

OWEN LATTIMORE AND RESEARCH ON THE SINO-KOREAN BORDERLANDS, 1931–1946

ADAM CATHCART

Lecturer in Chinese history, University of Leeds

Abstract

Owen Lattimore was an early student of frontiers in East Asia, and this paper takes as its point of departure Lattimore's collection of books and articles relating to Koreans in Manchuria, and the border between Manchuria (then Manchukuo) and Korea. The paper indicates the depth of dependency that Lattimore and others had on German-language treatments of the border region during the late colonial period, and aligns with the scholarship of Suk-Jung Han in seeking new approaches to reframing the history of interactions along the Yalu/Amnok and Tumen rivers in the 1930s and 1940s.

Key words: Sino-Korean border, borderlands, Koreans in Manchuria, *Chosonjok*, Owen Lattimore, German Sinologists, Manchukuo

OWEN LATTIMORE AND RESEARCH ON THE SINO-KOREAN BORDERLANDS, 1931–1946

ADAM CATHCART¹

Introduction

The rise of ‘borderland studies’ in recent years has coincided—or, more accurately, collided—with a wave of public interest in the 1400-kilometer boundary between the People’s Republic of China and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (North Korea).² Scholars and journalists are continuously seeking to unpack the various modes of interaction along the two rivers (the Yalu and Tumen, respectively) that today divide the two socialist states, looking at illicit activities, North Korean joint ventures, Chinese border security and (potential) natural disasters, to name a few. To a much slower tempo, academics have re-envisioned the border region as a fertile space for the investigation of history, but have difficulty arguing for the relevance of their research amid the dominance of relatively short-term issues such as China’s willingness to enforce United Nations sanctions on North Korea.³ And in Pyongyang and Beijing, the role of the nation-state in creating hegemonic historical narratives of the border space emphasizing sovereign control and charismatic guerrilla activity seems clearer than ever today.

This paper begins a process of looking back at the border region from roughly 1931–1946, a period that saw extraordinary changes on both sides of the border.⁴ In this fifteen-year period, the border space was encompassed by Japanese imperial rule or collaborator regimes, followed by a brief period of Soviet occupation and a brutal civil war on the Chinese side of the border. As seen by historians in Beijing, the 1930s and 1940s in the region also serve as a prelude to the outbreak of the Korean War and threats to the border from the United States, as well as the creation of a socialist Korean ethnic autonomous prefecture (in Yanbian, formerly known as Jiandao) where the PRC finally reorganized the Guomindang’s administrative boundaries and reclaimed Japanese colonial space *in toto*.⁵ Perhaps reflecting the careful editing and availability of sources in China, academic work focused on the later end of this spectrum, namely the establishment and consolidation of Chinese Communist state power in ethnic Korean areas, often has the disadvantage of seeing the period of Japanese supremacy as primarily being of interest for the expression of ethnic difference between Han Chinese and Koreans in Manchukuo, a breach

which was then left for the CCP to contend with or bind up. Suk-jung Han of Dong-a University, fortunately, has pioneered a more interesting approach wherein questions of sovereignty can be probed in part through looking at the border region between Manchukuo and colonial Korea, while scholars like Yonsei's Michael Kim bridge the 1945 divide by looking at Koreans in Manchuria without submitting to the PRC's dominant narrative.

Scholars writing about the border region during the 1930s and 40s obviously had no inkling that the region would ultimately be flanked by communist people's republics, but they did have the advantage of being intermittently in the region prior to the emergence of the PRC or the DPRK. But even that advantage had its limits, and Western scholars with any experience at all in the border region were few. First, as Owen Lattimore described in 1948, it was supremely difficult to find an individual who has "previous knowledge of the conditions of field work, combined with a knowledge, from study of the literature, of what to look for, where to look for it, and where to break new ground."⁶ Add to this that sources remain a particular problem for borderland studies, and that this is true also for the study of this particular border. North Korea, already renowned for its secrecy and general unwillingness to disgorge archival documents, has not left many captured archives behind about the border region (since with the brief exception of Hyesan, the cities along the North Korean frontier with China were not occupied by US or ROK forces in the autumn of 1950).⁷ No single scholar, to my knowledge, had continuous access to the region for the whole of this period, and the archival data on it is scattered around the globe and mostly closed.

This paper therefore takes as its starting point the private library and publications by the most prominent frontier scholar of the era, Owen Lattimore, a pioneer in what would later become 'borderland studies' and one of the most well-travelled Sinologists of his era.⁸ Lattimore's work, and that of his German competitors and interlocutors in the 1930s and 40s, helps us to understand not just the well-worn question of the Japanese outlook on Manchuria, but also the position of the Manchukuo-Chosen border at the time amid other Asian frontiers. One such competitor was Sven Hedin, whose protean travel writings on Tibet in particular were of deep interest to Lattimore and filled his shelves. But when it came to Manchuria, Lattimore was more specifically reliant on a group of German scholars like Walter Fuchs, Ernest Schultze, and Gustav Fochler-Hauke who wrote extensively about Manchuria and covered the role of Koreans there and discussed the border region.⁹ Lattimore's collection of books and rare materials now held at the University of Leeds help us to understand how Japanese scholars in that period (and those who followed Japanese instructions) placed Manchuria/Manchukuo and Korea into the same conceptual sphere, considered and visualized the boundary—and how Chinese scholars in the same period looked at the same region or boundary.¹⁰ Lattimore's own

interests overflowed into multiple Chinese frontiers, and his library reflects as much (his stint in Chongqing with the Republic of China government-in-exile and advising of Chiang Kai-shek brought him into contact with many Chinese scholars and interest in the southwest), but his foundational interests in Manchuria make him an ideal portal into the border region.¹¹ While he never saw the Koreans in Manchuria as the key movers of history, his writing about this group and the frontiers of Manchukuo generally provide an interesting point of departure for a wider attempt to gather up sources from the period.

The paper's approach to the period just after 1945 is truncated for a few reasons which may not be entirely obvious. The first is the difficulty of engaging in cross-border studies of comparative (or perhaps interactive) socialist land reform—namely, did North Korean land reform influence Chinese Communist practice in the crucial eastern border regions of Manchuria? How much interaction existed between overseas Chinese in Korea and the counterparts on the Chinese side of the border? And to what extent did the violence of retribution killings and 'anti-bandit' operations on the Chinese side of the frontier impact or involve participants in North Korean state building? But the primary reason that 1945–46 is a cut-off point is because Lattimore's materials for this period become more slender; he left Asia and started to write more widely on geopolitics and wield his influence in the realm of US policy toward Asia.¹² For understanding of northeast China, he began to rely more upon the work produced by counterparts like O.E. Clubb, who travelled extensively in the region during the Chinese Civil War.¹³ Likewise, after the war, most of Lattimore's German interlocutors began to have political problems associated with denazification, although some of their wartime scholarship was finally published. And for its part, Japanese scholarship on the region was eclipsed immediately after the war.¹⁴

Japan in Manchuria

In the 1930s and 1940s, Manchuria (today the three northeastern provinces of China), was among the most fantasy-laden geopolitical spaces on the globe.¹⁵ Japanese social scientists, industrialists, military planners as well as European and American journalists crisscrossed the new colony of Manchukuo (established in February 1932) in search of a new vision for modernity but also as a method of competitively gauging Japan's colonial strength and model.¹⁶ At the same time, Chinese intellectuals and guerilla fighters cherished the landmass as vital to China's national identity and completeness as a modern nation-state.¹⁷

Travel to Manchuria for Japanese tourists was often packaged with trips to Korea. One film called *A Grand Tour of Manchuria and Inner Korea* (*Naisenman shuuyu no tabi—Manshuuhen*, 1937), includes the crossing of the Yalu River bridge as a moment of tourist appeal on a trip which had begun in Dairen/Dalian.¹⁸ There was

more to the Japanese experience between Korea and Manchuria than looking out at landscapes or borders, seeing the landscapes and empire through the aperture of train travel.¹⁹ The connectivities between Mukden/Shenyang and Keijo/Seoul, were multiple.²⁰ For colonists in Korea, Manchuria was a vacation destination, and vice versa, with Japanese festival days being of particular interest.²¹ In general, ‘the Japanese colonizers [were] associated with industrial modernity and the other populations of Manchuria portrayed as nomadic, primitive and thus without a priori claims to the still “virgin land” that await[ed] transformation by the utopian modernizers.’²² Yet in terms of borders, even the robustly transnational Greater East Asia Literary Conference (*Daitoa bungakusha taikai*) that ran after 1942, Japanese propaganda just as often extolled the need for barriers of various kinds—both in terms of physical international borders, and hygienic quarantines.²³ Lattimore travelled to Antung (present-day Dandong), the Chinese city across the river from Sinuiju, prior to the Japanese annexation and noted that the city was ‘on the Korean frontier at the mouth of the Yalu, and fed by the Yalu and a branch of the Suth Manchurian Railway (besides being in communication with the Korean railway system), [and] is also dominated by Japan.’²⁴

The question of sovereignty was crucial at the time—was Manchuria Chinese, Japanese, or to become functionally autonomous from both major countries? And what would its relationship be with Japan’s colony of Korea? The past immediately came into play here. In a book written during the Second World War, Michael Franz wrote ‘In past history, however, Manchuria was not a country with either definite borders or a uniform people, but rather an areas of contact of different types of life and societies.’²⁵ Such an approach focused on ethnic movement irrespective of frontiers was perhaps reflective of the influence of the German Japanologist Karl Haushofer, whose views of the Sino-Korean border are interspersed through his famous book on borderland studies.²⁶ But for the Japanese colonizers, there was a counterfactual insistence that the new puppet government (nominally headed by Pu Yi, the last Manchu Emperor) was itself anti-colonial, even as the Empire insisted on maintaining what it called ‘zugeteiltest Land’ (fushudi / 附地) i.e., colonial concessions. Duara argues Manchukuo had the form of a nation-state, calling it ‘quasi-colonial’.²⁷

The border between Korea and Manchuria was therefore a hard one, in spite of the many visualizations and slogans that indicated otherwise. So while the Japanese encouraged Korean migration into Manchuria, and the two area’s embodied connectivity was conceptually strengthened by Japanese ideologists and railroad companies, the border was not necessarily easily crossed. Suk-Jung Han describes difficulty of customs checks and further indicates that the border was relatively closed. Although, Han argues, Japan was ‘an immense force in an infrastructural sense’, Manchukuo authorities were hardly fully permissive when it came to tariffs, migration, or a marketplace for colonial Japanese rulers in Korea.²⁸ In a 1946 article,

Shannon McCune also described the situation: ‘The Korean side of the border was protected in the days of Japanese control by a border patrol with well-built stone block houses situated every five miles or so and intermediate posts within sight or gun-shot of each other along some stretches.’²⁹ Negotiation about border spaces and disputes was still necessary.

Ethnic Koreans, however, continued to move into Manchuria and the new puppet state in large numbers, encouraged by Japanese policies and propaganda. Lattimore’s 1932 analysis put the primary agency at the feet of the Japanese, for whom ‘the land-hunger has gone out of their blood ...[now] when they go abroad, [they] go only as exploiters, never as settlers.’ While recognizing anti-Japanese sentiment and “enthusiasts for the Russian type of revolution” among the Koreans who migrated to Manchuria, he also wrote: ‘The Chientao Koreans are historically a rearguard; for the Koreans undoubtedly once occupied a considerable part of Manchuria, from which they were driven by the Manchus and other tribes. This and other rearguard Korean communities, are, however, now being turned into advance-guards by a fresh impulse of Korean migration toward Manchuria.’³⁰ Lattimore’s 1932 book obviously was taking its final shape just as the Wanpaoshan incident was occurring, and his analysis has a partial character to it even as it summarizes some basic questions about sovereignty and citizenship for Koreans in the border region.

Water rights were at the center of Korean controversies in eastern Manchuria in 1932, but so too were floods. In the areas on the boundaries near Korea on the upper Tumen River, floods occurred.³¹ Yanji was also flooded and set up a relief committee, and relief organizations like the White Swastika and Red Swastika also participated, predating the arrival of the Japanese state.³² Natural disasters in the border areas and further inland heavily impacted Koreans. Nicholas Wright explains the impact on the Korean tenant farmers in what is today eastern Heilongjiang province:

Many Koreans were more severely affected than the Japanese, suffering serious losses to their crops. Over 4,000 Korean flood refugees congregated in Harbin. Although regarding its responsibility as ‘troublesome’, the Japanese consulate demanded protection for the camps holding Korean refugees, and tried to persuade the Korean authorities to provide financial support.³³

But water also led to depictions of plenty for Koreans; the easy naturalism of lumber flowing down an un-demarcated Yalu River in a Japanese textbook used by Lattimore attests to the softer side of the border which propagandists and educationalists in Japan sought to depict.³⁴ Tucker describes the mental geometries of the Japanese empire and its experiments in Manchuria; as he says, ‘The seizure of Manchuria provided a blank slate, or as city planners in Manchukuo put it, a white page, *hakushi*, on which ideal designs might be realized.’ 1932 was ‘a time of intense activity and anticipation in Manchukuo, of imagined but not realized projects.’³⁵ Manchukuo was

seem by some Japanese as an opportunity to improve on Korean failings, in terms of architecture, environmental suitability, and even the shape of developments (the hexagon was a constant motif used by Japanese rural designers).³⁶ Even German city planning became influential in Japan in 1934, thanks in part to visits to Japan that year by key German architects.³⁷ And there were, in fact, a number of German scholars who played a role in shaping knowledge, and Owen Lattimore's understanding, of the Chinese-Korean border region.

German Sinologues and the Border Region

Control of knowledge was of course central to which researchers were allowed into Manchukuo or Korea, or their mutual border region. We tend to assume that non-Japanese researchers were not really allowed in, but this was not quite the case. As Owen Lattimore noted in a 1948 review of a major fieldwork-based study of the region:

After the proclamation of the bogus state of 'Manchukuo' in 1932 the scientific study and description of China's Northeastern provinces became a Japanese monopoly in which the only outside participants were a few Russians and ... a handful of Germans who were acceptable both to the Japanese regime and to the Hitler regime in Germany ... In order to be allowed any freedom of movement behind [Japan's] heavy strategic security curtain, an American or Western European had first to pass a screening as a fellow traveler of the Kwantung Army ... No noteworthy Westerners who passed this screening were also well qualified in the natural sciences, especially geography.³⁸

Here Lattimore identifies a key lacuna. It is not a lack of interest in frontiers that prevented further study of the Sino-Korean border during the 1930s and early 1940s, but rather political fissures. German scholars had access to the region, while those affiliated with the Allies did not.

Some German researchers studied topics like Korean rural economy and the slash-and-burn method on hillsides in order to prepare them for spring planting.³⁹ In general, the interest in Koreans moving over the border into Manchukuo was an economic one. One of the most detailed investigations of this question was written by Ernst Schultze, an economist in Leipzig.⁴⁰ Entitled 'The expulsion of the Korean farmer by Japanese imperialism; an unknown chapter in East Asian world politics,' the article argued for a more historicized view of Korean migration into Manchuria, simply stating that prior to Japan's more vigorous moves in 1931, Korean migration had not been nearly as large as it subsequently became. Schultze had had a somewhat strange career, spending the 1910s writing on an array of topics that veered from film pedagogy to England as a sea power to the independence movement in Ireland to the role of prostitution in Asia. In the 1920s he built up his expertise on economic issues,

reaching a peak with a huge two-volume study of the Japanese economy with an eye toward the coming World War, in 1935. In that same year he published a study of the Nazi economy and returned to the Anglophobia of his earlier years for the duration of the decade.

Like many of his counterparts in German academies, Schultze saw Japanese imperialism as being of a grasping nature for resources, and significant in moving populations; migration was a theme of part of his two-volume study.⁴¹ In this sense, Schultze was engaging in debate with the journalists of his day. Richard Sorge, who reported for *Frankfurter Zeitung* from Tokyo and who toured China and Korea, wrote some more extended pieces for *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* in 1937, took issue with the notion that poverty was driving migration, when technology and investment could make 'inner colonization' more possible in the region.⁴²

German researchers of Manchuria and the border region with Korea were very active in the 1930s. Walter Fuchs was a journeyman German Sinologist who ended up as one of the few Western academics in Manchuria in the key years of the early 1930s. He thus performed some research work to rival or at least counterpose to the Japanese researchers of the South Manchurian Railway Company, which at the time was on its way employing a research staff that reached an apogee of some 2,345 in the late 1930s.⁴³ Fuchs ventured into Liaoyang and its outskirts, on the eastern side of the Liao River. In order to reach the Manchu tombs which were the subject of what would become a foundational study, Fuchs had to pass through Gaolimen, or Koryo Gate, the aperture that had once served as the boundary or a customs function between kingdoms which today would be labelled as Chinese and Korean, respectively.⁴⁴ Today, that area is the site of a huge new housing development which is largely empty.

Fuchs was a wanderer with an interest in border regions. In 1933, he published his diary from a journey into southwestern China and the city of Chengdu, an area that also fascinated Owen Lattimore.⁴⁵ During the Sino-Japanese War that erupted in the summer and autumn of 1937, he joined the Nazi Party. He was ultimately caught up in denazification back in Germany. Having moved back to Munich in 1950, he was never able to take up substantive academic employment due to his work with the Nazi Party in China after he joined the Party in 1937.⁴⁶ He appeared to have a good relationship with Lattimore, according to inscriptions on his books in the Leeds University library collection; it is possible that the men had met in the early 1930s.

Research published postwar had been started during the conflict. One good example is in his Mongol maps, published in 1946, Fuchs put forward a 'Sea route around Shantung to Manchuria' which showed Korea as more or less peripheral, and the border region as a sort of no-mans land.⁴⁷ Fuchs describes the ancient preoccupation with border regions, in a discussion of Lo Hung-hsien, in a treatment of 9 Border Regions, perhaps dating from 1560s, reflected a Ming-era sensibility to

the frontier management. Korea could here be fit into frontier states like Mongolia, Annam, and the northwest.⁴⁸ Like Lattimore, Fuchs' sense of frontiers was large and inherently comparative, rarely focusing on just one.

Notes

1. A preliminary version of this paper was presented at the Institute for Transnational & Spatial History, University of St. Andrews, 25 August 2017. Particular thanks are due to Dr. Konrad Lawson for generating the kernel of the paper and then soliciting it through its various permutations, as well as for his critical commentary on it, as well as to Bernhard Struck and Riccardo Bavaj at St. Andrews for attuning me to more spacial approaches to German cartographic and social history, respectively.
2. On borderland studies in Asia, see Willem Van Schendel and Erik de Maaker, 'Asian Borderlands: Introducing their Permeability, Strategic Uses and Meanings,' *Journal of Borderlands Studies* Vol. 29, No. 1 (2014), 3–9. On the Chinese-Korean border region, see Adam Cathcart, Christopher Green, and Steven Denney, eds., *De-coding the Sino-North Korean Borderlands* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, forthcoming); Koen de Custer, Valérie Gelézeau, and Alain Delissen, *Debordering Korea: Tangible and Intangible Legacies of the Sunshine Policy* (London: Routledge, 2013). On contemporary interest in the China-North Korea border region, citation of major articles from the region—typically Dandong and Yanji in China—in the *New York Times* by Jane Perlez, the *Washington Post* by Anna Fifield, and *The Guardian* by Tania Branigan in the past five years would likely fill a full page.
3. On using a sanctions framework to analyze the border region, see work by Stephan Haggard and Marcus Noland, *Hard Target: Sanctions, Inducements, and the Case of North Korea* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2017); Charles A. von Denkowski, 'From state-organized crime to legal business: Transforming North Korea—A criminological approach,' in *East Asian Intelligence and Organised Crime*, Stephan Blancke, ed. (Berlin: Verlag Dr. Koester, 2015), pp. 343–396; Center for Advanced Defence Studies (C4ADS), *In China's Shadow: Exposing North Korean Overseas Networks*, ASAN Institute for Policy Studies (August 2016); John S. Park, 'North Korea, Inc.: Gaining Insights into North Korean Regime Stability from Recent Commercial Activities,' *United States Institute of Peace Working Paper*, 22 April 2009 <<https://www.usip.org/sites/default/files/North%20Korea,%20Inc.PDF>>. For slightly modulated yet essentially presentist or securitized approaches, see Justin Hastings, 'The economic geography of North Korean drug trafficking networks,' *Review of International Political Economy* Vol. 22, No. 1 (2015), 162–193; and Adam Cathcart, 'Evaded States: Security and Control in the Sino-North Korean Border Region,' in *Routledge Handbook of Asian Borderlands*, Alexander Horstmann, Martin Saxer, Alessandro Ripa, eds. (London: Routledge: 2018), pp. 422–433.
4. For similar arguments on the logic of this periodization, see Bruce Cumings, 'The Korean-centric Japanese Imperium and the Transformation of the International System from the 1930s to the 1950s,' *The International Order of Asia in the 1930s and 1950s*, Shigeru Akita and Nicholas White, eds. (Ashgate, 2010). Matsumoto's pathbreaking study of the role of Japanese technicians at what became the CCP's model steel factory in northeast China, Anshan steel, moves easily across conventional periodization divides. See Toshiro

Matsumoto, *Manshukoku kara shinchugoku e: anzan tekkogyo kara mita chugoku tohoku no saihen katei, 1940–1954* (Nagoya: Nagoya University Press, 2000).

5. One of the only scholarly treatments of one segment of the border region, that being the Korean-dominated counties in eastern Manchuria, over the same span is Robert Oliver (University Press, 1990); for a more discursive and (Marxist) theory-heavy approach influenced by Harry Harootunian, see Hyun Ok Park, *Same Bed, Different Dreams: Settler Colonialism and the Origins of the North Korean Revolution in Manchuria* (Columbia University Press, 2005).
6. Owen Lattimore, review of Gustav Fochler-Hauke's 'Die Mandschurei: Eine Geographisch-Geopolitische Landeskunde' in *Pacific Affairs*, Summer 1948, pp. 303–304.
7. There have been very few examinations, particularly based on archives, of the Chinese border regions with Korea during the Chinese civil war. For use of North Korean captured archives in investigating the border region with China in the late 1940s, see Adam Cathcart and Charles Kraus: 'Peripheral Influence: The Sinuiju Incident of 1945,' *Journal of Korean Studies* (Winter 2008); Charles Kraus has since produced new work on Overseas Chinese in northern North Korea.
8. This is as distinct from Lattimore's private papers, which total some 22,175 items and are held in 62 boxes at the United States Library of Congress. Lattimore's work on frontiers is sizeable; a good starting point is his *Inner Asian Frontiers of China* (New York: American Geographical Society, 1940), a work which he discussed in the early 1930s Beijing/Beiping with Karl Wittfogel.
9. Ultimately I use the term "competitor" advisedly, as Lattimore maintained good personal relations with most members of his broad remit until his denunciation by Senator Joseph McCarthy in 1949. On the destruction of his friendship with his fellow English Sinologist George E. Taylor, see the correspondence file in the Taylor Papers in the Special Collections of the University of Washington Library, Seattle.
10. Lattimore's various maps and his collection of *Xinyaxiya* (New Asia), a periodical produced by Nationalist Chinese scholars which focused on frontier issues, as well as his interactions with such scholars, could be the basis of an article of itself. For an outstanding updated treatment of Chinese academic discourse on fieldwork, human geography, and frontiers in the 1920s and 1930s, see Zhihong Chen, 'The Frontier Crisis and the Construction of Modern Chinese Geography in Republican China (1911–1949),' *Asian Geographer* Vol. 33, No. 2 (2016), pp. 141–164.
11. Robert P. Newman, *Owen Lattimore and the 'Loss' of China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).
12. Owen Lattimore, *The Situation in Asia* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1949).
13. O. Edmund Clubb, 'Chinese Communist development programs in Manchuria: with a supplement on Inner Mongolia,' (New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1954), 46 p.; see also Richard D. McKinzie, 'Oral History Interview with O. Edmund Clubb,' New York City, June 26, 1974, in Harry S Truman Presidential Library, <<https://www.trumanlibrary.org/oralhist/clubb.htm>>.
14. Dai Maolin and Lin Po, *Zhonggong Zhongyang Dongbeiju* (The CCP Northeastern Bureau), *1945–1954* (Shenyang: Liaoning Renmin Chubanshe, 2016).

15. Annika A. Culver, *Glorify the Empire: Japanese Avant-Garde Propaganda in Manchukuo* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2013).
16. Peter O'Connor, *Japanese Propaganda: Selected Readings, Series 2: Pamphlets, 1891–1939, Vol. 8, From the China Quagmire, 1937–38* (Kent, UK: Global Oriental, 2005).
17. Rana Mitter, *The Manchurian Myth: Nationalism, Resistance, and Collaboration in Modern China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).
18. Jie Li, 'Phantasmagoric Manchukuo: Documentaries Produced by the South Manchurian Railway Company, 1932–1940,' *positions: east asia cultures critique*, Volume 22, Number 2 (Spring 2014), pp. 329–369 (p. 342).
19. Wolfgang Schivelbusch, 'Panoramic Travel,' in *The Nineteenth Century Visual Culture Reader* (London: Routledge, 2008), p. 98. See also South Manchuria Railway Company, *Manchuria through the car window* (Dairen: Minami Manshuu Tetsudoo Kabushiki Kaisha/General Directorate of Railways, the SMR, 1938), held at the Hoover Institution.
20. See Minami Manshuu Tetsudoo Kabushiki Kaisha (General Directorate of Railways, the SMR), *South Manchuria Railway, operating all lines in South Manchuria and Chosen (Korea) east of Mukden. Its origin, development, and phenomenal rise to importance* (Dairen: Manshu nichinichi shimbun, December 1922), held at Stanford University Library.
21. Dandong Municipal Archives, 'Yi, Yalu jiang tieqiao/一、 钢铁桥梁' [One: Steel bridge over the Yalu], Dandong Municipal Archives website, 3 July 2015, <http://www.dddaj.com.cn/page/news.asp?id=1456>.
22. Jie Li, 'Phantasmagoric Manchukuo: Documentaries Produced by the South Manchurian Railway Company, 1932–1940,' *positions: east asia cultures critique*, Volume 22, Number 2 (Spring 2014), pp. 329–369 (p. 333).
23. Junko Agnew, "Constructing Cultural Difference in Manchukuo: Stories of Gu Ding and Ushijima Haruko," *International Journal of Asian Studies* Vol. 10, No. 2 (2013), pp. 171–188 (p. 180).
24. Owen Lattimore, *Manchuria: Cradle of Conflict* (New York: Macmillan, 1932), p. 26.
25. Franz Michael, *The Origin of Manchu Rule in China: Frontier and Bureaucracy as Interacting Forces in the Chinese Empire* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1942), p. 12.
26. Karl Haushofer, *Grenzen in Ihrer Geographischen und Politischen Bedeutung* (Heidelberg, 2nd edition: Kurt Vowinkel Verlag, 1939), pp. 39, 71.
27. Prasenjit Duara, *Sovereignty and Authenticity: Manchukuo and the East Asian Modern* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003), pp. 59–61, 247–247; see also Han Suk-jung 'The Problem of Sovereignty: Manchukuo, 1932–1937,' *positions: east asia cultural critique* vol. 12, no. 2 (Fall 2004), 457–478.
28. Suk-Jung Han, 'From Pusan to Fengtian: The Borderline between Korea and Manchukuo in the 1930s,' *East Asian History* vol. 30 (2005), pp. 92–93.
29. Shannon McCune, 'Physical Basis for Korean Boundaries,' *The Far Eastern Quarterly* Vol. 5, No. 3 (May 1946), p. 276.
30. Owen Lattimore, *Manchuria: Cradle of Conflict* (New York: Macmillan, 1932), pp. 236, 239, 241.

31. Wright, p. 193. It was the National Food Relief Commission of GMD.
32. Wright, p. 194.
33. Tim Wright, 'Legitimacy and Disaster: Responses to the 1932 Floods in North Manchuria,' *Modern China* Vol. 43, No. 2 (2017), 186–216 (p. 198); drawing from Japan Center for Asian Historical Records (JACAR), www.jacar.go.jp.
34. *Futsu gakko kokugo kokuhon*, vol. 7 (Seoul: Chosen sotokufu, 1935), p. 109.
35. David Tucker, "City Planning without Cities: Order and Chaos in Utopian Manchukuo," in *Crossed Histories: Manchuria in the Age of Empire*, Marino Asano Tamanoi, ed. (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press/Association of Asian Studies, 2005), pp. 53–81 (pp. 55, 58).
36. Tucker (2005), P. 61–64, 68.
37. Tucker (2005), p. 73, cites Gottfried Feder, *Die Neue Stadt* (The New City), Berlin: Springer, 1939.
38. Owen Lattimore, review of Gustav Fochler-Hauke, 'Die Mandchurei: Eine Geographisch-Geopolitische Landeskunde (Heidelberg: Vowinkel, 1941),' in *Pacific Affairs* (Summer 1948), pp. 303–304.
39. Hermann Lautensach, 'Über den brandrodungsfeldbau in Korea mit bemerkungen zur urlandschaftsforschung,' *Petermanns geographische mitteilungen*, Vol. 87, No. 2 (February 1941), pp. 41–54; cited in McCune (1946), p. 276.
40. 'Die Verdraengung der koreanischen Bauern durch den japanischen Imperialismus: Ein unbekanntes Kapitel der ostasiatischen Weltpolitik,' *Wirtschaftsring* Vol. 48 (November 1934). My awareness of and discussion of this article is indebted to p. 261 of Mun Soo-Hyun, 'German Discourse on Korea during the Era of Japanese Imperialism,' *Seoul Journal of Korean Studies* vol. 27, no. 2 (December 2014), pp. 241–267.
41. Ernst Schultze, *Japan als Weltindustriemacht*, 2 vols (Stuttgart, 1935).
42. Richard Sorge, in *Zeitschrift für Geopolitik* (1937, no. 3), reprinted in *Dr. Sorge funkelt aus Tokio* (East Berlin: Deutsche Militaer Verlag, 1970), pp. 230–233. See also 'Japans Kampf um Lebensraum: Übertoeckerung und Auswanderung — Der Führungsanspruch in Ostasien,' *Westdeustcher Beobachter*, 6 March 1942, in German Bundesarchiv, Auswaertiges Amt files, R901 / 58321, s. 167.
43. Akihiko Maruya, *The South Manchuria Railway Company as an Intelligence Organization* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2012), p. 3. See also Louise Young, *Japan's Total Empire*.
44. Walter Fuchs, 'Fruehmandjurische Fürstengräber bei Liao-Yang,' *Asia Major*, ed. Bruno Schindler and Friedrich Weller, Vol. X, Leipzig, 1934, pp. 94–111.
45. Walter Fuchs, *Von Sian nach Ch'engtu, Tagebuchblaetter von einer Wanderung nach Suedwest-China* (Berlin: Seminar Feuer Orientalischen Sprachen, 1933).
46. Hellmut Wilhelm, 'German Sinology Today,' *The Far Eastern Quarterly* Vol. 8 No. 3 (May 1949), pp. 319–322.
47. Fuchs, p. 37.
48. Fuchs, p. 12–13.

Bibliography

- Bergman, Sten. *In Korean Wilds and Villages*, Frederich Whyte, translator (London: John Gifford, Ltd., 1938).
- Cathcart, Adam, Green, Christopher and Denney, Steven eds. *De-coding the Sino-North Korean Borderlands* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, forthcoming).
- Cathcart, Adam. 'Evaded States: Security and Control in the Sino-North Korean Border Region,' in *Routledge Handbook of Asian Borderlands*, Alexander Horstmann, Martin Saxer, Alessandro Rippa, eds. (London: Routledge: 2018), pp. 422–433.
- Cathcart, Adam and Kraus, Charles. 'Peripheral Influence: The Sinuiju Incident of 1945,' *Journal of Korean Studies* (Winter 2008).
- Chen, Zhihong. 'The Frontier Crisis and the Construction of Modern Chinese Geography in Republican China (1911–1949),' *Asian Geographer* Vol. 33, No. 2 (2016), pp. 141–164.
- Chinese Eastern Railway. *North Manchuria and the Chinese Eastern Railway* (Harbin: CER Printing Office, 1924).
- Clubb, O. Edmund. 'Chinese Communist development programs in Manchuria: with a supplement on Inner Mongolia,' (New York: Institute of Pacific Relations, 1954).
- Cosgrove, Denis. 'The geometry of landscape: Practical and speculative arts in sixteenth-century Venetian land territories,' in *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design and Use of Past Environments*, ed. Denis Cosgrove and Stephen Daniels (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 254–276.
- Cumings, Bruce. 'The Korean-centric Japanese Imperium and the Transformation of the International System from the 1930s to the 1950s,' *The International Order of Asia in the 1930s and 1950s*, Shigeru Akita and Nicholas White, eds. (Ashgate, 2010).
- Dai, Maolin and Li, Po, *Zhonggong Zhongyang Dongbeiju* (The CCP Northeastern Bureau), 1945–1954 (Shenyang: Liaoning Renmin Chubanshe, 2016).
- De Ceuster, Koen, Gelézeau, Valérie and Delissen, Alain. *Debordering Korea: Tangible and Intangible Legacies of the Sunshine Policy* (London: Routledge, 2013).
- Culver, Annika. *Glorify the Empire: Japanese Avant-Garde Propaganda in Manchukuo* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2013).
- Von Denkowski, Charles. 'From state-organized crime to legal business: Transforming North Korea—A criminological approach,' in *East Asian Intelligence and Organised Crime*, Stephan Blancke, ed. (Berlin: Verlag Dr. Koester, 2015), pp. 343–396.
- Elliott, Mark. 'The Limits of Tartary: Manchuria in Imperial and National Geographies,' *Journal of Asian Studies* Vol. 59, no. 3 (2000), 603–646.
- Fochler-Hauke, Gustav. *Die Mandschurei: Eine Geographisch-Geopolitische Landeskunde* (Heidelberg: Kurt Vowinkel Verlag, 1941).
- Fuchs, Walter. *The 'Mongol Atlas' of China, by Chu Ssu-pen and the Kuang-Yu-t'u*, with 48 facsimile maps dating from about 1855 (Beiping: Fu Jen University/Catholic University Press, 1946).

- . 'Fruehmandjurische Fürstengräber bei Liao-Yang,' *Asia Major*, ed. Bruno Schindler and Friedrich Weller, Vol. X, Leipzig, 1934, pp. 94–111.
- Haggard, Stephan and Noland, Marcus. *Hard Target: Sanctions, Inducements, and the Case of North Korea* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2017).
- Han, Suk-jung. 'From Pusan to Fengtian: The Borderline between Korea and Manchukuo in the 1930s,' *East Asian History* vol. 30 (2005), pp. 92–93.
- Hastings, Justin. 'The economic geography of North Korean drug trafficking networks,' *Review of International Political Economy* Vol. 22, No. 1 (2015), 162–193.
- Harvey, John. 'Maps, knowledge, and power,' in *The Iconography of Landscape: Essays on the Symbolic Representation, Design and Use of Past Environments*, ed. Dennis Cosgrove and Stephen Daniels (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 272–312.
- Haushofer, Karl. *Grenzen in Ihrer Geographischen und Politischen Bedeutung* (Heidelberg, 2nd edition: Kurt Vowinckel Verlag, 1939).
- Kinney, Henry. *Manchuria Today* (Darien, December 1930).
- Lattimore, Owen. *Manchuria: Cradle of Conflict* (New York: Macmillian, 1932).
- . *The Situation in Asia* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1949).
- . Review of Gustav Fochler-Hauke's 'Die Mandschurei: Eine Geographisch-Geopolitische Landeskunde' in *Pacific Affairs*, Summer 1948, pp. 303–304.
- . *Inner Asian Frontiers of China* (New York: American Geographical Society, 1940).
- Lautensach, Hermann. 'Über den brandrodungsfeldbau in Korea mit bemerkungen zur urlandschaftsforschung,' *Petermanns geographische mitteilungen*, Vol. 87, No. 2 (February 1941), pp. 41–54; cited in McCune (1946), p. 276.
- Lindt, August. *Special Correspondent: With Bandit and General in Manchuria* (London: Cobden-Sanderson, 1933).
- Li, Jie. 'Phantasmagoric Manchukuo: Documentaries Produced by the South Manchurian Railway Company, 1932–1940,' *positions: east asia cultures critique*, Volume 22, Number 2 (Spring 2014), pp. 329–369 (p. 342).
- Maruya, Akihiko. *The South Manchuria Railway Company as an Intelligence Organization* (Washington, D.C.: Center for Strategic and International Studies, 2012).
- Matsumoto, Toshiro. *Manshukoku kara shinchugoku e: anzan tekkogyo kara mita chugoku tohoku no saihen katei, 1940–1954* (Nagoya: Nagoya University Press, 2000).
- McKinzie, Richard. 'Oral History Interview with O. Edmund Clubb,' New York City, June 26, 1974, in Harry S Truman Presidential Library, <<https://www.trumanlibrary.org/oralhist/clubb.htm>>.
- Michael, Franz. *Der Streit um die Mandschurei: Die chinesisch-japanischen Rechtsbeziehungen in den 'drei östlichen Provinzen' Chinas vor Ausbruch des Konfliktes im September 1931*, vol. 29 in *Abhandlungen des Instituts für Politik, ausländisches öffentliches Recht und Völkerrecht an der Universität Leipzig*, hrsg. von Richard Schmidt and Hermann Jarreiss (Leipzig: Vinversitaetsverlag von Robert Noske, 1933).

- . *The Origin of Manchu Rule in China: Frontier and Bureaucracy as Interacting Forces in the Chinese Empire* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1942).
- Mitter, Rana. *The Manchurian Myth: Nationalism, Resistance, and Collaboration in Modern China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).
- McCune, Shannon. 'Physical Basis for Korean Boundaries,' *The Far Eastern Quarterly* Vol. 5, No. 3 (May 1946), p. 276.
- Newman, Robert. *Owen Lattimore and the 'Loss' of China* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992).
- Pakhomov, Nikolai. 'Japanese Intervention in Manchuria,' *Izvestia*, 21 September 1931, in Harriet L. Moore, *Soviet Far Eastern Policy, 1941–1945*, Institute of Pacific Relations Imprint (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1945). Appendix II, Statements, pp. 211–215.
- O'Connor, Peter. *Japanese Propaganda: Selected Readings, Series 2: Pamphlets, 1891–1939, Vol. 8, From the China Quagmire, 1937–38* (Kent, UK: Global Oriental, 2005).
- Schultze, Ernst. *Japan als Weltindustriemacht*, 2 vols (Stuttgart, 1935).
- Sorge, Richard. *Zeitschrift fuer Geopolitik* (1937, no. 3), reprinted in *Dr. Sorge funkelt aus Tokio* (East Berlin: Deutsche Militaer Verlag, 1970), pp. 230–233.
- Tucker, David. 'City Planning without Cities: Order and Chaos in Utopian Manchukuo,' in *Crossed Histories: Manchuria in the Age of Empire*, Marino Asano Tamanoi, ed. (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press/Association of Asian Studies, 2005), pp. 53–81.
- Van Schendel, Willem and De Maaker, Eric. 'Asian Borderlands: Introducing their Permeability, Strategic Uses and Meanings,' *Journal of Borderlands Studies* Vol. 29, No. 1 (2014), 3–9.
- Wright, Tim. 'Legitimacy and Disaster: Responses to the 1932 Floods in North Manchuria,' *Modern China* Vol. 43, No. 2 (2017), 186–216 (p. 198).