71}\). The strategic rehabilitation of Russian culture and nationality was used to emphasize the unifying

----

\(^{65}\) Martin, 2001: 350  
\(^{66}\) Simon, 1991, 138  
\(^{67}\) Martin, 2001: 321  
\(^{68}\) Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic  
\(^{69}\) Martin, 2001: 351  
\(^{70}\) Martin, 2001: 413  
\(^{71}\) Martin, 2001: 394
core of the Soviet Union\textsuperscript{72}. This is what Russian sociologist Nicholas Timasheff called the “Great Retreat”: the gradual abandoning of revolutionary, utopian, social and cultural practices in favor of traditional, often pre-revolutionary beliefs\textsuperscript{73}. The Great Retreat marked a new emphasis on Soviet citizens’ right to assimilate- the right to choose their own identity. At the same time, ethnic minority statutes in their own regions were promoted as well. The right to assimilate tried to tackle some practical problems. Apart from providing a home for the ethnic Russians through the Russification of the RSFSR, there was also a need to stabilize the number of nationalities and their territories to a managable size. The majority of the Soviet nationalities were neither expected nor encouraged to assimilate. Rather, their nationhood was further secured and the deep historic roots of their ethnicity emphasized and celebrated. Nevertheless, we must also not forget that the Soviet government was in a position to make this move. Suppressing Russian nationality and reinforcing non-Russian nationalities in the 1920s was a measure taken to convince the non-Russian population to join the Soviet Union, despite the fact that nationalism was not compatible with the fundamental ideology of the Soviet Empire. After a decade of consolidating power and empire building, the Soviet Union was in a position to revive the Russian nationality. Rather than denouncing nationalism in general, the Soviet state could not get around the fact that nationalism is difficult to eradicate\textsuperscript{74}.

Although non-Russian national self-expression kept on being promoted in the non-Russian territories, this did not mean than the ethnic minorities faced no repressive measures, especially in comparison with the 1920s. Beginning in the 1930s, institutions that had served ethnic minorities were gradually broken down. Ethnic minorities were no longer regarded as a group that was in need of protection and development because of their weakness\textsuperscript{75}. Starting in 1933 and reaching its highest point in 1937-1938, ethnic cleansing and mass arrests and executions among the Soviet Union’s emigrants were performed. They were considered to be disloyal

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{72} Martin, 2001: 353
  \item \textsuperscript{73} Martin, 2001: 414-415
  \item \textsuperscript{74} Martin, 2001: 448
  \item \textsuperscript{75} Simon, 1991: 61
\end{itemize}
because of their national ethnicity alone\textsuperscript{76}. The revival of Russian national self-expression and the status of Russian culture as the unifying core, gave Russian culture a privileged status. In 1934, schools and mass media started introducing new views of history where apart from the history of the socio-economic base, they returned to the instruction of history of nation and states. Old heroes and personalities of Russian history were reintegrated. In practice this meant that Russian history became the history of the Soviet Union, and histories from the ethnic minorities were a mere prehistory of the integration into the Russian Empire and the Soviet Union\textsuperscript{77}. Russian culture and Russian people were now regarded as “great”. Russian culture was the most “progressive culture” and was used to serve as a model for other Soviet nationalities. The reason why Russian culture was deemed so great was because it was linked to closeness with socialism and the dominant role of the Russian proletariat in the October revolution of 1917\textsuperscript{78}. The Russian language became important for everybody to participate in the “greatness” of Russian culture. Non-Russians were demanded to express repeatedly and ritualistically their gratitude to the Russians for their “brotherly help”, as well as their esteem and love for Russian culture\textsuperscript{79}. Anyone opposing this belief was portrayed as a bourgeois nationalist\textsuperscript{80}.

This emphasis on Russian culture was expressed in the rhetoric of the Friendship of the Peoples, which was introduced by Stalin in 1935. The rhetoric, which displayed Soviet patriotism, was created at a time when revolutionary spirit in the Party had disappeared due to the disillusionment of all the unfulfilled promises and terror that had reigned with the start of the late 1920s. This new patriotism was created as a replacement for a revolutionary ideal that no longer existed. Apart from Soviet pride for the homeland, the Friendship of the Peoples was also related to the constant threat of war by “capitalist encirclement”. From 1936, Stalin’s personality cult became part of the Soviet patriotism represented by the Friendship of the

\textsuperscript{76} Martin, 2001: 26-27
\textsuperscript{77} Simon, 1991: 88
\textsuperscript{78} Martin, 2001: 452
\textsuperscript{79} Martin, 2001: 453
\textsuperscript{80} Martin, 2001: 429
Peoples. Russians, Russian culture and the RSFSR were to be the primary power that created and preserved that friendship. Although the Russians became the center of the friendship, they were encouraged to identify with Soviet interests. Russian and Soviet history were made to historically link all the people of the Soviet Union with each other. Russian holidays, anniversaries and celebrations also became part of the rhetoric of the Friendship of the Peoples. Stalin’s language policy made clear on March 13th 1933 that Russian classes in non-Russian schools were to become compulsory. Russian was regarded necessary for mutual contact and relationships among the peoples, the development of cadres in science and technology, and to create a more unitary military. Native-language education did remain compulsory in non-Russian schools and Russian was only to remain a study subject. The goal was bilingualism, or as Terry Martin argues, “at most biculturalism”.

The 1930s was a time when there was a turn away from the Soviet view that nations were modern constructs, towards an emphasis on the deep prehistoric roots of modern nations. We can see this turn clearly in the way people regarded the national exotic. During the 1920s, the excessive use of folklore was regarded as one of the crimes committed by both nationalists and especially Great-Power Chauvinists. With the Friendship campaign of 1935, this concern disappeared and the folkloric and the exotic were uncritically celebrated. This trend also affected the literary world. Where before new works about the revolution had been favored, there was now a renewed interest in the pre-revolutionary “classics” that were devoted to folkloric themes. The purpose was to stress the depth and the historicity of the national culture. Where in the 1920s Brotherhood of the People had stood for international proletarian solidarity against internal class enemies and Great-Power Chauvinists, the Friendship of the
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People emphasized the nationalities “feeling of love” for each other. The emotions that were being stressed were now intimate and personal\textsuperscript{89}. The Great Retreat that introduced the Friendship of the Peoples was characterized by Stalin’s display of affection through paternal concern towards the common people, and the people’s gratitude and love for him\textsuperscript{90}. Purposely, the Friendship of the Peoples was not only portrayed as strong, but also as “indestructible” and “eternal”. The purpose of this was to discourage separatists from dreaming of a future\textsuperscript{91}.

All in all, Soviet nationality policies during the 1920s and 1930s tended to be full of contradiction. Not only regarding ideas themselves, but also with regards to the “daily reality”\textsuperscript{92}. For example, regardless of the fact that Marxist-Leninist dogma states that nationalism is a “bourgeois trick”, nationalities were acknowledged. At the same time, the subsequent nationality policy did not lead to a fusion of nationalities in which above-class national alliance could be split for statehood. The “Great Retreat” of the 1930s marked pre-revolutionary practices in which there was a turn away from the Soviet view that nations were modern constructs, towards an emphasis on the deep prehistoric roots of modern nations. This again went against fundamental Marxist-Leninist beliefs. The Soviet Union was not alone in these kinds of contradictions. As we shall see in the next chapter, the Manchukuo state seems to have been almost a “champion” in this.

\textsuperscript{89} Martin, 2001: 442

\textsuperscript{90} Martin, 2001: 438

\textsuperscript{91} Simon, 1991: 150

\textsuperscript{92} Martin, 2001: 411
3. The Manchukuo Experiment

The Manchukuo state presents us with two faces. Although cruel violence was used against its subjects, Manchukuo was also a developmental state. While it ruthlessly killed and exploited people, the state also provided high levels of investment, succeeded in state building, eliminated banditry, and controlled warlord armies by turning them into the Manchurian army\textsuperscript{93}. Like the Soviet Union, the Manchukuo government tried to find a balance between coercion and concessions, the latter necessary for support for its regime. The conditions under which the Manchukuo state was formed differed from the Soviet Union and therefore present us with different outcomes. Nevertheless, like the Soviet Union, the Manchukuo government tried to see what worked practically and subsequently made concessions where necessary. The main part of this chapter will focus on the (contradictory) policies and institutions the Manchukuo state created in relation to the different ethnic groups during its consolidation of power. I will focus on the subthemes \textit{Formation, Discriminatory Difference, Sovereignty and Propaganda}.

The final part of this chapter focuses on the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese war in 1937, and how this crisis shifted the attitude of the Manchukuo state towards their non-Japanese population. Although the Manchukuo state conducted a multi-ethnic policy in which all races were to be equal, that does not mean racism disappeared but rather that “it could operate even while being disavowed”. With this type of inclusionary racism” people would be incorporated into the hierarchical order rather than exterminated or excluded, which represents “exclusionary racism”. Inclusionary racism would stress the cultural or historical backwardness of the non-Japanese, but not their essential inferiority\textsuperscript{94}. With the formation of the Manchukuo state in 1932, some sort of inclusion of the non-Japanese was necessary, and this certainly affected the institutions, policies and doctrines the Manchukuo state created. Nevertheless, after 1937, the need for inclusion became ever more demanding.

3.1 Beginning and Mid-1930s
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During the 1920s, Japan’s economic growth resulted in great achievements like the production of raw materials, the output of manufactured goods, technological advances and the diversification of its industries. By 1927, eighty-five percent of Japanese foreign investment was in China, and eighty percent of this was in Manchuria. The Japanese controlled the major coal and iron mines, foreign trading and shipping companies, electric supply, and railway lines. One of Japan’s major investments was the South Manchurian Railway Company (SMRC) or Mantetsu, which cost 440 million yen in 1920 alone. Since economic expansion was its major goal, the Japanese government tried to protect its rights and interests in China. Moreover, it sought to increase export and provide further opportunities for investment. Mainstream political parties also earnestly supported the expansion of the empire. Many parties saw it not only as the way to gain equality with the Western imperial powers, but also as a means to gain Western acquiescence in a special sphere of interest. However, Japanese economic dominance in China was tested by the railway development of warlord Zhang Xueliang, who tried to compete with the SMRC, and by the denial of landownership to Japanese nationals. Many Chinese were discouraged and forbidden to lease lands to the Japanese, who used Koreans with Chinese citizenship in Manchuria for this purpose. Since the Koreans who worked on Japanese farms competed with Chinese farmers, the rivalry between the two groups sometimes escalated into violence.

In 1927, General Tanaka Gichii took office as prime minister and pursued a firmer approach in foreign policy than in the years before. Three times in the period of 1927 and 1928, he sent troops to China, initially to protect Japanese citizens and economic interests. In the same period, the Nationalist army, led by charismatic leader Chiang Kaishek, had taken control of central China. The Japanese government
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feared that Chiang Kaishek would expand his forces to Northern China and thereby threaten Japanese privileges. In the period between 1929 and 1932, Japan faced severe economic depression, intense social conflicts, military expansion, and the assassination of prime ministers and leading capitalists. A combination of these factors led to a transformation of the political system in Japan. Independent political parties, business associations, producer cooperatives, labor unions, and tenant unions were replaced by a series of state-controlled mass bodies in order to bring “peace back at home”. The reconstruction of the Japanese economy and society together with the perceived problem of a surplus rural population throughout the Japanese empire, gave rise to the slogan “Manchuria is our lifeline”. Japan hoped to confront this problem through the emigration of Koreans and Japanese and their resettlement in Manchurian cooperative farms. When we look specifically at Manchuria, the Kwantung army started to view their role not simply as defending Japanese interests. They anticipated the army as a group in the front line of the coming war between Japan and the West. They had a mission to build a model of a new society in the areas they occupied.

Finally, partly due to Japan’s victory in the Russo-Japanese war of 1904-05, subsequent public pride soon led to the assumption that Japan should have a leadership role in Asia. Advocates of expansion used Japan’s success story in modernizing the country as an excuse to have a more active role in “civilizing” the more “backward” Asian countries. By harmonizing and incorporating Eastern and Western elements, they considered Japan to be in an outstanding position to help
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China\textsuperscript{105}. Many Japanese also believed they had a responsibility to “civilize” China not only because of the fact that it was a neighboring country, but also because of their intimate historical bonds. These ideas came together in the concept of \textit{dobun doshu}, same culture and same race\textsuperscript{106}. Moreover, the idea that “China is not a state but merely a civilization” became increasingly popular. By arguing that “being merely a civilization, it has no clearly delineated political borders”, the Japanese government could justify expansion and territorial conquest in China\textsuperscript{107}. Despite the fact that Manchuria was overwhelmingly populated by Han- Chinese, and consequently “Sinicized”, it was the historical image of Manchuria as a frontier, a virgin land of “primitive” and hostile people unrelated to the Chinese that bolstered imperialistic claims to the area\textsuperscript{108}.

On September 18, 1931, the Kwantung army blew up a part of the railway track of the southern Manchurian railway. They declared it was the work of Chinese military forces. This self-created incident was then used as an excuse to start attacking Chinese regional armies in the area\textsuperscript{109}. Furthermore, according to a story circulated by Kwantung Army officers, Manchurian Chinese had grown tired of the continuing Chinese civil war and the accompanying destructions. During the 1920s, local Chinese had adopted the slogan \textit{hakyo amin}, “secure the borders, pacify the people”. They demanded that Manchuria was to be separated from China, south of the Great Wall. In 1931 and 1932, Japanese military leaders claimed to be acting in name of this local independence movement\textsuperscript{110}. By December 1931, Japanese forces controlled most of Southern Manchuria. The Kwantung army installed a government
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that consisted of collaborators that included military and civilian elites. These people were attracted by the promise that their own positions would be secured, or even improved. On the long term, these promises were almost never honored, and the reality was that although only 469 out of the 1951 government officials in the Manchukuo government were Japanese, they took up all the important positions. Within the police force, the indigenous people were underrepresented almost twenty to one. Furthermore, large plots of lands were also forcibly confiscated from Chinese farms for Japanese settlers. Chinese who resisted were suppressed with extreme violence. Nevertheless, the Japanese attracted enough allies to quell a possible resistance and the Japanese founded Manchukuo in 1932. Most of the support came from the landed classes who promised loyalty in return for stability and the suppression of communism. With the end of 1933, all “internal” resistance groups were “successfully” destroyed.

Manchukuo was a formal independent nation. In Korea in 1919, Japan was faced with the Korean anti-colonial movement, in which groups in- and outside the regime began to rethink the nature of Japanese expansionism. Faced with the pressures offered by nationalism, the Japanese started adopting pan-Asianist ideologies. Rather than creating a colony, the discourse of pan-Asian liberation and anti-Western imperialism, and alternatively, the idea of national self-determination propagated by Lenin and Woodrow Wilson, led to the decision to forge an independent nation-state that would “acknowledge and support its multi-ethnic nature.”
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acknowledgement of different ethnic groups – on Japanese conditions - on the other, the Japanese hoped that a multi-ethnic state would be a solution towards Japanese imperialism and Chinese nationalism. Furthermore, the proclamation of independence of Manchuria was initially meant to please the League of Nations and to fend off the claims of Chinese nationalists. However, with the failure to get the recognition by the League, Japan played right into the hands of these nationalists. What is more, despite the independent structure of the Manchukuo state, in practice the Japanese maintained full control over the territory.

**Discriminatory Difference** Like Morris-Suzuki acknowledges, Japan, brought to its empire a variety complex and a self-contradictory mass of policies and institutions. These were based on a mix of human sentiments that included the desire of national power and prestige, the impulses of economic exploitation, the survival instincts of the colonial settler populations, bureaucratic fear and ignorance of its own subjects, genuine idealism, but also straightforward violence and greed. From the viewpoint of the colonized, even the most apparent “modernizing” institutions were heavily marked by discriminatory difference.

For instance, unlike Germany, where many intellectuals fled or disassociated themselves from expansionist goals, many Japanese intellectuals actually supported the war by using their time, expertise and money. These intellectuals were (internationally) educated, well traveled, multilingual and cosmopolitan. Japanese scholars and China experts gathered to take up research and planning posts, as well as civilizing missions in the newly formed nation. Strongly influenced by left-wing ideas and often sympathetic to Japanese expansionistic ambitions, Manchukuo was perceived to be the solution to the tense Sino-Japanese relations. According to their logic, the Manchukuo state could both accommodate Japanese economic imperialism and Chinese nationalism. These intellectuals hoped to create a new society of
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“rightfulness” out of the chaos of twentieth century China. Ironically, the civilizing mission turned liberals and radicals, who even supported Chinese nationalism and were not sympathetic to the army, into imperialists. This meant that by supporting the development of Manchukuo, they supported military action against Chinese nationalism.

The cooperative farms embody a second example of one of the self-contradicting institutions created by the Manchukuo state. During the Japanese occupation of Manchuria in 1931, Chinese expressed their social and political discontent by attacking Koreans whom they believed to be assisting the Japanese for decades in penetrating Manchuria. The Manchukuo government feared that Korean refugees of the Chinese attacks would join anti-Japanese forces, who had previously led peasant uprisings in the Kando region. As a solution, agrarian cooperatives were created to protect Korean refugees. Cooperatives were to establish security, protect people from bandits, promote collective rule, and provide services such as transportation, communication, and education. It was believed that improvement in social life would be the ultimate means to discourage peasants from joining anti-Japanese movements. The cooperatives were soon expanded as a means to repress anti-Japanese elements, and separate cooperatives were built for Korean and Chinese residents.

According to Hyun Ok Park, people in the farms were placed into two categories: Manin and Japanese. Referring to the people of Manchukuo, the category Manin included Han Chinese, Manchu’s, and Mongols. The Japanese category consisted of Japanese and Koreans. This categorical distinction seemed to be designed to stress the Manchu origin of the Qing and Manchukuo state. It also sought to combine the ethnic principle of nation building with a territorial principle as the state sought to establish its sovereignty over the “Japanese” as well. Since Japanese were at the top of the hierarchy, the Kwantung army defined the Japanese population
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as model subjects capable of leading the colonization process in Manchuria. Japanese ought not only to defend their territory from the Soviet Union and participate in war in an emergency, but also claimed leadership in its “material and mental aspects”. The Japanese would teach agricultural techniques and management skill to the natives of Manchuria, setting an example to lead a stable and healthy life. By doing so, the Japanese would lay the foundation for Manchukuo and the East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere where modernity would flow from Japan to Manchukuo by the example the immigrants would set\textsuperscript{129}.

Higher up in the ethnic hierarchy, people were believed to have higher and more expensive standards of living. Subsequently this was expressed in the amount of land and the terms of loans which were distributed\textsuperscript{130}. Collective farms built for Chinese tenant differed from those for Koreans and Japanese peasants. Koreans were “second-class subjects”, situated between Chinese and Japanese nationals in which the Koreans had a considerable advantage compared to the Chinese when it came for instance to getting state-loans and larger plots of lands. These loans were used for housing, farm supplies, and collective facilities. This was to transforms tenants into independent cultivators. Furthermore, when Japanese immigrants fell short, Koreans were recruited to live in the (strategic) places meant initially for the Japanese\textsuperscript{131}. This fueled Koreans with a new sense of superiority and contempt for the Chinese and often led to tensions between the two. However, even though Koreans and Japanese were put in the same category there were undoubtedly differences between them. Japanese cooperatives also offered loans, but the amounts and terms were much better than those offered to Korean peasants. Because Koreans were both registered in the Manchurian state register and in the Korean family register, and therefore had “dual nationality”, they had uncertain rights and faced discrimination, had to pay more taxes and had no legal protection. They were unable to join the Manchukuo army and were excluded from high-ranking administrative positions of the Manchukuo state\textsuperscript{132}. In line with the hierarchy, Chinese peasants were the worst off.
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Chinese cooperatives lacked the substantive mechanisms to improve living conditions since they had hardly any access to loans at all\textsuperscript{133}. In general, the cooperatives trapped people into a life that came close to slavery, with practices like high rents and taxes, unpaid labor, and exploitation. Furthermore, the maximization of profits depended largely on the lengthening of hours of work in cultivation, construction of infrastructure such as housing, facilities, roads, and the organization of defense groups\textsuperscript{134}.

The final example of the self-contradictory institutions the Manchukuo state created is represented by the Chinese mass political organization called the Kyowakai, or Concordia Association that was formed in July 1932. Its aim was to become the cornerstone of the newly formed state. The Concordia Association was part of the Kwantung Army, aimed to destroy resistance against the new regime, as well as to further spread its political control over society. The Concordia Association’s main purpose was to create propaganda and information gathering bureaus, as well as complete the network of so-called “peace and preservation committees” that organized cities, town and villages into neighborhood units. These units were collectively responsible for ensuring order within their district\textsuperscript{135}. The association declared to be both anti-capitalist and anti-communist, and tried to overcome class and other divisions by organizing people through their communities. Although the Concordia Association was created to represent the different ethnic communities, it mainly sought the support of the elites of these ethnicities who represented them\textsuperscript{136}. Through the association, people were integrated based on groups like occupation, ethnicity and religion, rather than as individuals. By giving different people and nationalities rights under a state structure, the Concordia Association saw itself as a nation in fashion of the Soviet Union of nationalities\textsuperscript{137}. The Manchukuo state thus borrowed ideas of their (ideological) competitors in their search for legitimacy.

To promote solidarity, so-called “values of communalism” within religion

\textsuperscript{133} Park, 2005: 156


\textsuperscript{135} Young, 1998: 287

\textsuperscript{136} Duara, 2003: 74

\textsuperscript{137} Duara, 2003: 73
were emphasized. This was to celebrate Pan-Asianism, and to support the religious leadership among the people such as the Mongol lamas, the Manchu and Daur Shamans, Buddhist monks, and Confucian moralists\textsuperscript{138}. Other techniques the association used to integrate people into the state structure were meetings, lectures and language classes; records and folksongs; theater and street performances; newspapers, literature and magazines; popular movements, sport events, arts and sciences and social interaction\textsuperscript{139}. The Concordia Association was supposed to be two stages ahead of the old colonial ideas of the nineteenth century, and rejected bourgeois Western-style democracy in favor of a single party system where “representatives truly express the opinions of the multitude; where councils come to a conclusion by unanimity; where people say frankly what they think of officials; where officials get people to understand what they intend to do; and where both the people and the officials cooperate”. It was not only controlled from the center through the appointment of local representatives, but also by political agendas. Despite the fact that the association was supposed to represent the will of the people and ultimately would even replace the Kwantung Army, around the mid-1930s its leadership was changed and it was made into an instrument of the army and government. Consequently, it started focusing more on surveillance and mobilization\textsuperscript{140}.

**Sovereignty** With the rise of Chinese nationalism, the Manchukuo government enforced policies to claim sovereignty over the region. These varied by some degree of governmentality that was represented by detailed censuses and surveys, large scale and complex plans for settlements, attention to hygiene and welfare, the availability of education, drinking water, shelters, and the mobilization of the population for vaccination\textsuperscript{141}. The Kwantung army and the regional power structure also forged alliances with local elites, redemptive societies, and the old power structure.
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Although the allies had little choice given the reality of Japanese military power, it was also clear to the Japanese that some kind of autonomous status was necessary to maintain the alliance\textsuperscript{142}.

One of the most important alliances the Manchukuo government forged was with the redemptive societies. These societies had been suppressed during the Northern expedition of the Chinese nationalists and by Chinese warlords. This presented the Japanese with a timely opportunity to gather support. Furthermore, the restoration of the imperial institution, which was represented by the installment of Emperor Puyi on the throne, seemed very important to most of the redemptive societies and thus served the Japanese cause\textsuperscript{143}. Not only were these societies able to continue their work, but they also appeared stronger than they had ever been during the time of the Japanese occupation in Manchukuo\textsuperscript{144}. This move by the Manchukuo government is fascinating, since redemptive societies in Japan in the 1930s were attacked. Their ideologies sometimes competed with sovereignty claims presented by the state and as such could be a force of anti-government resistance. Despite bureaucrats in the Manchukuo government expressing doubts, these societies were far too important for the political projects to be disregarded. Not only were they more effective in mobilizing people than civic organizations\textsuperscript{145}, they were also believed to embody the Asiatic characteristic of agrarian communitarianism that represented the spirit of all national and ethnic groups in Asia\textsuperscript{146}. The government believed that it could change the redemptive societies into departments that were engaged in welfare, enlightenment, and control of the people, while at the same time suppressing its “superstitious” nature\textsuperscript{147}. By leaving this kind of organizations and power structure intact, and transforming them for their own benefit, the Manchukuo government could thus have a “traditional” kind of legitimacy. So just like the Soviet Union
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allowed nationalism to gain support while remaining suspicious of it, the Japanese
boosted the redemptive societies in Manchukuo.

Finally, faced with Chinese nationalist claims on the area, the Manchukuo
government created doctrines to not only appeal to the ethnic minorities living there,
but also in a way to convince themselves of their “rightfulness”. One of the ideas was
the “kingly way” or _odo_. The kingly way was based on the classical Confucian idea
of sage statesmanship. Imperial rule was thus assumed by the ruler as an intermediary
between heaven and earth. The Japanese government used the kingly way to justify
the restoration of the overthrown Qing emperor Puyi onto the Manchurian throne.
The Japanese ministers of Puyi in the Manchukuo government would oversee the
“realization of the Confucian ideal of the society of great unity” (_daido_), by claiming
“to protect the livelihood of the people”. Accordingly, if enlightened absolutism was
represented by the kingly way, feudal institutions of oppressions could be
transformed into instruments of liberation\(^{148}\). In short, this represented the conviction
that traditional ideas and practices could be used again and transformed to serve as a
source of legitimacy. Bound to the kingly way was the idea of local self-government
(_jichi_). “The ideal society of great unity” was only achieved when people lived by
self-governance alone. When this phase was achieved, people would be living in a
self-sufficient and self-regulating society. The monarch could withdraw from the
government and would not be deemed necessary anymore. Nevertheless, when the
people failed to achieve and preserve welfare, the government was needed to
strengthen the powers of the local self-governing institutions\(^{149}\). By intentionally
keeping the conditions of self-governance vague, the Manchukuo government had a
permit to rule according to its wishes while at the same time claiming to have the
interest of the people at heart.

The idea of racial harmony (*minzoku kyowa*) was used to further legitimize
Japanese rule in Manchukuo. According to this racial harmony principle, “Chinese,
Manchus, Mongols, Koreans and Japanese would cooperate as equal citizens in a
self-governing unit”. Within this multiracial political structure, Chinese and Japanese
would be able to “mix harmoniously into a single society, where human beings loved
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one another, and which would bring to reality the ideal of coexistence and co-prosperity.” This might be compared to the idea of fusion and Friendship of the Peoples propagated in the Soviet Union during the 1920s and 1930s. In the creation of the Manchukuo identity, Manchukuo state-builders did recognize the importance of identity formation for mobilization purposes and domestic and international sovereignty claims. However, they could not build a strong nationalist identity that either excluded the interest of Japan or compromised the colonial sense of superiority among Japanese in the region. Therefore the identity that they created was weakly territorial, expressed in the ethnic nationality framework, in Asian civilization forms, and in “the spatial representation of a frontier nation build around the forest”. In order to appeal to the Chinese population, the state allowed Asian civilizational forms like Confucianism and redemptive societies. On the other hand, the representation of Manchukuo as a natural frontier was meant to limit Chinese claims on the region and promote the Japanese as caretakers of the autochthonous peoples and their “primitive” culture. While different efforts were made to harmonize the contradictory conceptions of authenticity, the Manchukuo government seems to have juggled them most of the time.

For example, although society in Manchukuo was heavily influenced by Chinese culture, and also was inhabited by a large population of Han-Chinese, the idea of harmony among the races required the state to reverse this process of “Sinicization” and to create “pure” races in order to enforce the program. In the ethnic classification system, Japanese and Koreans represented the Southern Tangus; the Daur, the Solon, the Yellow River Tangus, and Shandong peoples represented the Mongol Tangus; the Manchu, the Goldi represented the Manchurian Tangus; and the Oroqen represented the Siberian Tangus. This Tanguisic or Pan-North-Asian people theory was copied from the Ural-Altaic thesis that was popular in Russia and Europe in the 19th century. Customs, language and religious practices like shamanism were categorized into this theory of common racial origins. The theory could on the
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one hand be used to legitimize Japanese rule by claiming it had roots in Northeast Asia, while at the same time it could claim its superiority\textsuperscript{153}.

Like Duara shows in his research, the identity creation to limit Chinese claims while at the same time represent the Japanese as caretakers of the ethnic minorities, shows clearly in the case of the Oroque tribe. The basic tribal strategy of the Manchukuo state was to isolate and concentrate them. The Oroque, who had become agriculturist under Han influence, were moved from farmland and forbidden to practice agriculture and marriage with other people. This policy did not only isolate them, it also sought to return them to their “primitive” status\textsuperscript{154}. Furthermore, the Oroquen were labeled and forced to live by an identity, even though the reality of their lives was dramatically different. In order to protect the border, the Manchukuo state forced the Oroquen to undergo two months of military training each. This training was carried out simultaneously with the hunting season and consequently led to a decline in their income. Ironically, these kinds of state intrusions took place at a time when the Manchukuo government claimed to “preserve their original culture”\textsuperscript{155}.

\textit{Propaganda} In order to spread ideas like the kingly way and racial harmony, propaganda such as leaflets and pamphlets, along with radio and movie broadcasts were extensively utilized\textsuperscript{156}. During the celebration of foundation day for example, the media was used intensively in order to foster a Manchurian identity among the local people. There were performances of the national anthem, flag- and military parades. Honoring of the war dead was also conducted, however, only to commemorate the fallen Japanese soldiers\textsuperscript{157}. Because the government in Manchukuo faced Chinese counterpropaganda produced by the Communists and Nationalists, it felt it needed to have a tight control over what kind of propaganda was to be
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produced. Therefore, it was important to not propagate contradicting messages\textsuperscript{158}. The Manchukuo state, however, did hardly any research on the effectiveness of the propaganda and discourses that the state produced among its target population\textsuperscript{159}. Even if such surveys were conducted, government officials disregarded them as “unimportant”, and considered their own vision to be more valuable to the creation of policies and propaganda\textsuperscript{160}. What perhaps illustrates this point the best, is the propaganda poster created for “miss Manchuria”. The girl in the poster was a Japanese girl, wearing traditional Chinese clothes, convincing her audience to be “Chinese”. Thus not even policy makers and the majority of the important positions in the government were filled by Japanese, even models for propaganda were Japanese. This shows the lack of dialogue between the ethnic minorities living in Manchuria when it comes to policies and ideas directly affecting them\textsuperscript{161}.

Since policies and propaganda were created in isolation from the ethnic minorities, they show very low effectiveness rates. Propaganda that was spread among the population tended to be disorganized and dissatisfying. Most of the messages propagated were hard to follow for the civilian population, and worse, could be counter effective\textsuperscript{162}. Posters and pamphlets contained weird sentences, often literally translated from Japanese to Chinese. Even though most of the people were illiterate, supposing that they could read, the message would simply not come across
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anyway. In addition, due to the poor behavior of the military, barbaric actions against the civilian population were not uncommon. Moreover, due to bureaucratic and racist arrogance, Japanese found it difficult to sympathize, or even empathize, with the Asians they claimed to liberate. The result was an indigenous society that saw no reason to support and fight for the Japanese. Since there was no widespread sense of identification with the Manchukuo state, the army faced difficulties when they tried to mobilize troops with the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese war in 1937. The non-Japanese population saw no need to defend “a country” that had plunged them into a war in the first place.

Even though there was such a strong split between “reality” and the policies the Manchukuo government preached and implemented with regards to the indigenous population, this “reality” was in a sense irrelevant. The Japanese measured the value of their actions by the attempt itself. By telling themselves that they were working for the good of the Chinese masses, even the most progressive Japanese had trouble in seeing that the benefits of the colonial progress in Manchukuo were mainly enjoyed by themselves.

3.2 1937 Onwards

Generally we can see three periods of governance in the Manchukuo state between 1931-1945. In 1931-1936, the Guangdong Army was relatively receptive to the Japanese utopian and visionary groups based in Manchuria. This does not mean that there was no establishment of Japanese dominance, but rather that there was an independence of Manchukuo from Japanese government interference and Zaibatsu capitalists. From the mid-1930s, bureaucrats from Japan arrived in Manchukuo to
increase their influence, and by 1936 the government announced the first series of five-year plans. These were extensive state control plans to build up the industry and commerce that was needed in the increasingly hostile and warlike world. Within this time frame, perhaps the largest shifts in policies came with the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese war in 1937. As the war intensified, the Manchukuo regime became ever more committed to mobilizing the population, regardless of ethnicity, for its political, economic, and ideological projects. This move was necessary since even though Japan brought under control most of China’s major cities, industry, international trade, and productive farmland, it was never able to quell resistance that was mostly represented by Chinese Nationalists and Communists. China became a region that consumed large amounts of Japan’s military resources.

Despite the trend towards inclusionary racism and reliance on the non-Japanese population in Manchukuo, where one would expect a closer compliance by the government to their ideology of the kingly way and racial harmony, the opposite happened. Official events focused more on superiority of the Japanese culture and less on Manchu identity. Emperor Puyi, who was initially considered equal to the Japanese emperor, became increasingly subordinated. He worshipped at the holy shrines of Ise, and in 1939 a shrine for Ameterasu was installed in his palace. In 1940, Puyi underwent a ritual rebirth from the womb of Ameterasu that made him the Japanese goddess where the Japanese emperor is claimed to be descendants of.

---
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younger half brother of the Japanese emperor\textsuperscript{174}. Nevertheless, whereas the idea of racial harmony stressed the common roots the Japanese had with the people living in Northeast Asia and therefore their claim on sovereignty in the region, the rebirth of emperor Puyi as a half brother also signified the inclusion of the “non-Japanese” in the Japanese “bloodline”. People in Manchukuo now represented Japan’s subpopulation. This act is consistent with the inclusionary policies of the post-1937 period throughout the empire\textsuperscript{175}.

Like Fujitani shows, with the wartime conditions changing around the Empire, not only in Korea but also in Manchukuo the population was targeted as human beings, in which acts of governmentality sought to make people healthy, reproductive and long lived\textsuperscript{176}. Health became a key issue in the government line, since the likeliness of war increased in 1935. In every city free clinics were established. Through sport events, the government hoped not only to improve health, but also to foster a “Manchukuo identity” among the people. This was an important step, since in 1938 military service became obligatory\textsuperscript{177}. From April 1937 onwards, the Concordia Youth League started compulsorily mobilization of all youths aged sixteen to nineteen\textsuperscript{178}. There were also forces working for autonomy within the power structure in Manchukuo. The Kwantung army attacked special rights for Japanese, like in 1936 when extraterritorial rights and a series of privileges were abolished\textsuperscript{179}. Nevertheless, this did not mean Japanese and non-Japanese faced equal measures from that point onwards, nor does it mean that violence against the population disappeared\textsuperscript{180}. What is more, although Japanese privileges were abandoned, this gesture pales in comparison to the growing subordination of Manchukuo to the expanding Japanese
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war machine\textsuperscript{181}. With the war and the increase in industrial production, inflation and taxes began to burden people. Especially after the outbreak in the Pacific War in 1941, living standards were extremely reduced, particularly among the Chinese population. In 1939 for every 100 yuan a Japanese earned, a Chinese worker only made 29 yuan.\textsuperscript{182} In military school where Japanese consumed rice, Chinese ate sorghum\textsuperscript{183}.

The Concordia Association also became increasingly involved in the war efforts. During the forties its most important function was to encourage unrealistic increases in factory production while making sure that the workers did not rebel under the harsh conditions\textsuperscript{184}. Religious and redemptive societies were also used for this goal. However, the societies showed little comprehension of the goals of the mobilization campaign and therefore refused to cooperate. Subsequently the authorities planned to change the format and use seminars and lectures to teach the activists of the redemptive societies. During the war years, the regime depended on balancing support from redemptive societies and cooperatives, while developing industrialization projects that where in line with its state-building goals\textsuperscript{185}. When Japan’s iron grip on the country grew stronger, Chinese “collaborators” grew hostile towards the Japanese. Many started to express their loyalty to China and complained that they were being kept in office by force. Manchurian soldiers were first happy to be reorganized into the Manchukuo army due to their inclusion in the state, but grew hostile when they had to fight against the Chinese. They expressed their dissatisfaction by defecting weapons or passing them on to the Chinese. Chinese businessmen, bankers, teachers and doctors living in Manchukuo were unified in their dislike of the Manchukuo government\textsuperscript{186}.

Despite the growing hostility towards the Manchukuo government, support of the non-Japanese population remained crucial to the Manchukuo state. Nevertheless, the state also viewed them with suspicion and caution. From 1939, all Koreans who
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wanted to immigrate to Manchuria had to demonstrate their political purity\textsuperscript{187}, and groups that refused to follow the official government line were dissolved\textsuperscript{188}. This was not without reason since after 1933 the Soviet Union supported Chinese Communist attacks against the Japanese. In the Korean-dominated Jiandao, communist-led uprising were brutally suppressed. Whole villages were wiped out, including the killing of 2500 villagers in the Pingtingshan massacre. The Japanese government allowed germ warfare experimentation in Manchuria and elsewhere in China. In Harbin located unit 731, 3000 people died between 1937 and 1945\textsuperscript{189}. It is important to remember that the dual approach of some sort of form of governmentality, as well as the elaborately planned isolation of peasants in hamlets, the cold-blooded science of human experimentation with lethal bacteria, and the mobilization of the population for a deadly war, were expressed by most modern nondemocratic regimes of the inter-war years. This duality was also expressed by fascist Italy, Nazi Germany, and the Stalinist Soviet Union\textsuperscript{190}. Nonetheless, the contradiction between sovereignty claims by the Manchukuo state and the imperialist power structure became more and more intolerable over the war years. This was especially evident with the outbreak of the Pacific war, as the entire enterprise started to fall apart\textsuperscript{191}. Manchukuo ended “as a strong-military fascist-state that represented only itself”\textsuperscript{192}.
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4. Conclusion

The Soviet Union and the Manchukuo state were constructed as nation-states, in which developmental, modernization, and industrial programs were enforced. The question Duara rightfully asks is whether such forms of state building and governmentality could develop without referring to the identities and the loyalties of its citizens\(^{193}\). Not to mention the pressure of internal and external forms of nationalist movements, and the idea of national self-determination. As the previous chapters have shown, the way the Soviet Union and the Manchukuo state dealt with ethnic groups, and the way they subsequently enforced policies, were to a great deal dependent on the domestic and/or international “crisis” in which they were created. It was also “crisis” that would enforce revision on their ethnic policies years later.

The Manchukuo state and the Soviet Union went in almost opposite directions when it comes to the way they handled their ethnic population. The Soviet Union was the result of years of Civil War. Not only Bolshevik and anti-Bolshevik forces combated each other. Different groups around the Russian Empire, who were influenced by ideas of national self-determination, also started to rethink their relation towards the Kremlin. In order for the Bolsheviks to preserve the territorial integrity of the previous regime, they adopted the slogan of national self-determination. This was to recruit ethnic support for the revolution. Naturally, when the Soviet Union was created in 1922, the Soviet government had to secure the national identities of their ethnic minority population as well as to suppress Russian nationalism in order not to inflame anti-Russian sentiments. Only then could the Soviet Union claim sovereignty over these groups of people. The Soviet government put considerable resources into the promotion of national self-consciousness of its non-Russian population, even though this meant that they had to betray the Marxist-Leninist ideology that stated that nationalism was a “bourgeois trick”.

Unrest, anxiety, the prospect of war, and the inability of the Soviet government to live up its revolutionary promises marked the 1930s. Local nationalism prevented the path to a unitary state and society, emigration movements rejected the Soviet fatherland, and border regions resisted strongly to collectivization. The split between revolutionary utopia and reality was significant. Stalin was
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convinced that Russian and Russification were more reliable ways of establishing authority. The Russian nationality was revived, and Russian culture and language were used to emphasize the unifying core of the Soviet Union. Subsequently this gave Russian culture a privileged status. Nevertheless, despite the revision of the nationality policy, the national identity among the ethnic minorities kept on being promoted. Bilingualism or biculturalism was the goal at most.

Alternatively, Manchukuo presents us with a totally different image. During the 1920s, Japan had already become a major economic and military power in the Manchurian region. However, economic competition and sovereignty claims over the region presented by the Chinese, and the transformation of the political system in Japan due to domestic social and global economic crisis, changed Japan’s approach towards Manchuria. Together with the perceived problem of a surplus rural population, and the superior feeling amongst Japanese towards their Asian counterparts, the Japanese government could justify its territorial conquest of Manchuria. Manchukuo was founded in 1932 as an independent multi-ethnic nation. This was to fend off claims by the Chinese, to seek recognition by the League of Nations, and to give consideration to the discourse of pan-Asian liberation, anti-Western imperialism, and right to self-determination. The threat to the sovereignty of the Manchukuo state was mostly external and presented by Chinese Communists and Nationalists and to some degree the Soviet Union, as in 1933 all internal resistance groups were suppressed. After all, Manchukuo was integrated into the Japanese Empire by force, and consequently no great concessions had to be made toward the non-Japanese population to claim sovereignty.

In contrast to the Soviet Union, the Manchukuo state subsequently constructed an identity rather than giving acknowledgment to an identity that already existed. Notably since Manchuria was mostly populated by Han-Chinese, Manchurian nationalism hardly existed. Although the forged “Manchurian” identity was claimed to represent equality among the different ethnicities, Manchukuo state-builders could not build a strong nationalist identity that either excluded the interest of Japan or compromised the colonial sense of superiority among the Japanese in the region. Consequently, the forged identity was weakly territorial and sought to appeal to the Chinese on the one hand, while limiting Chinese claims on the region on the other. Needless to say, such a constructed identity did not gain much following among the non-Japanese population. This is especially evident when one considers
the discriminatory policies and institutions such as cooperative farms, the tribal policy towards the Oroquen, and the barbaric actions against the civilian population.

With the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese war in 1937, the Manchukuo state was forced to mobilize their population regardless of ethnicity. Such kind of mobilization for war could not take place without downplay of vulgar racism, and the inclusion of the non-Japanese as Japan’s sub-population. Governmentality, such as the establishment of free clinics, sought to make people healthy, reproductive, and long lived. Extraterritorial rights and privileges for Japanese were abandoned. Whereas mobilization for the war meant a more inclusionary policy towards its non-Japanese population, alternatively, it was also the ongoing war that made sure these people kept on being exploited and violated.

Despite the fact that the differences between Manchukuo and the Soviet Union are obvious, it is also possible to draw some parallels between the two. Both governments made concessions in the sense of what worked, rather than what was ideologically the “right thing to do”. In order to concentrate on goals like industrialization, modernization as well as sovereignty claims, both countries encouraged policies that went against their fundamental beliefs. The Soviet Union encouraged nationalism; alternatively, the Manchukuo state supported the redemptive societies for mobilization purposes, even though these societies were suppressed in Japan. The Soviet Union and Manchukuo government were both suspicious of nationalism and the redemptive societies respectively, since they could offer forms of anti-government resistance. Nationalism and the redemptive societies were boosted by the argument that under state supervision their nature could be changed. The Manchukuo government believed that it could suppress its superstitious nature while change the redemptive societies into departments engaged in welfare, enlightenment, and control of the people. Alternatively, the Soviet government hoped that by granting people forms of nationhood, it could split above-class alliances for statehood. But the Manchukuo state might have gone even one step further. In the Concordia Association, it borrowed ideas of their ideological competitor, the Soviet Union. The association saw itself as a nation in fashion of the Soviet Union of nationalities, by giving “people and nationalities rights under a state structure”.

When it comes to the status quo of the dominant ethnic group, the Russians and Japanese, we can also see some similarities. Even during the 1920s, when the Russians suppressed their nationality, most influential positions were reserved within
the republic for Russians. Likewise, in the Manchukuo government the Japanese took up all the important positions. The Soviet government made a distinction between eastern and western nationalities, in which the Russians were part of the western “advanced” nationalities. Similarly, the Manchurian identity and the sovereignty claims made by the Japanese were based on their superior nature. In the 1930s, characterized by the Friendship of the Peoples, Russian culture was considered to be the most “progressive” culture and serve as a model for other Soviet nationalities. On the other hand, the Japanese were supposed to be model subjects capable of leading the colonization process in Manchuria. Their “material and mental” capacities would set an example to the indigenous people to leave a stable and healthy life.
5. Literature


