Assemblies of Empire:

Ethnic Korean Participation in the Manchukuo Concordia Association

Michael Kosei Delphia

University of Michigan Ann Arbor

Department of Asian Languages and Cultures

Submitted on 25 April 2025

Abstract

The migration of ethnic Koreans to Manchuria (now the northeastern provinces of the People's Republic of China) began in the late nineteenth century, as agricultural migrants sought better lives north of the Yalu River. Migration intensified after Japan's annexation of Korea in 1910. Over the subsequent decades, hundreds of thousands of ethnic Koreans moved to Manchuria and its border regions. The Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931, and the establishment of the puppet state of Manchukuo in 1932, brought these Koreans "resident in Manchuria," or *Zai-Man* Koreans, under the mixed administration of Japanese imperial power and the new, putatively independent state of Manchukuo. Some *Zai-Man* Koreans sought to negotiate for political power and autonomy within the national-imperial project through engagement with mass political organizations and structures. This thesis investigates the history of *Zai-Man* Korean involvement with the Concordia Association, Manchukuo's primary mass political organ, through analysis of records of the Concordia Association and other organizations. Building on existing scholarship in Japanese and English concerning the Concordia Association and its precedents, I argue that collaborationist *Zai-Man* Koreans were active in Manchukuo mass politics throughout the state's existence, seeking to negotiate political space and authority, but that their representation did not translate to political power, as *Zai-Man* Koreans were bound by both the Manchukuo nation-building project and broader imperial ambitions of the Empire of Japan. This "double burden" role demanded that *Zai-Man* Koreans be constituent elements of both an imagined multi-ethnic Manchukuo state and of an assimilating Japanese Empire. Through to the end of Manchukuo and Japan's imperial ambitions, this contradiction remained unresolved.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1
Chapter 1: Debates on the Concordia Association and Ethnic Politics 23
Chapter 2: Abrogation and the National Congresses 35
Chapter 3: *Zai-Man* Korean Education between Japan and Manchukuo 53
Conclusion 74
Glossary 80
Bibliography 81

Introduction

Throughout the 1930s and 1940s, the Japanese Empire embarked on a nation-building project. Empire-building was nothing new to the Japanese state and its agents: Japan had already annexed Taiwan in 1895, and Korea in 1910. After the First World War, it took over Germany's former Pacific possessions. Japan also had an existing stake in Northeast China, as Japanese spheres of influence snaked across the landscape, emanating from the occupied Korean peninsula and Japanese-controlled treaty ports. The Japanese knew this region as "Manchuria" (Manshū 満洲).[1] It was here that, in late 1931, a garrison army of the Imperial Japanese Army staged a military takeover of the region and established a new state known as Manchukuo (1932-1945).

Manchukuo (C: Manzhouguo, J: Manshūkoku, K: Manjuguk, 满洲国) was unique in the overall scheme of Japanese imperialism, as it presented itself as an independent, sovereign state. In pursuit of this image, Manchukuo—home to not only an overwhelming Han Chinese majority, but also minority groups of Mongols, Russians, Manchus, Japanese, and Koreans—presented its establishment as an experiment in the Pan-Asianist slogan of *minzoku*[2] *kyōwa* 民族協和, a

---

[1] "Manchuria" is a contentious term due to its history as an exonymic label used by Euro-American powers and Japan, and its use by the Japanese Empire to separate the Northeast from China proper. While the term has its risks, I employ "Manchuria" to emphasize the role of Japanese colonial and Korean migratory imaginations that saw the region as distinct, especially after its forced separation from China. I acknowledge the impact of the term, which will be used semi-interchangeably with "the Northeast" (Dongbei 東北 and variants, which better emphasizes the historical, cultural, and political ties of the region as a contemporary constituent of China.

[2] *Minzoku* 民族 can be difficult to translate into English, occupying a space between English-language concepts of "nation" and "ethnicity." Kevin M. Doak translates *minzoku* as "ethnic nationality" in contrast to biological race (*jinshu*) also noting its connections to the German concept of Volk. In this paper, I will translate *minzoku* as "ethnicity" or "ethnic" from Japanese passages. For more on the evolution of the Japanese concept of *minzoku*, refer to Kevin M. Doak, "The Concept of Ethnic Nationality and Its Role in Pan-Asianism in Imperial Japan," in Pan-Asianism in Modern Japanese History: Colonialism, Regionalism and Borders, ed. Sven Saaler and J Victor Koschmann (London; New York: Routledge, 2007).

concept that can be translated as "ethnic harmony."[3] *Minzoku kyōwa*, when combined with the related concept of "Concord Among Five Races" (*gozoku kyōwa*, 五族協和), framed Manchukuo as a site of Pan-Asianist dreams and praxis. The contradiction between the imposition of Japanese imperial authority from above, which founded and ruled Manchukuo, and the efforts to construct a nation of *minzoku kyōwa*, remained unsolved until Manchukuo's dissolution at the end of World War II.

The ethnic Korean population of Manchukuo embodied this tension. From the late 19th century through the Japanese occupation of Korea, hundreds of thousands of Koreans crossed the Yalu and Tumen Rivers, settling in the border regions and vast interior of Manchuria.[4] The Japanese authorities categorized these Koreans as *Zai-Man Chōsen-jin* 在満朝鮮人, or "Resident Koreans in Manchuria." I employ the label of *Zai-Man*, rather than translated English terms or the contemporary Chinese term for ethnic Koreans in the Northeast, Chaoxianzu (K: Chosŏnjok 朝鮮族), in order to emphasize the historical particularity of the *Zai-Man* category. The label was inherently tied to the transnational, transborder status of Koreans as Japanese subjects who resided outside the formal borders of the empire, a historically specific paradigm that disappeared in 1945.

While the *Zai-Man* Koreans escaped the direct rule of Japan, they were treated as Japanese subjects and could not escape the concomitant influence over their lives. After the Japanese annexation of Korea, Koreans legally became Japanese imperial subjects, but in

---

[3] Translation courtesy of Yuka Hiruma Kishida, *Kenkoku University and the Experience of Pan-Asianism: Education in the Japanese Empire* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020). David George Egler translates the term as "racial harmony" in "Japanese Mass Organizations in Manchuria, 1928-1945: The Ideology of Racial Harmony" (Phd Diss., Tucson, The University of Arizona, 1977), http://hdl.handle.net/10150/565382.

[4] For more on the overall course of Korean migration into Manchuria and related Japanese colonial policy, see Andrew James De Lisle, "Japanese Borderland Colonialism and the Koreans in Jiandao, 1905-1932" (Phd Diss., Australian National University, 2020).

practice they were treated as second-class subjects. Some Koreans fought for independence, while others, today marked in both North and South Korea as collaborators, sought to work within the system to elevate the status of Koreans. This division survived the establishment of Manchukuo, as some *Zai-Man* Koreans joined the mass political organizations and bureaucracies of the Manchukuo state, which espoused the ideals of *minzoku kyōwa* and embarked on a project of national formation.

One of these organizations was the Manchukuo Concordia Association (*Manshū [Tei]koku kyōwakai*, 満洲[帝]国協和会). The origins of this organization lay in the political maneuvers of Japanese settlers in late 1920s and early 1930s Manchuria, whose various organizations eventually coalesced in 1932 into the Concordia Association. The organization presented itself as the primary mass political body of Manchukuo society and the vanguard of *minzoku kyōwa* thought and praxis. The Concordia Association consisted of various local branches, regional assemblies, and departments, all under a single national umbrella organization. While originally separate from the state, the Concordia Association, as an organizer and promoter of *minzoku kyōwa,* become closely entwined with Manchukuo state power. The Concordia Association had members from across Manchukuo's regions, classes, and ethnic groups, including ethnic Koreans.

In this work, I analyze how *Zai-Man* Koreans participated in the politics of the Concordia Association. Scholars have elucidated the role of ethnic Koreans within Japan's imperialist designs in Northeast China, before and after the Manchurian Incident. I contribute to this literature through analysis of mass politics and *Zai-Man* participation in the Concordia Association. From early debates over how Koreans should organize within the Concordia Association to petitions and arguments between *Zai-Man* Koreans and Manchukuo in national-

level assemblies, Koreans sought to shape their role in the organization and advocated for what they saw as superior outcomes for *Zai-Man* Korean life. Choosing cooperation with the authorities of the Concordia Association, these Koreans worked within the power structure of the Association, and by extension, the Manchukuo state. However, the outcomes of their efforts indicate the stark limits of the politics of collaboration. Representation did not translate to political success. These *Zai-Man* actors also employed strategies that sought to protect the position of Koreans within Manchukuo by tying Koreans closer to the Japanese state and its project of assimilation. Analysis of ethnic Korean participation in the Concordia Association thus elucidates how in Manchukuo, proximity to imperial and state power failed to secure a share in this power.

Background

Koreans and Manchuria

Japan's victory in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905 marked the ascendancy of Japanese control over the Korean peninsula.[5] The long encroachment of the Japanese state and colonial actors against Chosŏn dynasty Korea in past decades came to fruition, as the defeat of rival Russia allowed Japan to force the Korean state into becoming a protectorate, a colony in all but name. By 1910, despite armed Korean resistance and debate within Japan over the fate of Korea, Korea was formally annexed into the Japanese Empire.[6] The incorporation of Korea into the

[5] For a history of modern Japanese imperialist designs and encroachment toward Korea before the annexation of 1910, refer to Peter Duus, *The Abacus and the Sword: The Japanese Penetration of Korea, 1895-1910* (Berkeley: University of California press, 1995).
[6] Duus, *The Abacus and the Sword*, 240-41.

formal Japanese Empire had significant effects both within the enlarged empire and across the Sino-Japanese border, into Manchuria.

Koreans began migrating out of Chosŏn dynasty Korea into Manchuria in the late 19th century, a process that accelerated with the rise of Japanese power over the Korean peninsula. While initial Korean settlement during the Qing dynasty's rule over China was small in scale and took place on a seasonal basis,[7] mostly from the poor northeastern Korean provinces that neighbored Manchuria, settlement soon became permanent. It grew to be especially prominent in the border region of Gando (C: Jiandao, J: Kantō, K: Gando, 間島).[8] Recent scholarship by Andrew De Lisle has delved into the history of Gando, with a focus on Korean migration and Japanese colonial policy between 1905 and 1932, elucidating the complexity of Chinese, Japan, and Korean conflicts and claims in the region.[9] It is estimated that, by 1910, around 200,00 ethnic Koreans were living full-time in Manchuria—mostly in Gando, where they had formed around two-thirds of the population since the turn of the century.[10] The Japanese conquest of Korea only accelerated the process of Korean migration: By 1930, around 600,000 Koreans were in Manchuria, accounting for roughly 2% of the region's total population. These migrants brought wet rice cultivation to the region and were at times welcomed by Chinese authorities for their productivity. However, their need for water and irrigation led to conflicts with Chinese farmers over water rights. These included the infamous Wanbaoshan Incident of 1931, in which

---

[7] Farmers from Hamgyŏng province crossed the Tumen River to plant rice in the spring, then returned for the fall harvest. De Lisle, "Japanese Borderland Colonialism and the Koreans in Jiandao, 1905-1932," 23-24.
[8] While "Gando" and its variants in Japanese and Chinese are no longer commonly used, and the Chinese term "Jiandao" is prevalent in scholarship, I choose to use the Korean reading of "Gando" to emphasize the role and presence of *Zai-Man* Koreans in the region.
[9] De Lisle, "Japanese Borderland Colonialism and the Koreans in Jiandao, 1905-1932."
[10] Hyun Ok Park, *Two Dreams in One Bed: Empire, Social Life, and the Origins of the North Korean Revolution in Manchuria* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 43-44.

clashes between Chinese and Korean farmers in Gando spread from Manchuria to trigger riots in Korea against Chinese residents and property.[11] By 1931, then, Koreans were a part of the Manchurian social and environmental landscape, shaped by Sino-Japanese state interactions.

While migrants to Manchuria were for a time able to escape direct Japanese rule and state authority, their legal status as Japanese imperial subjects, however unwillingly, authorized continued Japanese control and surveillance over their lives. In 1910, two months before the establishment of formal colonial rule over Korea, the Japanese state stipulated that ethnic Koreans would be defined, according to historian Barbara Brooks, as "nationals of Korea, regardless of birthplace, residence, and acquisition of nationality in other countries."[12] While pre-annexation Korea, known as the Great Han Empire, took steps to implement nationality laws and extend nationality to Koreans abroad, Japanese officials expanded these efforts as annexation approached.[13] The annexation transformed these Korean nationals into Japanese subjects, imposing Japanese jurisdiction over Koreans and their diaspora. The system of Japanese colonial nationality expanded in 1922, implementing a household registration system that tied overseas Koreans to family records in the peninsula.[14]

This legal status of ethnic Koreans tied them to the Japanese state and its power with few alternatives. Subjecthood provided legal protections under Japanese law in China, as Japan had

---

[11] Barbara Brooks, "Japanese Colonial Citizenship in Treaty Port China: The Location of Koreans and Taiwanese in the Imperial Order," in *New Frontiers: Imperialism's New Communities in East Asia, 1842-1953*, edited by Robert Bickers and Christian Henriot (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000), 116-17.
[12] Park, *Two Dreams in One Bed*, 50.
[13] De Lisle, "Japanese Borderland Colonialism and the Koreans in Jiandao, 1905-1932," 74, 91-93.
[14] The household registration system (戸籍, J: *koseki*, K: *hojŏk*), notable for institutionalizing the role of a male family head, survived liberation and through the 20th century in South Korea, until its abolition in 2005 over concerns that it supported patriarchal norms. Ki-young Shin, "The Politics of the Family Law Reform Movement in Contemporary Korea: A Contentious Space for Gender and the Nation," *Journal of Korean Studies* 11, no. 1 (September 1, 2006): 93–125, https://doi.org/10.1353/jks.2006.0005.

secured extraterritorial privileges through unequal treaties with the Qing and its notional successor state, the Republic of China.[15] As Japanese subjects, with Japanese nationality, Koreans thus became members of Japan's overseas empire. However, this legal condition also meant that Koreans who resisted Japanese rule were subject to Japanese control, surveillance, and punishment.[16] Japanese consulates monitored the activities of Koreans, while Japanese-sponsored Korean Associations (J: *Chōsen-jin minkai*, K: *Ch'osŏnin minhoe*, 朝鮮人民会,) served as local centers of Korean political and economic life outside of the peninsula.[17]

To analyze the role of Koreans within this broader imperial system, historian Hyun Ok Park employs the metaphor of "osmosis." Park argues that the flow of Korean migration into Manchuria, across the porous membrane of the Sino-Korean/Japanese border, formed a process of "osmotic imperialism" and expansion of Japanese power and governmentality as attached to Korean bodies.[18] Japanese authorities and media acknowledged the role of Koreans in Japanese imperial ambitions in the Northeast, celebrating their presence as a means to establish a foothold and stake in the region.[19] Along with the flow of imperial power came the logic of capital, which dominated the lives of Koreans who eventually came *en masse* to Japanese-occupied Manchuria through Japanese development corporations and agricultural cooperatives. Koreans, even after crossing the border, remained Japanese imperial subjects by law, subject to Japanese control, consular surveillance, and social organization. Therefore, an increase in Koreans within

---

[15] Brooks, "Japanese Colonial Citizenship in Treaty Port China," 117.
[16] Brooks, "Japanese Colonial Citizenship in Treaty Port China," 117-18.
[17] For more on the Korean Associations, refer to Hirooka Kiyonobu, "Kantō ni okeru Chōsenjin minkai to ryōjikan keisatsu: Zai-Man Chōsenjin to shokuminchi teikoku Nihon," *Jinbun gakuhō* 106 (April 2015): 169–204, https://doi.org/10.14989/200248. In English, Hyun Ok Park has discussed the connection between the Korean Associations and mechanisms of Japanese capitalist control in Manchuria in *Two Dreams in One Bed*.
[18] Park, *Two Dreams in One Bed*, 41-56.
[19] Brooks, "Japanese Colonial Citizenship in Treaty Port China," 118-19.

Northeast China corresponded to a *de facto* rise in Japanese authority and power in the region, regardless of the intentions or allegiances of Korean migrants.

The legal status of *Zai-Man* Koreans was not limited to the category of Japanese subjecthood. Many Koreans naturalized to become Chinese nationals through the authority of the warlord government in the Northeast; however, as stated before, they could not rid themselves of their legal status as Japanese imperial subjects. De Lisle notes while Japanese law prohibited dual nationality, in practice Japanese state policy did not recognize the naturalization of Koreans to Chinese nationality (and therefore the abandonment of Japanese nationality), to sustain its imposition of authority.[20] Thus, before the Japanese conquest of Manchuria in 1931, Koreans became a site of competition between Japanese and Chinese state power, as Chinese officials of the Northeastern government encouraged naturalization to extend authority over the Korean population.[21] This competition did not, in the end, enable Korean emigrants to play off these two states against one another to their own benefit. In 1925, the Mitsuya Agreement led to Japanese-Chinese cooperation to persecute anti-Japanese partisans and activists in the Korean community of Manchuria, placing further pressure on the population.[22] While some Koreans sought to escape Japanese jurisdiction through obtaining Chinese or Russian nationality, Japanese officials insisted that Koreans were subject to Japanese nationality law and authority as a means to continue the process of osmotic imperialism.

Japanese Empire and Manchukuo

[20] De Lisle, "Japanese Borderland Colonialism and the Koreans in Jiandao, 1905-1932," 155, 186.
[21] Park, *Two Dreams in One Bed*, 50-51.
[22] Brooks, "Japanese Colonial Citizenship in Treaty Port China," 115.

Even before 1931, Japanese influence in Manchuria was not limited to Gando and areas with ethnic Korean populations. The main thrust of Japanese imperialism in the Northeast of China was in the Kwantung Leased Territory (Kantō Shoshakuchi 関東租借地, Kantōshū 関東州), a formal Japanese colony on the southern tip of Manchuria, as well as the South Manchuria Railway Company's "Railway Zone" (Mantetsu fuzokuchi 満鉄付属地).[23] Both regions came under Japanese control after Japan's victory in the Russo-Japanese War (1904-1905) and the Treaty of Shimonoseki, which affirmed Japan's position as the most influential imperialist power in China's Northeast. The South Manchuria Railway (Minami Manshū Tetsudō 南満洲鉄道), or SMR (Mantetsu 満鉄) for short, was one of the products of the treaty, inheriting the Russian-built track between the Leased Territory and the northern Manchurian city of Harbin.[24] The company also inherited the Railway Zone, a narrow strip of land surrounding the north-south track under the management of the SMR and subject to Japanese consular influence.

As has been detailed in historian Erik Esselstrom's study of the Foreign Ministry's role in Japanese imperialism in Northeast China, these spheres of informal empire, combined with the power of Japanese consular police, provided a framework by which Japanese state power could extend beyond its formal borders to control both ethnic Japanese and ethnic Koreans in Manchuria.[25] Further, Japan had a direct military presence in Manchuria as well, in the form of the Imperial Japanese Army's Kwantung Army (Kantōgun 関東軍). The Kwantung Army was the garrison force of the leasehold and the Railway Zone. It formed the core of Japanese military

---

[23] For an overview of Japanese imperialism in Manchuria before 1932, with a focus on the Railway Zone, see Yoshihisa Tak Matsusaka, *The Making of Japanese Manchuria, 1904–1932* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001).
[24] Matsusaka, *The Making of Japanese Manchuria, 1904–1932*, 4, 71.
[25] Erik Esselstrom, *Crossing Empire's Edge: Foreign Ministry Police and Japanese Expansionism in Northeast Asia* (University of Hawai'i Press, 2009), https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt6wr0v1.

power in the region. Japanese power thus extended across Manchuria and its railways through military presence, extraterritoriality, and consulates.

The Japanese takeover of Manchuria in 1931, a series of events known in Japanese as the "Manchurian Incident" (Manshū Jihen 満洲事変), marked a new paradigm for the region and the *Zai-Man* Koreans. On September 18, 1931, the Kwantung Army executed a false-flag incident through which they blamed Chinese agents for the destruction of SMR track near the city of Fengtian.[26] This incident soon expanded into a large-scale military takeover of all Northeast China, in which the Kwantung Army and Japanese colonial forces from Korea expelled the ROC-aligned forces and government of warlord Zhang Xueliang 張學良 (1901-2001)[27] from the region. Initial resistance against escalation, from the Imperial Japanese Army's bureaucracy and the Japanese foreign ministry, ended when Japanese authorities in the metropole caved to the Kwantung Army's disregard for authority. Shifting political tides in Japan favored the militarist turn in Manchuria policy.[28]

The Kwantung Army's conquest of Manchuria culminated in the establishment of a new state known as Manchukuo in early 1932, and in Japan's eventual recognition of the entity later that year. An international commission inspected the aftermath of the Kwantung Army's initial false flag incident and published the Lytton Report on October 2, 1932. It placed the blame of the outbreak of hostilities on Japan.[29] The report's conclusions, combined with the carving out of

---

[26] For a detailed overview of the leadup, execution, and aftermath of these events (collectively known in Japanese historiography as the "Manchurian Incident" *Manshū Jihen* 満州事変), refer to Sadako N. Ogata, *Defiance in Manchuria: The Making of Japanese Foreign Policy, 1931-1932*, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964).
[27] Nicholas D. Kristof, "Zhang Xueliang, 100, Dies; Warlord and Hero of China," *New York Times*, October 19, 2001, https://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/19/world/zhang-xueliang-100-dies-warlord-and-hero-of-china.html.
[28] The Manchurian Incident led to an outpour of jingoistic sentiments in Japanese media and society, a topic analyzed by historian Louise Young in chapters 3 and 4 of *Japan's Total Empire: Manchuria and the Culture of Wartime Imperialism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).
[29] Ogata, *Defiance in Manchuria*, 171-72.

Manchukuo from the Republic of China's territory in violation of Chinese sovereignty, led to international outcry and pressure against Japan. Japan quit the League of Nations in early 1933, roughly half a year before Germany followed, after it became clear that the international community would not recognize Japan's new puppet state in China.[30] The "Manchurian Incident" (Manshū Jihen 満洲事変), as it was euphemized, thus became a *fait accompli* pushing Japan toward increasing aggression against China and into international isolation.

While Manchukuo was a product of Japanese imperialism, it was not a direct Japanese colony. Instead, the nascent Manchukuo state and Japanese settlers sought to build legitimacy and to erect a veneer of sovereignty for the new state, supporting it through narratives of ethnic co-existence and righteous, Confucian-style rule.[31] Even before such narratives took hold, from the late 1920s, Japanese settlers in Manchuria, including many employees of the SMR, began to organize. One of their organizations was the Manchurian Youth League (Manshū Seinen Renmei 満洲青年連盟), a mass political organization with membership in the thousands across Japanese-influenced Manchuria. The League's promotion of cooperation between Chinese and Japanese in the Northeast turned to concern and fears over the erosion of Japanese power in the region. The Northeastern warlord government's turn away from the Japanese (especially after the Kwantung Army's assassination of its leader, Zhang Zuolin 張作霖 in 1928) triggered concern over the state of Japanese power and interests in the region among members of the Manchurian Youth League. In response to these anxieties, League members, such as Yamaguchi Jūji 山口重

---

[30] Ogata, *Defiance in Manchuria*, 173-75.

[31] Aside from *minzoku kyōwa*, thinker and China hand Tachibana Shiraki's concept of the "Kingly Way" (王道 C: Wangdao, J: Ōdō) became a key slogan in the early formation of Manchukuo. Shiraki rejected Western-style democracy and popular sovereignty, instead promoting a form of government he considered more suitable to Asian nations, rooted in Confucian traditions and monarchism. Refer to Shin'ichi Yamamuro, *Manchuria under Japanese Dominion*, trans. Joshua A. Fogel (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 74-81.

次, began to conceptualize a future for Manchuria that was neither wholly Chinese nor Japanese. Their solution was the concept of *minzoku kyōwa*, in which Japanese, Chinese, and other ethnicities present in the Northeast would work together toward a brighter future. Faced with the rise of Chinese nationalism and a rejection of Japanese imperialism, Japanese settlers in Manchuria thus envisioned an alternative to outright colonial domination which would nonetheless maintain Japanese hegemony.

The Manchurian Youth League eventually coalesced into the Concordia Association and grew to be tied to the Manchukuo state. Members of the League assisted the Kwantung Army during its offensives to occupy Manchuria, negotiating with local Chinese powerbrokers and propagandizing for the army. Coinciding with the declaration of the state of Manchukuo in early 1932, leaders of the League founded the Concordia Party (Kyōwatō 協和党) on April 1, 1932.[32] The Concordia Party promoted *minzoku kyōwa* as a core principle, bringing the slogan into Manchukuo politics and society. However the Kwantung Army and the Manchukuo Head of State (and later Emperor), former Qing Emperor Puyi 溥儀, proved unwilling to support party politics. [33] As a result, after a member reorganization that saw the departure of several Manchurian Youth League-era idealists like Yamaguchi, the Concordia Party was dissolved and reformed, with state backing, into the Concordia Association. The Concordia Association was thus born as a mass political entity within the framework of nascent Manchukuo politics and society, injecting *minzoku kyōwa* into the Japanese imperialist project in Northeast China. It is this Concordia Association, in particular its Korean constituents and participants, that are the focus of this study.

---

[32] Egler, "Japanese Mass Organizations in Manchuria, 1928-1945," 222-28.
[33] Egler, "Japanese Mass Organizations in Manchuria, 1928-1945," 203.

Literature Review

Since the fall of Manchukuo in 1945, and especially from the 1990s onward, English-speaking scholars have written on Manchukuo and the Japanese occupation of northeast China. Such scholars as Louise Young (1998) and Prasenjit Duara (2003) examined the empire and nation building projects of Manchukuo, while Janis Mimura detailed the role of Manchukuo and its bureaucracy in the Japanese war machine.[34] Later scholars have advanced Anglophone research of Manchukuo into the realms of avant-garde culture, narcotics, and female literature. Yuka Hiruma Kishida is one of few scholars who has analyzed *minzoku kyōwa* as a primary object of research, investigating the role and potential praxis of the slogan in the Manchukuo institution of Kenkoku University (Kenkoku Daigaku 建国大学).[35]

However, it is Japanese-language scholarship that has led the way in researching the Concordia Association. Filippo Dornetti, an Italian scholar writing in Japanese, periodized the evolution of Japanese historiography of the Concordia Association and detailed the debate over the role of the organization in Manchukuo society.[36] Was *minzoku kyōwa* an ideology or mere rhetoric? What was the relationship between the Concordia Association and the state? What was the extent of Concordia Association influence over society? Japanese-language scholarship has worked to answer these questions over the course of several decades.

---

[34] See Prasenjit Duara, *Sovereignty and Authenticity: Manchukuo and the East Asian Modern* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2003); Janis A. Mimura, *Planning for Empire: Reform Bureaucrats and the Japanese Wartime State* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011), https://muse.jhu.edu/pub/255/monograph/book/26168; and Young, *Japan's Total Empire*.

[35] Yuka Hiruma Kishida, *Kenkoku University and the Experience of Pan-Asianism: Education in the Japanese Empire* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020).

[36] Filippo Dornetti, "'Manshūkoku' Kyōwakai kenkyū no seika to kadai," *Mita Gakkai zasshi* 105, no. 4 (2013): 693(171)-717(195).

Japanese scholarship of the Concordia Association began in earnest in the 1960s and 1970s. The first wave of Manchukuo literature consisted of memoirs and books written by former colonists and bureaucrats involved in the colonial project. Yamaguchi Jūji, the former leader of the Manchurian Youth League and early proponent of *minzoku kyōwa*, published a memoir in 1967 that projected an idealized image of Manchukuo.[37] In 1970 and 1971, a group of editors with ties to Manchukuo published *Manshūkokushi* (*History of Manchukuo*), in two volumes.[38] The volumes contained histories of the Concordia Association within a broader history that valorized the Manchurian project, its ostensive ideals of multiculturalism and righteous rule, and the role of Japanese settler population.

In the 1970s, Japanese academic historians reacted to the nostalgic historiography of Manchukuo written by former colonists with more critical views of Manchukuo and the Concordia Association.[39] These included Hirano Ken'ichiro's critique of its underlying goals in protecting Japanese interests, and Suzuki Takashi's analysis of the evolution of the formation of the Concordia Association and its close ties to military interests.[40] Okabe Makio linked the Concordia Association research to the debate over whether or not fascism as seen in Europe could be found in Japan, linking the activities of Manchurian Youth League to a conceptualization of Japanese fascism.[41]

---

[37] Yamaguchi Jūji, *Kieta teikoku Manshū* (Tokyo: Mainichi shinbunsha, 1967).
[38] Manshūkokushi Hensan Kankōkai, ed., *Manshūkokushi sōron* (Tokyo: Manmō dōhō engokai, 1970); Manshūkokushi Hensan Kankōkai, ed., *Manshūkokushi kakuron* (Tokyo: Manmō dōhō engokai, 1971).
[39] Dornetti, "'Manshūkoku' Kyōwakai kenkyū no seika to kadai," 173-4.
[40] Hirano Kenichirō, "Manshū Jihen mae ni okeru Zai-Man Nihon-jin no dōkō - Manshūkoku seikaku keisei no ichi yōin," *Kokusai seiji* 1970, no. 43 (1970); Suzuki Takashi, "Manshūkoku kyōwakaishi shiron 1," *Kikan gendaishi* 2 (May 20, 1973): 28–5 and Suzuki Takashi, "Manshūkoku kyōwakaishi shiron 2," *Kikan gendaishi* 5 (Spring 1974): 102–33.
[41] Okabe Makio, "Shokuminchi fashizumu undō no seiritsu to tenkai: Manshū Seinen Renmei to Manshū Kyōwatō," *Rekishigaku kenkyū* 406, no. 3 (1974): 1–16.

In the 1980s, the focus of research concerning the Concordia Association shifted from the Japanese settler population and its early formation to the Association's governance structure and ties to the state. In 1986, Asada Kyōji and Kobayashi Hideo co-edited *Nihon teikoku shugi no Manshū shihai* (*The Domination of Manchuria by Japanese Imperialism*), a collection of studies into the control mechanisms of the Manchukuo state.[42] The volume examined the military, political, and economic aspects of control, while also focusing on the previously underexamined causes of the fall of Manchukuo. The volume also included Kazama Hideto's research on how the Manchukuo state organized the Concordia Association to manage local governance in rural areas and pacify the population. Kazama argued that the Concordia Association's lack of resources or focus on rural governance, along with lackluster popular support, resulted in effective failure of its systems of rural control.[43]

The 1990s saw further developments in the study of the Concordia Association. The Association of Manchukuo Research (Manshūkoku Kenkyū no Kai 満洲国研究の会) approached Manchukuo and the Concordia Association with a broad background in Meiji period Japanese history and state formation.[44] Researchers in the group, including Yamamuro Shin'ichi, Yamamoto Yūzō, and Okumura Hiroshi, critiqued Kobayashi and Asada's *Nihon teikoku shugi no Manshū shihai*, arguing that previous research failed to address the political history of Manchukuo and its state formation, and that it focused too much on imperial designs for industrialization in Manchuria.[45] Okumura argued that Kazama portrayed the Concordia

---

[42] Asada Kyōji and Kobayashi Hideo, *Nihon teikoku shugi no Manshū shihai: 15-nen Sensōki wo chūshin ni*, (Tokyo: Jichōsha, 1986).
[43] Kazama Hideto, "Nōson gyōsei shihai," in *Nihon teikoku shugi no Manshū shihai: 15-nen Sensōki wo chūshin ni*, ed. Asada Kyōji and Kobayashi Hideo (Tokyo: Jichōsha, 1986), 256–326.
[44] Dornetti, "'Manshūkoku' Kyōwakai kenkyū no seika to kadai," 186.
[45] Dornetti, "'Manshūkoku' Kyōwakai kenkyū no seika to kadai," 185-6.

Association and local governance structures as directly linked, while they were often in conflict and dialogue with each other through the imposition of Japanese-style local organization on existing structures and elites.[46] Okumura's work is notable as a rare example of the literature with a focus on the National Congresses (Zenkoku Rengō Kyōgikai 全国連合協議会)[47] of the Concordia Associations.

In 1998, Tsukase Susumu continued research into local Concordia Association governance by researching not national-level policy documents, as in previous literature, but the practical reach of, and the effects of the Concordia Association upon, local life in Manchukuo,.[48] Scholarship of the 1990s also revisited previous areas of research into the Concordia Association. Yamamuro Shin'ichi's 1996 book *Kimera: Manshūkoku no shōzō*, later translated into English by Joshua Fogel as *Manchuria under Japanese Dominion*, focused on the ideological elements of Manchukuo and the Concordia Association, including the development and role of *minzoku kyōwa*.[49]

In the present century, Japanese-language research into the Concordia Association evolved in new directions. Scholars began to focus on how the Concordia Association interacted with the various ethnic groups in Manchuria, notably Koreans, beyond the majority Chinese and influential Japanese minority populations. In 2003, Hirooka Kiyonobu researched the Concordia

---

[46] Okumura Hiroshi, "Chihō seiji ni okeru Manshūkoku Kyōwakai no ichi: Manshūkoku Kyōwakai dai 7-ji zenkoku rengō kyōgikai no bunseki wo tōshite," in *"Manshūkoku" no kenkyū*, ed. Yamamoto Yūzō (Kyoto: Kyoto University jinbun kagaku kenkyūjo, 1993), 157–8.

[47] While Egler translates the Japanese title of these assemblies more directly as "National Federated Assemblies," I have elected to use "National Congress," courtesy of the English-language newspaper published in Manchukuo, the *Manchuria Daily News*. "Concordia Talks Preservation of Peace and Order," *Manchuria Daily News*, October 1, 1938, Mobilizing East Asia Online.

[48] Tsukase Susumu, "1940-nen dai ni okeru Manshūkoku tōji no shakai e no shintō," *Ajia Keizai* 39, no. 7 (July 15, 1998): 2–21.

[49] Yamamuro Shin'ichi, *Manchuria under Japanese Dominion*, trans. Joshua A. Fogel (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006).

Association and its rhetoric surrounding the wartime mobilization of Koreans. In 2015, he later branched out beyond the Concordia Association, with research into how *Zai-Man* Koreans confronted their changing legal status and interacted with Japanese consular authorities.[50] Tanaka Ryūichi and Sin Kyu-sŏp researched the trajectory of *Zai-Man* Koreans' involvement in the Concordia Association at the local and national levels, respectively.[51] This recent scholarship has contributed to the research of Koreans in Manchukuo and their relations to the Concordia Association, building on existing Korean-language literature and research on the topic. Research into the Concordia Association continued to be published in Japanese into the 2010s, led by scholars including Dornetti and Hirooka.[52]

English-language research into the Concordia Association has been less active, with some mentions of the organization but few dedicated works of research. David George Egler's 1977 dissertation is the most extensive work on the Concordia Association written in English, detailing the evolution of the organization and *minzoku kyōwa*. Egler argued that Japanese settlers in Manchuria developed *minzoku kyōwa* as an ideological tool that was not purely cynical yet was crucial to justifying the colonial project in Manchukuo.[53] He also outlined how the bureaucratization of the Concordia Association reduced the influence of *minzoku kyōwa* and its early advocates. In recent years, Emer O'Dwyer (2015) analyzed Japanese settler society in the

---

[50] Hirooka Kiyonobu, "Zai-Man Chōsen-jin no 'kōkoku shinmin' gensetsu: sōryokusen-ka no Manshū Kyōwakai wo chūshin ni," *Chōsenshi kenkyūkai ronbunshū* 41 (October 2003): 119–43 and Hirooka Kiyonobu, "Kantō ni okeru Chōsen-jinminkai to ryōjikan keisatsu: zai-Man Chōsen-jin to shokuminchi teikoku Nihon," *Jinbun gakuhō* 106 (April 2015): 169–204, https://doi.org/10.14989/200248.

[51] Sin Kyu-sŏp, "Chigai hōken teppai to zai-Man Chōsen-jin tōgō seisaku: chigai hōken teppai kara kyōwakai e no hen'nyū made," in *Nitchō kankeishi ronshū: Kang sensei koki, taishoku kinen* (Tokyo: Shinkansha, 2003), 661–81 and Tanaka Ryūichi, "'Manshūkoku' ki Harbin Chōsen-jin no 'tainichi kyōryoku,'" *Jinbun gakuhō* 91 (December 2004).

[52] Filippo Dornetti, "Chiiki shakai ni okeru Manshū Kyōwakai no tenkai to nōmin no dōkō: Hōten-shō Bujun-shi wo chūshin ni," 2017, and Hirooka, "Zai-Man Chōsen-jin to shokuminchi teikoku Nihon."

[53] David George Egler, "Japanese Mass Organizations in Manchuria, 1928-1945: The Ideology of Racial Harmony" (Phd Diss., Tucson, The University of Arizona, 1977), http://hdl.handle.net/10150/565382, 321-27.

port city of Dairen and detailed the development of mass politics in Manchuria, including the development of Concordia Association predecessors such as the Manchurian Youth League and the Concordia Party.[54] O'Dwyer situates the Concordia Association into a broader world and lineage of settler politics and organizations, tracing a line of continuity from Japanese colonial society before the Japanese takeover of all Manchuria through the development of Manchukuo. The works of Egler and O'Dwyer have created a detailed picture of the Manchurian Youth League and related settler organizations in the genealogy of the Concordia Association.

Other English-language works on Manchukuo have explored themes related to the Concordia Association and ethnicity in Manchuria. Ethnicity in Manchukuo is an established object of study, with scholars such as Mariko Tamanoi (2000) and Prasenjit Duara researching the construction of ethnic identity in Manchukuo, and how the Japanese attempted to mobilize colonial "others" for the nation-building project.[55] Hyun Ok Park (2005) examines the economic structures and mechanisms that controlled ethnic Koreans and their migrations into northeast China.[56] Park outlined the complex relations between Koreans, state authorities, and Japanese-made institutions that included the Korean Associations, later incorporated into the Concordia Association.

Recent Chinese-language scholarship from the People's Republic of China focuses on the Concordia Association's role as a coercive tool to pacify the majority-Chinese population of Manchukuo, a perspective informed by the Japanese invasion of China. Manchukuo was forcibly

---

[54] Emer Sinéad O'Dwyer, *Significant Soil: Settler Colonialism and Japan's Urban Empire in Manchuria* (Harvard University Asia Center, 2015).
[55] Duara, *Sovereignty and Authenticity* and Mariko Asano Tamanoi, "Knowledge, Power, and Racial Classifications: The 'Japanese' in 'Manchuria,'" *Journal of Asian Studies* 59, no. 2 (May 1, 2000): 248–76, https://doi.org/10.2307/2658656.
[56] Park, *Two Dreams in One Bed.*

carved out of China and served as a staging ground for a larger invasion in 1937, and the post-war reckoning decried collaboration with the Japanese. Li Xujuan (2005) outlines the general history of the Concordia Association and its relations to Japanese systems of control.[57] Feng Ya and Zhu Lixin (2013) analyze the rhetoric and publications of the Manchurian Youth League to posit the Concordia Association's origin as a tool of colonial control.[58] Wang Changhuan (2018) follows Feng and Zhu's research into the Manchurian Youth League, while also comparing the trajectories of Chinese and Japanese scholarship of the Concordia Association.[59] Wang criticizes how the Chinese-language scholarship's focus on surface-level aspects of the Concordia Association, suggesting that Sinophone scholars look to Japanese scholars of the past, such as Suzuki Takashi and Hirano Ken'ichirō, as guides for future research.

Overall, most research concerning the Concordia Association has originated in Japan, with English, Chinese, and Korean-language scholarship also contributing to the field. Japanese-speaking scholars originally focused on Japanese perspectives and the systems colonial authorities established, with recent turns toward colonial subjectivity and the role of ethnic Koreans. I contribute to this research with my analysis of Korean participation in the Concordia Association, and with my research into the little-analyzed National Congresses of the organization.

Methodology and Outline

---

[57] Li Xujuan, "Xie he hui yu wei man zheng fu guan xi xul un – yi Xie he hui gai zu wei he xin zhan kai," *Qiu shi xue han* 32, no. 5 (2005): 119–25, https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1000-7504.2005.05.022.
[58] Feng Ya and Zhu Lixin, "'Manzhou ping lun' zhong de 'Man qing lian' yu 'Xie he hui,'" *Wai guo wen ti yan jiu*, no. 3 (January 2012): 20–23.
[59] Wang Changhuan, "Ri wei shi qi 'Manzhou qing nian lian meng' yan jiu," *Xian dai jiao ji*, no. 10 (January 2018): 44–45 and Wang Changhuan, "Zhan hou wei Manzhouguo Xie he hui zhong ri yan jiu zong xu," *Zhong wai jiao liu*, no. 30 (January 2017): 44–45.

The primary objects of analysis in this thesis are the internal documents of the Concordia Association, especially during the 1930s. Chapter 1 focuses on two documents created by regional offices, both digitized and available via the digital archive of the Japanese Center for Asian Historical Records (JACAR), along with the published by-laws of the Concordia Association. Chapters 2 and 3 cite the records for the Concordia Association's National Congresses in the late 1930s and early 40s, digitized and accessible on the National Diet Library (NDL) Digital Collection. The National Congress records at hand are an incomplete collection, as other records have yet to be digitized by the NDL or are stored in other archives. A future study would benefit from comprehensive collection of these records to depict a more complete image of the Concordia Association National Congresses.

This thesis is organized into three chapters, organized roughly chronologically. Each chapter discusses an aspect of *Zai-Man* Korean interactions with Concordia Association. Chapter 1 details the incorporation of ethnic Koreans into the Concordia Association after the organization's establishment in 1932. Japanese authorities sought to transfer everyday jurisdiction over Koreans in Manchuria from the Korean Associations, which had Japanese consular and Korean Government-General support, to the Concordia Association. These efforts sparked debates within the Concordia Association over how these Koreans would be incorporated into the organization. The question was as follows: Should the Concordia Association organize along ethnic lines, thus providing Koreans their own branches and institutions within the organization? The result was a Concordia Association that limited ethnic organization, curtailing the creation of an institutional power base for *Zai-Man* Koreans.

Chapter 2 discusses how *Zai-Man* Koreans participated in the National Congresses of the Concordia Association. The implementation of the abrogation of extraterritoriality led to the

incorporation of Koreans into the Concordia Association under the structures discussed in Chapter 1. Koreans soon participated in the Concordia Association's annual assemblies, where local issues were able to come to the attention of top Concordia Association and Manchukuo officials. However, their petitions faced resistance from the authorities, who often dismissed Korean concerns or argued that the Concordia Association lacked the power to fulfill these requests.

Chapter 3 continues the analysis of the National Congresses and its internal dilemmas, focusing on the debate over the jurisdictional boundaries of Korean education in Manchukuo. Abrogation created a division within *Zai-Man* Korean education, so that schools outside of select areas were transferred to Manchukuo jurisdiction, while select schools remained under Japanese consular control, along with schools for ethnic Japanese pupils. This division, along with the difference in outcomes for ethnic Japanese and Korean schools, led *Zai-Man* Korean representatives in the National Congresses to submit petitions and to debate with Manchukuo officials. The dual status of ethnic Koreans as both members of an imagined Manchukuo nation and Japanese imperial subjects became particularly salient here. Like the efforts seen in Chapter 2, however, *Zai-Man* education advocacy encountered an audience in Concordia Association with little interest in solving ethnic Korean woes.

I conclude with a discussion of the fate of Manchukuo and the Concordia Association, along with the ethnic Koreans in Northeast China who outlived Japanese imperialism. As Japan fell and the People's Republic of China rose, the category of *Zai-Man* Koreans disappeared. In its place, there appeared Chaoxianzu 朝鮮族 or Chosŏnjok, who were now reimagined as "Korean Chinese." The conclusion reflects trajectory of *Zai-Man* participation in the Concordia

Association and its National Congresses, and of the collaboration that had come to naught with the end of Japanese rule.

Chapter 1: Debates on the Concordia Association and Ethnic Politics

Creating Korean Branches

After the establishment of the Concordia Association in 1932, the course of the organization was not a decided matter, including when it came to the organization of local governance and cells. The primary political unit comprising Concordia Association was the branch association (*bunkai* 分会). From the founding of the Concordia Association until a structural reorganization in September 1934, Concordia Association guidelines for the branches dictated that a branch would be "organized in principle based on occupation" (*shokugyōbetsu ni soshiki suru* 職業別ニ組織スル).[1] The justification was that the primary site of societal interaction was at the workplace, and therefore it was only natural for these connections to serve as the basis of Concordia Association activities. However, for "the masses with a low degree of culture" (*bunka teido no hikuki minshū* 文化程度ノ低キ民衆), some temporary exceptions could be made for alternate "appropriate [organizational] structures" (*tekitōnaru keishiki* 適当ナル形式) with an eventual move toward occupational organization.

The guidelines do not elaborate what this alternative to occupational organizations would look like. However, certain groups and members of the Concordia Association proposed the adoption of an alternative structure of branches, inciting debate over the nature of local level Concordia Association politics.

---

[1] Manshūkokushi Hensan Kankōkai, ed., *Manshū kokushi kakuron* (Tokyo: Manmō Dōhō Engokai, 1971), 82-83, 86 and Soshikika, "Bunkai soshiki shidō hōshin," in Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, ed., *Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai soshiki enkakushi* (Fuji Shuppan, 1982), 63. While the quoted "Bunkai soshiki shidō hōshin" is only dated sometime between 1932 and 1934, the *Manshūkokushi kakuron* indicates that guidelines of occupational organization were in play from the foundation of the Concordia Association, and were official decreed in March 1933 until the reorganization of 1943.

The alternative, with backing from elements of the Concordia Association and ethnic Koreans, was the organization of branches along ethnic lines. In April 1933, the Harbin Regional Office (Harubin Chihō Jimukyoku 哈爾濱地方事務局) of the Concordia Association published a document titled "One Korean Intellectual's Resonant Impression of the Concordia Movement" (Bō yūshiki Senjin no kyōwa undo ni taisuru kyōmeiteki kansō 某有識鮮人ノ協和運動ニ対スル共鳴的感想, henceforth "Resonant Impression"). The Harbin office introduces the anonymous Korean author as a former independence activist who studied in Japan, but now sympathizes with the Concordia Association's objectives.[2] The introduction states that, as members of the office agreed with the author's points, they published the pamphlet as a reference, likely for other members and organs of the Concordia Association.

The author of "Resonant Impression" argues that the Concordia Association should be organized along ethnic lines, rather than the existing divisions by occupation. He states that achieving the goals of *minzoku kyōwa* ideology requires fulfilling material and spiritual conditions, the former relying on mutual support and economic support to prevent societal discontent against the state and between ethnic groups.[3] The spiritual path to *minzoku kyōwa*, on the other hand, requires "the liberation and development of 'ethnic character'" (*minzokusei no kaihō hatten* 民族性ノ解放発展), as only through elevating all races in Manchukuo onto the same cultural and developmental footing could the monarchical utopian ideals of Manchukuo be realized.[4] To encourage the material and spiritual development of each race, the author proposes a reorganization of the Concordia Association along ethnic lines. Instead of causing conflict

---

[2] Manshūkoku Kyōwakai Harbin Chihō Jimukyoku, "Bō yūshiki Senjin no kyōwa undō ni taisuru kyōmeiteki kansō Daidō 2-nen 4-gatsu," April 1933, C12120177400, JACAR, 1411.
[3] Manshūkoku Kyōwakai Harbin Chihō Jimukyoku, 1416.
[4] Manshūkoku Kyōwakai Harbin Chihō Jimukyoku, 1418.

between groups, the author argues, this structure will encourage each group to build itself up through "dialectical competition" (*benshōhōteki tairitsu* 辨証方的対立(ママ)).[5] The author's detailed proposal for an ethnically organized Concordia Association calls for five parallel bureaucratic structures for each of the five primary ethnic groups in Manchukuo, with division between races at all levels, leading up to a separate national convention for each of the five groups. From there, all five parallel organizations would meet in an overarching Concordia Association national convention. This proposal centers the role of ethnicity in the Concordia Association's organization over strict occupational branch divisions promoted at the national level.

Closer inspection of the treatise, however, reveals the role the author's Korean identity in relation to his proposal for an ethnically organized Concordia Association. The author argues for a "need to organize a political division with vanguard elements within the Concordia Association" (*kyōwakai-nai ni aru sen'eibunshi o motte seijibu …o ketsugō … subeki dearu* 協和会内ニアル尖鋭分子ヲ以ツテ政治部…ヲ結合…スベキデアル), including a research division within "a certain ethnic organization's structure" (或ル民族別組織図).[6] The author implies the existence of members of the Concordia Association who would be interested in promoting ethnic reorganization, and the author's previous involvement in the Korean independence movement, mentioned in the Harbin office's introduction, suggests that the author may have continued his involvement in ethnic Korean politics in Manchukuo and the Concordia Association.

Another clue to the author's focus on Koreans is his triangulation of mutual attitudes among Japanese, Koreans, and Han Chinese. Toward the end of the treatise, the author lists

---

[5] Manshūkoku Kyōwakai Harbin Chihō Jimukyoku, 1420.
[6] Manshūkoku Kyōwakai Harbin Chihō Jimukyoku, 1415.

negative perspectives of the Japanese, toward the Chinese; of the Chinese, toward the Japanese; of the Koreans, toward the Chinese; and of the Chinese, toward the Koreans.[7] Mention of any relationship between Koreans and Japanese is conspicuously absent. While this omission could be to avoid censorship or to avoid stating the obvious for readers of Japanese (likely to be ethnic Japanese and Koreans), it attempts to distinguish ethnic Chinese from Japanese and Koreans. The text details no enmity between the Japanese and Koreans, while the Chinese are a clear "other" in the triangulated relationship. The author's proposal, seen in this light, is a polemic arguing for the elevation of the position of Koreans to holding equal political weight within the Concordia Association as Chinese and Japanese, rather than be outnumbered and subsumed into a larger mass.

The presence of the Korean Associations and the All-Manchurian Korean Associations Congress is crucial background to the mechanism of ethnic mass politics that "Resonant Impression" proposes. Thirteen Korean Associations across Manchuria formed a regional assembly in Mukden on October 20, 1931, in the wake of the Kwantung Army's false-flag attack.[8] This became the All-Manchurian Korean Associations Congress (Zen-Man Chōsen-jin minkai rengōkai 全満朝鮮人民会連合会), called mainly to address the crisis of Korean refugees fleeing Sino-Japanese military engagements, and to address Chinese hostility to Koreans. Their first assembly in October submitted a list of thirteen requests to Japanese authorities, ranging from general security concerns to proposals for increased autonomy for *Zai-Man* Koreans.[9] While at first the organization had no official backing, in 1933, the Kwantung

---

[7] Manshūkoku Kyōwakai Harbin Chihō Jimukyoku, 1427-28.
[8] Sin Kyu-sŏp, "Shoki 'Manshūkoku' ni okeru Chōsen-jin tōgōsaku: Chōsen-jin Rengōkai wo chūshin ni," *Nihon shokuminchi kenkyū* 9 (1997), 21-22.
[9] Noguchi Tauchi, "Jikyoku ni tsuki zai-man chosenjin hogo kyuzai narabini shorai no hatten ni kansuru seigansho," October 21, 1931, C05021897200, JACAR.

Army incorporated it into its strategy by which to manage ethnic Koreans in Manchuria.[10] The Koreans Associations and the Congress thus formed a precedent for Korean mass politics within Manchukuo. The idea of organizing Koreans for empire was not novel in Manchuria; instead, the proposal in "Resonant Impression" could be considered the next logical step of evolution.

The role of the Harbin Regional Office in the publication of "Resonant Impression" is important to note. A May 11, 1933 roundtable discussion of Concordia Association leadership on ideology in Manchukuo noted Harbin as the center of the "bolshevization problem" (*sekka mondai* 赤化問題) in the country.[11] The character of Harbin as a center of leftist activity in early Manchukuo may explain the Marxist-Leninist leanings seen in the document (e.g. mention of dialectics, attention to material conditions, and calls to establish a vanguard faction) and the Harbin office's publication and approval of the document. This context, and the content of "Resonant Impression," imply the existence of left-leaning elements within the Concordia Association that aligned with politics advocating for ethnic Korean political power within Manchukuo.

Against Ethnic Organization

The pro-Korean leanings in "One Korean Intellectual's Resonant Impression on the Concordia Movement" were not lost on others within the Concordia Association. A month later, in May 1933, the Concordia Association's office in Fengtian published "A Critique of the Proposal to Reorganize the Concordia Association along Ethnic Lines" (Kyōwakai no minzokubetsu

---

[10] Sin Kyu-sŏp, "Shoki 'Manshūkoku' ni okeru Chōsen-jin tōgōsaku: Chōsen-jin Rengōkai wo chūshin ni," 20.
[11] Manshūkoku Kyōwakai Hōten Chihō Jimukyoku, "Kyōwakai no minzoku betsu saisoshiki teishō ni taisuru hihan daidō 2-nen 5-gatsu," May 11 1933, C12120177500, JACAR, 1483.

saisoshiki teishō ni taisuru hihan 協和会の民族別再組織提唱に対する批判), henceforth "A Critique"), which was also printed anonymously. The author lists other recent polemics calling for the establishment of a "mono-ethnic organization" (*tan'itsu minzoku dantai* 単一民族団体) for ethnic Koreans in Manchukuo, noting that the Fengtian office had previously criticized them from the standpoint of the Concordia Association and its objectives.[12] "Resonant Impression" is, in this context, framed as part of a worrying development within the Concordia Association as a whole. The author of "A Critique" goes on to criticize each of the main points of "Resonant Impression," arguing that reorganization along ethnic lines would cause further strife, also justifying the role of the Japanese as a leader[13] dominating the weaker, less developed races in Manchukuo with Pan-Asianist rhetoric.[14]

"A Critique" contains attacks against the author of "Resonant Impression" and his role as a Korean, along with general negative sentiment toward Koreans. Interestingly, while the Korean identity of the author of "Resonant Impression" was prominently included in the title and introduction of the text, there is no direct mention of "Korea" (Chōsen 朝鮮), or even of the Korean people, in "A Critique." Despite this omission, Koreans in Manchukuo were unmistakably on the mind of the author. Several times throughout the text, "A Critique" accuses the Korean author of working only for his own people, such as when he accuses the Korean of "hiding behind the name of *minzoku kyōwa* to promote the privileges of only one ethnic group" (*minzoku kyōwa no na ni kakure ichi-minzoku no ken'eki nomi o shuchō* 民族協和ノ名ニ隠れ

---

[12] Manshūkoku Kyōwakai Hōten Chihō Jimukyoku, 1431.
[13] Kevin M. Doak argues that the concept of "leading ethnic nation" (shidō minzoku 指導民族) as used in Pan-Asianist rhetoric has roots in the German National Socialist concept of the herrenvolk. Kevin M. Doak, "The Concept of Ethnic Nationality and Its Role in Pan-Asianism in Imperial Japan," in Pan-Asianism in Modern Japanese History: Colonialism, Regionalism and Borders, ed. Sven Saaler and J Victor Koschmann (London; New York: Routledge, 2007), 173.
[14] Manshūkoku Kyōwakai Hōten Chihō Jimukyoku, 1433-34, 36, 45, 48.

一民族の権益ノミヲ主張).[15] These accusations are repeated several pages later, and "A Critique" even surmises that "Resonant Impression" was written with only "a certain ethnic group as the subject" (*aru minzoku o shutai ni* 或ル民族ヲ主体ニ), with its author only taking into consideration "one group of people in one region" (*ichibu no chiiki ni okeru ichibu no minshū* 一部ノ地域ニ於ケル一部ノ民衆).[16] While "A Critique" takes great pains to avoid directly mention Koreans by name, the implications are clear. These accusations frame the calls for an ethnic reorganization of the Concordia Association as a Korean appeal to be granted political privileges, rather than the framing in "A Critique," which portrays the issue as the road to *minzoku kyōwa*.

"A Critique" also implicates Koreans as elements dangerous to Manchukuo society. In his conclusion, the author argues that the creation of ethnic organizations within the Concordia Association would lead to "infiltration by recalcitrant and villainous elements" (*futei burai no to ga sennyū* 不逞無頼ノ徒ガ混入) and subsequent plots against the Concordia Association.[17] While "A Critique" does not refer to Koreans directly here, "recalcitrant" (*futei* 不逞) was a label often applied to ethnic Koreans resisting Japanese rule, characterizing Koreans as a treacherous ethnic group.[18] The use of this term ties the Korean author of "Resonant Impression" and his push for ethnic organization of the Concordia Association to Korean nationalist politics and seditious activity against the empire.

The debate between proponents of ethnic and occupational organization of the Concordia Association became drawn into broader discussions of the association's future as Manchukuo

---

[15] Manshūkoku Kyōwakai Hōten Chihō Jimukyoku, 1435.
[16] Manshūkoku Kyōwakai Hōten Chihō Jimukyoku, 1437.
[17] Manshūkoku Kyōwakai Hōten Chihō Jimukyoku, 1449.
[18] Jun Uchida, *Brokers of Empire: Japanese Settler Colonialism in Korea* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2011), 206-07.

politics continued to form. Throughout 1933 and 1934, there emerged a conflict between the Concordia Association and bureaucrats of the new Manchukuo government in Xinjing (J: Shinkō, often Romanized as Hsinking 新京), as the relationship between the two institutions remained in flux.[19] Changes in Kwantung Army leadership, which brought in officers less interested in the Pan-Asianist idealism of Ishiwara Kanji 石原莞爾 and other figures involved in the initial Japanese invasion, exacerbated the woes of the Concordia Association. A solution came when Concordia Association leadership negotiated with Xinjing and the Kwantung Army to agree on terms of reorganization, with closer integration between the Concordia Association and Manchukuo bureaucracy, while ousting early idealist leaders of the organization, like Yamaguchi Jūji.[20]

The reorganization also led to changes in the roles of branch associations in the Concordia Association. A faction of members involved in anti-insurgent operations in eastern and northern Manchuria proposed changes to the branch system, amongst other changes at the operational level, based on their experiences in areas with militarized anti-Japanese resistance from ethnic Chinese and Koreans.[21] After an initial reorganization in September 1934, the Concordia Association announced new policies for branch associations with a public outline in February 1935. The introduction of the outline states that the early Concordia Association established branch associations "mostly blindly" (*hotondo mōmokuteki ni* 殆ド盲目的ニ) across Manchuria, making mistakes and causing a "fall in confidence" (*shinyō o shittsui shitsutsu ari* 信用ヲ失墜シツツアリ) along the way.[22] The Concordia Association's solution to the issue of

---

[19] Manshūkokushi Hensan Kankōkai, ed., *Manshūkokushi kakuron*, 86.
[20] Manshūkokushi Hensan Kankōkai, ed., *Manshūkokushi kakuron*, 87.
[21] Manshūkokushi Hensan Kankōkai, ed., *Manshūkokushi kakuron*, 87-89.
[22] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai soshiki enkakushi*, 119.

organizing branch organizations was the use of a "dual-track principle" (*nigen shugi* 二元主義), which called for the establishment of both occupational and ethnic branches.[23]

The rationale behind this decision was that the different material conditions of different ethnic groups in Manchukuo required different solutions, and that forced co-existence in any given branch could backfire. Under the dual-track principle, there were to be "ethnic branches for the annihilation of ethnicity" (*minzoku hakai no tame no minzoku bunkai* 民族破壊ノ為ノ民族分会) and "occupational branches for the annihilation of class [divisions]" (*kaikyū hakai no tame no shokugyō bunkai* 階級破壊ノ為ノ職業分会), building toward ideals of *minzoku kyōwa* and class harmony.[24] The Concordia Association's emphasis on symbolic violence against ethnic and class divisions reflects the early Association's anti-capitalist tendencies and emphasis on *minzoku kyōwa* in society, traits inherited from the Manchurian Youth League and its thinkers. Calls for ethnic organization appealed to these leanings. The document also calls for the protection of minority group opinions in branches not organized along ethnic occupational lines. With the establishment of ethnic-occupational dualism, the strict rule of occupational organization within the Concordia Association was broken.

While ethnic organization of Concordia Association branches was realized to an extent, it was by no means a complete victory for ethnic Korean proponents. Rather than creating a system of purely ethnic branches or branches within ethnic pillars, the dual-track principle called for all ethnic branches to be each organized around an occupation within the broader Concordia Association.[25] In addition, if the branch was in a region with only one ethnic group, then it would

---

[23] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai soshiki enkakushi*, 131-32.
[24] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai soshiki enkakushi*, 131-32.
[25] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai soshiki enkakushi*, 131-32.

be organized by *both* class and occupation, rather than by ethnic group. Under the new system, then, ethnic organization was only an option in Concordia Association politics, rather than its dominant paradigm.

Further revisions of the Concordia Association's branch system hampered the cause of ethnic organization. An internal document of the Concordia Association detailing rules for branches prior to July 1937 notes different roles for different ethnic branches.[26] The document states that Japanese, Koreans, and Mongolians were permitted to establish their own ethnic branches (thus excluding Chinese, Russians, Manchus, and smaller ethnic groups within Manchukuo), and that Korean branches would generally follow rules established for Japanese branches.[27] However, the document notes that a key difference between Japanese and Korean was that the leaders of Korean Associations fought each other for their own self-benefit, and that it was important to "end internal plotting against the authorities" (*kanken e no naimen sakudō ni shūshi shi* 官憲ヘノ内面策動ニ終止シ).[28] Here, the narrative of disloyal and plotting Koreans returns to the discourse surrounding ethnic organization of branches. The Korean branches are presented as a risk, inheriting internal power struggles from other mass political structures and serving as sites of potential dissent.

The period of limited ethnic organization in the Concordia Association soon came to an end. In August 1937, another round of reorganization led to major changes in the Concordia Association. These attempted to integrate the organization into the Manchukuo state more closely. The new principles of the association stated that branches were defined as representing a

---

[26] The document is undated but is contained in a section containing documents from 1936 through 1940, and details rules corresponding to those prior to the July 1937 reorganization as detailed in Manshūkokushi Hensan Kankōkai, ed., *Manshūkokushi kakuron*, 101-03. Thus, the document is likely from sometime in early 1936 to July 1937.
[27] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai soshiki enkakushi*, 198-99.
[28] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai soshiki enkakushi*, 206-07.

specific geographical area or region, with no mention of ethnic or occupational organization.[29] Each branch would now consist of members residing in each region, who would form a branch accordingly. While the previous internal document had noted regional organization as an option alongside existing occupational and ethnic systems, in 1937, it became the sole guiding principle of organizing branches.[30]

Later, in February 1938, the Concordia Association published the "Guiding Outline for Branch Organization along with Branch Activities" (Bunkai soshiki narabi ni bunkai katsudō shidō yōkō 分会組織並分会活動指導要項). In a rejection of past principles, the document confirmed the regional organization of branches, emphasizing that branches were to unite members regardless of "ethnic group, class, or occupation" (*minzoku, kaikyū, shokugyō* 民族、階級、職業).[31] While exceptions could be made for branches organized around workplaces for military bases, mines, and several other sites, there were no exceptions made for ethnic branches. In addition, the document ordered the gradual reorganization of now outdated forms of branches, including ethnic ones, to conform to the new guidelines for branches (i.e. regional organization).[32] By November 1938, out of 3,218 total branches in Manchukuo, there remained only 56 ethnic branches, as opposed to 2,480 regional ones.[33] While the organization of branches along ethnic lines did not completely disappear, the center of gravity decisively shifted to regional definitions.

---

[29] Manshūkokushi Hensan Kankōkai, ed., *Manshūkokushi kakuron*, 102-04.
[30] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai soshiki enkakushi*, 198-99.
[31] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai soshiki enkakushi*, 216-17.
[32] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai soshiki enkakushi*, 218.
[33] Manshūkokushi Hensan Kankōkai, ed., *Manshūkokushi kakuron*, 106-08. Aside from regional and ethnic branches, there were also 511 workplace, 165 occupational, 4 religious, and 2 external organization branches.

The rise and fall of ethnic branches in the Concordia Association illustrates how ethnic Korean politics had a voice within the early association's politics, even as they were subject to Japanese distrust and vulnerable to larger political winds surrounding the Association. The publication of "Resonant Impression" with support from a regional office of the Concordia Association demonstrates how issues relevant to Korean could be promoted to high levels of Concordia Association discourse. In contrast, the reaction in "A Critique," also with official backing, indicates challenges for advocates of Korean causes within the system in the face of Japanese suspicion. While the promoters of ethnic organization appear to have achieved a victory with the implementation of the dual-track principle, the policy remained transitional until its eventual absorption into regional organization. Even then, suspicion toward Koreans and ethnic organization persisted. Subject to the whims of Manchukuo state and increasing bureaucratization, *Zai-Man* Koreans proved in the end unable to establish an institutional power base in the Concordia Association.

Chapter 2: Abrogation and the National Congresses

Abrogation of Extraterritoriality and the Concordia Association

Throughout the 1930s, the Concordia Association evolved from a vanguard party to a mass political organization that operated in parallel to the Manchukuo state. At the same time, the Concordia Association National Congress rose to importance. The First National Congress was held in the capital of Xinjing on February 28, 1934, one day before the official start of monarchical rule in Manchukuo under Emperor Puyi.[1] The announcement that Manchukuo would become a monarchy was not universally popular, especially among the ethnic Chinese intelligentsia. The Concordia Association sought to support the coming monarchical system and to frame its support as representative of Manchukuo society. Ninety-nine representatives from branches in Jilin, Heilongjiang, and Rehe provinces congregated in the Xinjing Yamato Hotel, including three ethnic Korean representatives, and notables from the Kwantung Army, such as Generals Itagaki Seishirō 板垣征四郎 and Doihara Kenji 土肥原賢治.

Held annually, with members and motions assembled from across Manchukuo, the National Congress operated as a hierarchical deliberative body for the Concordia Association. From the 1935 Second Congress onwards, smaller congresses were also held in the prefectures and provinces in the country.[2] These constituent assemblies deliberated issues proposed by local branch associations, and would advance these motions to the National Congresses for deliberation.[3] The National Congress presided over provincial congresses, which in turn managed smaller prefectural congresses (including the other municipal bodies such as cities,

---

[1] Manshūkokushi Hensan Kankōkai, ed., *Manshūkokushi kakuron*, 84.
[2] Manshūkokushi Hensan Kankōkai, ed., *Manshūkokushi kakuron*, 118.
[3] Manshūkokushi Hensan Kankōkai, ed., *Manshūkokushi kakuron*, 120-122.

Mongol banners, and districts). The National Congress itself consisted of a general assembly (*hongikai* 本議会) to deliberate on motions, separate committees (*iinkai* 委員会) to discuss and analyze motions in detail, and round-table discussions (*kondankai* 懇談会) for any further discussions.[4] This structure formed, at least nominally, a system of bottom-up mass politics in Manchukuo society through which the local issues of a branch could make its way through prefectural and provincial congresses to the national level of political consideration.

The stated objective of the Concordia Association was to support the nation and empire-building project in Manchukuo through mass politics. The outline of the National Congresses rejects both democracy and autocracy, instead putting forth the National Congresses as "the sole constructive assembly of our nation" (*waga kuni yūiitsu no kensetsuteki kyōgitai* 我国唯一の建設的団体), aiming to "accomplish *minzoku kyōwa* and enact the correct will of the people… to extend and secure *kyōwa* politics" (*minzoku kyōwa shi tadashiki min'i o shisei ni han'ei seshimuru… kyōwa seiji o shinchō kakuritsusen* 民族協和し正しき民意を施政せしむる…協和政治を伸長確立せん).[5] The outline rejected ideas of democratic representation through majority rule and decision-making, proclaiming instead that deliberation through the National Congresses and *minzoku kyōwa* politics was the solution for Manchukuo.

The Concordia Association also imagined its congresses as a site for vertical political integration. The introduction to the records of the Third National Congress, held in 1936, emphasizes the assembly as a site for "unity between the state and the people" (*kanmin ittai* 官民一体), crucial to goals of developing *minzoku kyōwa* in Manchukuo.[6] The outline also

---

[4] Manshūkokushi Hensan Kankōkai, ed., *Manshūkokushi kakuron*, 122.
[5] Manshūkokushi Hensan Kankōkai, ed., *Manshūkokushi kakuron*, 123.
[6] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 3-nendo* (Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, 1937), https://ndlsearch.ndl.go.jp/books/R100000002-I000001208313, 2.

emphasizes the incompatibility between *minzoku kyōwa* and democracy, as the threat of a political party representing a majority group could dominate politics and have dire consequences, especially in the purportedly multiethnic state of Manchukuo. Instead of the maligned system of majority voting, the National Congress first employed a system of unanimous voting from 1935 through 1939, and a system known as "representative command" (*shūgi tōsei* 衆議統制), in which the chairman would make a final resolution after taking in the opinions of branch members.[7] Egler argues the later National Congress embodied a system akin to democratic centralism in communist states, with centralized decision-making tied to a nominally representative system.[8] Regardless of the system of decision-making, however, the National Congresses presented a site for local issues to reach the ears of national-level Manchukuo political power. As Koreans began to join the Concordia Association, they began to make their mark on the congresses.

Over the 1930s, the Manchukuo nation-building project drew Koreans closer to political authority in Xinjing. On August 15, 1936, Kwantung Army Command authored the "Outline for the Guidance of *Zai-Man* Koreans" (Zai-Man Chōsen-jin shidō yōkō 在満朝鮮人指導要項). The seven primary points of the document covered various topics, from education to migration.[9] Important for the development of mass politics in Manchukuo, the Kwantung Army called for the incorporation of Koreans and their existing organizations into the Concordia Association for

---

[7] Manshūkokushi Hensan Kankōkai, ed., *Manshūkokushi kakuron*, 120-21.
[8] David George Egler, "Japanese Mass Organizations in Manchuria, 1928-1945: The Ideology of Racial Harmony" (Phd Diss., Tucson, The University of Arizona, 1977), http://hdl.handle.net/10150/565382, 264, 310-11.
[9] Kantōgun Shireibu, "Zai-Man Chōsen-jin shidō yōkō no ken," August 15, 1936, C01003180100, JACAR, 2-4.

"self-cleansing moral suasion"[10] (*jijōteki kyōka* 自浄的教化).[11] The purpose of this re-education through the Concordia Association was to make Koreans understand themselves to be "an important constituent element of Manchukuo" (*Manshūkoku kōsei no jūyō bunshi* 満洲国ノ重要ナル構成分子). While the Kwantung Army "Plan for Guiding Koreans in Manchuria" (Manshū ni okeru Chōsen-jin shidō hōsaku 満洲に於ける朝鮮人指導方策) of 1933 also outlined the role of Koreans within nascent *minzoku kyōwa* politics, the Kwantung Army's focus at the time of quelling anti-Japanese revolts led to the consolidations of Koreans into the Korean Associations rather any Manchukuo state organ or organization.[12]

Its territorial control restored by 1936, the Kwantung Army could now focus on integrating Koreans into the ideological construction of a Manchukuo state and subjecthood along the lines of *minzoku kyōwa*. At this time, the Kwangtung Army made plans to abrogate extraterritorial privileges for Japanese subjects in Manchukuo, including ethnic Koreans, in order to legitimize the "independence" of Manchukuo.[13] Koreans, who had thus far been considered as Japanese imperial citizens in Manchukuo, were to be incorporated into imperial designs for a multiethnic Manchukuo. The Concordia Association was central to these plans.

As the political processes for the abrogation of extraterritoriality advanced, Koreans gradually became integrated into the Concordia Association. On June 10, 1936, Japan and Manchukuo began the process of abrogation through an initially treaty concerning taxation in the South Manchuria Railway's Railway Zone, a product of Japan's victory in the Russo-Japanese

---

[10] The translation of *kyōka* 教化 as "moral suasion" is courtesy of Sheldon Garon, who situates the term as central to pre-1945 Japanese efforts exert control over society. Sheldon M. Garon, *Molding Japanese Minds: The State in Everyday Life* (Princeton University Press, 1997), https://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb04089.0001.001.
[11] Kantōgun Shireibu, "Zai-Man Chōsen-jin shidō yōkō no ken," 3.
[12] Yin Hu, "'Manshūkoku' ni okeru Zai-Man Chōsen-jin shidō hōshin to 'minzoku kyōwa'" (Hosei University Repository, March 18, 2009), https://doi.org/10.15002/00003953, 41-42.
[13] Yin, "'Manshūkoku' ni okeru Zai-Man Chōsen-jin shidō hōshin to 'minzoku kyōwa,'" 44-45.

War, and in the resulting patchwork of various Japanese jurisdictions over parts of Manchuria.[14] While not the primary cause for the eventual disbandment of the Korean Associations, the imposition of Manchukuo taxes on ethnic Koreans, who effectively already paid taxes in the form of Korean Association fees, imposed a double burden that accelerated the end of the associations. A second and final wave of abrogation came in November 5, 1937, as another treaty transferred the Railway Zone to Manchukuo sovereignty, and which denied extraterritorial privileges to Japanese subjects within Manchukuo.[15] For ethnic Koreans, this also meant the transfer of the consular police system, long an institution of control over Koreans outside of Japanese territory, and of schools for ethnic Koreans, to Manchukuo authority.

The progression of abrogation coincided with the dissolution of the Korean Associations and the reorganization of *Zai-Man* Korean society into the Concordia Association. After the first wave of abrogation on June 10, 1936, over a period of months, the local administrative functions of the Korean Associations were transferred to local governments.[16] The process was complete by September of the same year. The Manchukuo state was the direct inheritor of most previous functions of the Korean Associations, particularly those pertaining to local governance. However, with the dissolution of the Korean Associations in 1936, ethnic Koreans began to shift their political activities to the Concordia Association. In September 1936, Koreans in the capital city area established the Xinjing Korean Association Branch (Shinkyō Chōsen Jinminkai Bunkai

---

[14] Sin Kyu-sŏp, "Chigai hōken teppai to Zai-Man Chōsen-jin tōgō seisaku: chigai hōken teppai kara Kyōwakai e no hen'nyū made," in *Nitchō kankeishi ronshū: Kang sensei koki, taishoku kinen* (Tokyo: Shinkansha, 2003), 662-63. Refer to Yoshihisa Tak Matsusaka, *The Making of Japanese Manchuria, 1904–1932* (Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001) for more on Japanese systems of control in Manchuria between the Russo-Japanese War and the establishment of Manchukuo.

[15] Sin Kyu-sŏp, "Chigai hōken teppai to Zai-Man Chōsen-jin tōgō seisaku," 663-66.

[16] Sin Kyu-sŏp, "Chigai hōken teppai to Zai-Man Chōsen-jin tōgō seisaku," 668-69, 671-74.

新京朝鮮人民会分会), the first ethnic branch in the Concordia Association since the decision to allow ethnic branches in 1935.[17]

Similar "Association Branches" with Korean Association legacies continued to form across Manchukuo. When the first sources counting the number of ethnic Koreans in the Concordia Association appeared in November of 1938, there were 41,713 Korean members.[18] In Gando Province, Koreans even formed a majority of its members: 18,661, out of 28,321 members in the province.[19] With the emergence of a Korean contingent in the Concordia Association and ethnic Korean branches for several years before their gradual elimination from 1938 onwards, Koreans entered the stage of Concordia Association politics.

Koreans Enter the National Congresses

Issues relevant to ethnic Koreans in Manchukuo began to appear within the agenda of the Concordia Association as it continued to grow in the mid-1930s. The Second National Congress in 1935 deliberated three motions that involved ethnic Koreans: One concerning improving the availability of financial capital (likely for Korean settler-farmers), another regarding supporting immigration, and one on tenant farmer rights.[20] Especially with the political uncertainty and continued anti-Japanese resistance in rural Manchukuo in the years immediately after the Manchurian Incident, the concerns that came to the attention of Concordia Association officials

---

[17] Sin Kyu-sŏp, "Chigai hōken teppai to Zai-Man Chōsen-jin tōgō seisaku," 673-74. Refer to Chapter 1 for more information on the debate over ethnic branches in the Manchukuo Concordia Association.
[18] Sin Kyu-sŏp, "Chigai hōken teppai to Zai-Man Chōsen-jin tōgō seisaku," 674.
[19] Manshūkokushi Hensan Kankōkai, ed., *Manshūkokushi kakuron*, 107.
[20] Hirooka Kiyonobu, "Zai-Man Chōsen-jin no 'kōkoku shinmin' gensetsu: sōryokusen-ka no Manshū Kyōwakai wo chūshin ni," *Chōsen-shi kenkyūkai ronbunshū* 41 (October 2003): 127. While records for the 1935 Congress are not available through online archives, Hirooka's research details a list of motions in the National Congresses from 1935 through 1944 concerning the ethnic Korean population of Manchukuo. The following research on these motions will reference both records available online and this list.

focused on economics and security against anti-Japanese guerillas. The active role of the Korean Associations at this time in *Zai-Man* Korean life, and the administrative isolation of Koreans from their Chinese neighbors, may also have brought issues that concerned national economic policy and aid to Koreans to the National Congress, rather than issues concerning *minzoku kyōwa* or cultural policy.

This state of affairs began to change in the Third National Congress of 1936, with more motions that touched on the position of Koreans within the multicultural framing of Manchukuo society. The 1936 congress saw five motions relevant to ethnic Koreans, three of which concerned issues of rural migration, one that touched on education policy[21] for Koreans among other ethnic groups, and one that addressed Koreans and *minzoku kyōwa*.[22] The motions brought up in the National Congresses were organized by category, and the motion "On the substantive realization of *minzoku kyōwa*" (*Minzoku kyōwa no jisshitsuteki gutai-ka no ken* 民族協和の実質的具体化の件) was included as Motion 8 of Association-related items.[23] This motion called for existing branches to encourage local "Japanese-Korean" (*Nissen-kei* 日鮮系, referring to both ethnic Japanese and Koreans in Manchukuo) residents to join, to require the presence of Japanese-Koreans in the creation of any new branches, and for Japanese-Koreans to learn some Chinese and vice versa. The motion even called for the encouragement of cross-ethnic business ventures and marriages as key policies to encourage *minzoku kyōwa*. The motion passed, with a resolution calling for Concordia Association members abide by the key points of the motion. While this motion likely did not derive from ethnic Koreans involvement, as abrogation loomed

---

[21] Refer to Chapter 3 for an analysis of the debates over ethnic Korean education in Manchukuo and the Concordia Association.
[22] Hirooka Kiyonobu, "Zai-Man Chōsen-jin no 'kōkoku shinmin' gensetsu," 127.
[23] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 3-nendo*, 95-96.

in 1936 and 1937, the coming role of Koreans in the Concordia Association came to be discussed in the National Congress.

Ethnic Koreans also began to involve themselves in the 1936 congress. Such involvement is evident in Motion 31 of items regarding the Ministry of Civil Affairs[24] (Minseibu 民政部), titled "Motion regarding the tenant farming and water use issues between Manchurians and Koreans" (*Man-Senjin-kan no kosaku mondai narabi ni suiri mondai ni kansuru ken* 満鮮人間の小作問題並に水利問題に関する件).[25] This motion, brought to the national level through a branch in Fushun Prefecture and the provincial assembly in Fengtian Province, was presented to attendees at the National Congress by one Kin Kōkai (Kim Hong-hae 金鴻楷), likely an ethnic Korean. The use in the motion of the character 畓 (K: *tap* 답), a Chinese character endogenously created in Korea and referring to rice paddies, further implies that the motion had origins with Korean members of the Concordia Association.

The explanation of the motion begins by stating how the one million ethnic Koreans in Manchukuo had developed land and established rice paddies to feed the country while suffering through great hardship.[26] The author emphasizes the role of Koreans in agricultural development, turning barren lands into "good fields and bountiful rice paddies" (*ryōden yōtō* 良田沃畓).[27] However, despite these contributions, the author argues, Chinese landlords have abused their tenants and raised rents, as there were no laws governing landlord-tenant relations in this regard. The motion thus called for an appropriate law, framing it as necessary to preserve the Concordia

---

[24] Translation courtesy of Joshua Fogel, Joshua A. Fogel and Shin'ichi Yamamuro, "Chimera: A Portrait of Manzhouguo. Harmony and Conflict," *The Asia-Pacific Journal: Japan Focus* (blog), March 1, 2007, https://apjjf.org/joshua-a-fogel/2384/article.
[25] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 3-nendo*, 131-32.
[26] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 3-nendo*, 131.
[27] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 3-nendo*, 131.

movement and co-prosperity through the improvement of Korean-Chinese relations and the economic conditions of Koreans.

The "Motion Regarding the Tenant Farming and Water Use Issues Between Manchurians and Koreans" marks an early entry of ethnic Korean politics and lobbying in the National Congress. The motion arrived at the National Congress prior to the final abrogation of extraterritoriality in late 1937, and before the subsequent wave of Koreans joining the Concordia Association en masse, indicating Korean activity in national Concordia politics from an early date. In addition, the body of the motion emphasizes the contributions of ethnic Koreans to the colonial project in Manchuria, along with ideas that ignoring the pleas of Korean farmers would not only be unjust compensation for the efforts but would also damage the *minzoku kyōwa* project. The Korean members that submitted the motion thus had to couch their requests in the Concordia Association in terms of how their requests would benefit the national goals of both Manchukuo and Japan. This juggling of dual colonial rhetorics, both under the overarching Japanese Empire yet nominally different, became a recurring theme in ethnic Korean politics in the Concordia Association from hereafter.

Despite appeals by ethnic Koreans to both colonizing and multiethnic ideologies within Manchukuo, however, the Concordia Association leadership was reluctant to act on their wishes. While the government side acknowledged the importance of rice paddy cultivation and the prescribed role of *minzoku kyōwa* in economic development, in its response, it stated that any law managing land rights for immigrants had to wait.[28] The committee tasked with analyzing the issue also avoided calls for major action, instead "stating the importance of local resolution"

---

[28] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 3-nendo*, 132.

(*genchiteki kaiketsu no hitsuyōsei o nobu* 現地的解決の必要性を述ぶ).[29] In the end, the assembly resolution sent the motion up to Concordia Association Central Headquarters (Chūō Honbu 中央本部) for resolution, while encouraging local branches to find local solutions to renter-landlord conflicts until a complete law was drafted. While the efforts of Koreans in the Concordia Association managed to bring this issue of tenant farming relations to the attention of national-level governance structures, the limits of the National Congresses and the lack of political will were both were evident. The lack of legislative powers, and a structure that redirected complex issues further up in a complex bureaucracy, failed immediately to address the concerns in question, a pattern that recurred later in the life of the National Congresses.

The submission to the National Congresses of motions regarding issues important to ethnic Koreans continued into the 1937 National Congress, this time brought to the congress by ethnic Korean branches. The Fourth National Congress heard five motions related to *Zai-Man* Korean issues, of which one concerned education; two, tenant farming; and another two, the migration of Koreans into Manchukuo.[30] While the looming prospect of abrogation brought about the motion for education to the congress, the focus of Korean politics in the Concordia Association remained on economic issues.

However, a major change from the previous National Congresses was the role of ethnic Korean branches in these motions. For example, the motion "Regarding the Tenant Rents and Water Use Issues Between Manchurians and Koreans" (*Mansenjin-kan no kosakuryō mondai oyobi suiri mondai no ken* 満鮮人間の小作料問題及水利問題の件) was originally proposed by the Changbai Prefecture Korean Branch (Chōhaku-ken Sen-kei Bunkai 長白県鮮系分会) in

---

[29] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 3-nendo*, 132.
[30] Hirooka Kiyonobu, "Zai-Man Chōsen-jin no 'kōkoku shinmin' gensetsu," 127.

Andong Province.[31] Another ethnic Korean branch in Fengtian Province proposed a related motion concerning tenant farmers, and the National Congress addressed these motions together. The "Motion Regarding Korean Migrants" (*Sen-kei imin ni kansuru ken* 鮮系移民に関する件) was jointly submitted by three different regional congresses and was drafted by two Korean branches in Harbin and Xinjing, respectively.[32] Furthermore, the motion regarding education policy in the 1937 congress was drafted and proposed through the combined efforts of three separate ethnic Korean branches.[33]

The 1937 congress thus saw a large uptick in Korean activity within the National Congress system, especially from the ethnic Korean branches which had begun to appear around Manchukuo. In addition, the involvement of multiple Korean branches in drafting and proposing many of these motions implies an increasing interconnectivity between Korean members of the Concordia Association. The National Congresses in these cases served as a form for interconnected branches to propose these motions relevant to *Zai-Man* Koreans, albeit within the framework of the Concordia Association and Concordia politics.

Activity After Abrogation

The abrogation of extraterritoriality in late 1937 detached Koreans from their status as nominal Japanese imperial citizens and placed them under the sovereignty of the Manchukuo state. As the Korean Associations began to dissolve and Koreans gradually were incorporated into the Manchukuo nation-building project, changes began to materialize in the National Congresses of

---

[31] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai giketsu jikō shori keika hōkoku (nichibun), Kōtoku 4-nendo* (Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, 1938), https://dl.ndl.go.jp/pid/1454676, 37.
[32] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai giketsu jikō shori keika hōkoku Kōtoku 4-nendo*, 42-49.
[33] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai giketsu jikō shori keika hōkoku, Kōtoku 4-nendo*, 42-49.

the Concordia Association as well. The Fifth National Congress, held in 1938, demonstrated the shift to broader Korean involvement in Concordia Association politics. While three out of six Korean-related motions focused on immigration and agricultural economics, as in previous congresses, there was also a motion calling for an end to unspecified discriminatory practices based on ethnicity, a motion addressing the increase in Korean workers in local bureaucracies, and one concerning education after the abrogation of extraterritoriality.[34] The motion on Korean staff highlights the transition of Koreans to Manchukuo sovereignty, as the dissolution of the Korean Associations transferred their functions as semi-autonomous governing structures to local municipalities.[35] As the Concordia Association and the Manchukuo state began their encroachment on the lives of ethnic Koreans in Manchuria beyond aspects immigration and tenant farming, other relevant issues appeared in the National Congresses.

Printed records produced from short-hand transcriptions of the 1938 Congress reveal how Korean involvement in the National Congress came to the attention of officials high in the ranks of the Manchukuo state. Motion Two of industry-related issues, "Motion Regarding the Intensification of Assistance for Korean Migrants" (*Chōsen imin josei sekkyoku-ka no ken* 朝鮮移民助成積極化の件), was discussed in detail by a separate committee outside of the general assembly.[36] Attendees included Manchukuo Agricultural Minister Irako Kenzō 五十子巻三, Development Minister Morishige Kimio 森重干男, and Director of the Korea-Manchuria Development Corporation (Man-Sen Takushoku Kaisha 鮮満拓殖会社), Okada Ryō 岡田両. The records of the committee's discussions on the motion begins with an introduction by Irako,

---

[34] Kiyonobu Hirooka, "Zai-Man Chōsen-jin no 'kōkoku shinmin' gensetsu," 127.
[35] Sin Kyu-sŏp, "Chigai hōken teppai to Zai-Man Chōsen-jin tōgō seisaku," 668-69, 671-74.
[36]Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo* (Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, 1938), https://dl.ndl.go.jp/pid/1449992, 564.

who then called for Pak Chun-byŏng 朴準秉, a representative from the Xinjing headquarters of the Concordia Association, to explain the general background behind the motion.[37] Pak began by outlining the colonization of rural Manchukuo by Japanese and Korean settlers to be both a "national policy of the Japanese Empire and at the same time is a national policy of Manchukuo" (*Nippon teikoku no kokusaku taru to dōji ni Manshū teikoku no kokusaku* 日本帝国の国策たると同時に満洲帝国の国策).[38] He exhorted the members of the committee not to forget that the reason why "we are able to eat rice here in Manchuria is because these Korean migrants produce it" (*Manshū ni oite warera ga kome o kutte iru no wa, kono Chōsen imin ga tsukutte kureru no de aru kara* 満洲に於て吾等が米を食って居るのは、此の朝鮮移民が作って呉れるのであるから).[39] Like the Korean members in the 1936 Congress, Pak emphasized the contribution of ethnic Koreans and their rice cultivation to the dual imperial and national projects in Manchuria.

The issue concerned the role of colonial companies in the settlement of ethnic Koreans in Manchukuo.[40] After introducing the contributions of ethnic Koreans, Pak detailed the main points of the motion, which criticized how colonial corporations like the Manchurian Development Corporation (Manshū Takushoku Kaisha 満洲拓殖会社) and Korea-Manchuria Development Corporation sent Korean colonists without adequate preparation to land in Manchuria.[41] Short-term, year-by-year planning by companies caused difficulties in purchasing land from Chinese locals, leading to the failure of some settlement plans. Pak noted how plans to settle Japanese farmers in Manchukuo involved long-term planning and large-scale economic

---

[37] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 564-65.
[38] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 564-65.
[39] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 564.
[40] For more on the role of colonial development corporations and their role in Korean settlement in Manchuria, see Park, *Two Dreams in One Bed*.
[41] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 566-66.

support for land purchases, in contrast to the short-sighted ventures of colonial corporations for Koreans. Pak concluded the explanation of the motion by requesting for Koreans to be included in these long-term plans and to improve the process of land purchasing so that local interference and profiteering by local landlords could be minimized. Here, Pak points out the failures of colonial corporations in supporting Koreans settlers that they brought to Manchukuo and highlights the double standard with Japanese settlers. Even after the abrogation of extraterritoriality, Koreans like Pak continued to point to and attach themselves to the Japanese, in pursuit of the potential privileges that came with this status within Manchukuo.

Another ethnic Korean representative, Kim Kyŏng-tae 金京泰, from Tonghua Province, provides examples of malpractice by colonial corporations. Kim first accuses the Korean-Manchuria Development Corporation of causing the breakdown of ethnic relations and *minzoku kyōwa* between Korean settlers and Chinese locals, and of profiting from the company's position in the "national policy" (*kokusaku* 国策) of Korean settlement.[42] The first example Kim put forward is how the corporation bought parcels of land from local Chinese owners in a Tonghua village. While each parcel was valued at around 15 yen, the corporation would threaten that they would seize the land unless the parcels were sold for only 5 or 6 yen.[43] Kim argues that the forced sales of land to the company, which was then sold to Korean settlers, represented both profiteering and a threat to *minzoku kyōwa*. In addition to the strategy of tying issues concerning Koreans to *minzoku kyōwa* rhetoric, Kim also recalls Pak's framing of Korean settlement as national policies in Manchukuo and Japan, attaching further importance to the issue.

---

[42] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 567-68.
[43] Kim calls the village "Sabon'nof" (サボンノフ), possibly an ethnic Russian settlement.

In another example, Kim details how a group from Chŏlla province in southern Korea recently moved to Liuhe county in Tonghua province, lured by promises from the Korean-Manchuria Development Corporation that they would have large houses ready to move into and rice fields ready to cultivate. However, when the Korean migrants arrived, according to Kim, "There was almost no water in the paddies. There were no paddies for the migrants to cultivate" (*mizu ga hotondo suiden ni arimasenu. Imin sareta kōsaku suru suiden ga arimasenu* 水が殆ど水田にありませぬ。移民された人が耕作する水田がありませぬ).[44] As a result, many migrants could not adapt to cultivating the existing dry fields, in the end running away from their new settlements and debts. Kim argues that this outcome was brought about "not because the quality of the migrants was bad, but because the Korea-Manchuria Development Corporation only thinks of its profit as a special corporation" (*imin no seishitsu ga warui no dewa naku, tokushu kaisha naru Sen-Man Takushoku ga amari eiriteki ni bakari kangaeteru* 移民の性質が悪いのではなく、特殊会社なる所の鮮満拓殖が余り営利的に許り考へてる). Like Pak, Kim criticizes the failures of colonial corporations in preparing Korean settlers, but he goes further to accuse the companies of making false promises to prospective settlers. Kim brought local cases of mistreatment against Koreans to the National Congress as evidence for the necessity of reform in the development corporation system.

In response to Pak Chun-byŏng and Kim Kyŏng-tae's criticisms of the implementation of Korean settlement in Manchukuo, state officials and colonial agents denied the severity of these issues, or even their existence. After Kim Kyŏng-tae's speech, Development Minister Morishige first acknowledged the concerns raised but argued against the use of the term "national policy,"

---

[44] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 568.

warning that the use of the term could be used to justify the excesses in question.[45] He then repudiated Kim's claim that the Korea-Manchurian Development Corporation engaged in profiteering, as he "did not believe that this happened" (*sayō na koto wa nai to shinjimasu* 左様な事はないと信じます)—and if it did happen, that it was "the mistake of one individual" (*sono hitori no ayamari* その一人の誤り), rather than a company-wide policy.[46]

Another official from the Development Ministry, an ethnic Korean surnamed Pak, also contested Kim's claims, arguing that the companies had no relation to the false advertisements, and denying the use of threats in land purchases.[47] Pak concluded his speech by telling Kim, "[w]e will have you avoid saying this and that after hearing someone else's story without any evidence in front of everyone" (*Jijitsu ga nai no ni tanin no hanashi o kiite kō iu koto da to iu yō na koto wa amari minasama no mae de wa iwanai yō ni shite itadakimasu* 事実が無いのに他人の話を聞いて斯う云ふことだと云ふやうな事は余り皆様の前で云はないやうにして頂きます).[48] As the discussion shifted to a related motion also concerning Korean settlers, Okada, director of the Korea-Manchurian Development Corporation, denied any profit motive or profiteering by his company.[49] The response to the Korean delegation's concerns was denial of the root concern over profiteering. The response even included personal attacks from an ethnic Korean colonial official. Rather debate on the terms of *minzoku kyōwa*, as the petitioners framed the issue, the officials argued that the issue itself did not exist, as it had no systemic roots.

---

[45] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 569-70.
[46] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 571.
[47] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 572-73.
[48] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 573.
[49] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 582.

The resolution of the issue had mixed results. An ethnic Korean representative from the Concordia Association Central Headquarters, Pak Sŏk-yun[50] 朴錫胤, expressed concern over the reports that the colonial companies were expropriating land in the countryside and lack of preparation for settlers.[51] However, the committee had little impact on the outcome of the resolution: The result, again, was to send the issue to Central Headquarters. Earlier in the discussion, a representative from Mudanjiang province had suggested sending the motion up, arguing that "to the extent that this National Congress is not a political decision-making body" (*kono rengō kyōgikai ga seiji hōmen no ketsugi kikan de nai ijō* 此の連合協議会が政治方面の決議機関でない以上), the only choice was to leave it to the state.[52] The expectation was apparently that the state would work with the upper echelons of Concordia Association leadership and regional governments to resolve the issue. While the Concordia Association and the state did draw closer throughout the 1930s, the association remained limited in its policy role. In the end, the final say remained outside the reach not only of the Koreans in the committee discussion above, but also of the Concordia Association as a political institution within Manchukuo.

---

[50] Pak Sŏk-yun (1896~1948?) was a Korean active in the colonial period, from participating in nationalist circles studying abroad in Japan to studying at Cambridge on behalf of the Korean Government-General. Pak came to Manchuria during the Manchurian Incident, helping found a pro-Japanese Korean organization in Gando known as the Minsaengdan (民生團). While the Minsaengdan was short-lived, Pak eventually made it into the Manchukuo bureaucracy, with stints in the Concordia Association and Manchukuo foreign service. While Pak worked in US-occupied Korea after WWII, a visit to the North led to his capture and execution. For more, refer to Mizuno Naoki, "Pak Sŏk-yun: shokuminchi-ki saikō no Chōsen-jin erīto," in *Kōza higashi-Ajia no chishikijin*, ed. Cho Kyŏng-dal et al., vol. 4 (Tokyo: Yūshisha, 2014), 326–41.

[51] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 587.

[52] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 579.

Throughout the mid- to late 1930s, Koreans joined the Concordia Association and participated in its internal politics and mass political structures. The main factor in drawing the two together was the policy of the Kwantung Army and Manchukuo state to integrate Koreans into the Manchukuo nation-building project, pursued through the abrogation of Korean extraterritorial rights as Japanese subjects. This project separated Koreans from the Korean Associations and the Government-General of Korea, propelling them toward the Concordia Association and its politics of *minzoku kyōwa*. Koreans established ethnic branches across Manchukuo and membership increased, and their involvement in the association resulted in representation in the National Congresses. Motions concerning the Korean population, whether on economic or political issues, were put forth starting in 1935 and increased in number over the next several years. By 1938, records indicate that Koreans not only proposed motions to the National Congress but also debated with high-ranking officials in the Manchukuo state.

However, while Koreans in the National Congresses enjoyed proximity to power, they did not possess it. The National Congress of this period was a deliberative body with little legislative or decision-making powers, and motions were often left unresolved at the congresses. The effort exerted in discussing the futures of *Zai-Man* Koreans was considerable, yet increased participation in the Concordia Association was not the easy answer for the woes of Koreans.

Chapter 3: *Zai-Man* Korean Education between Japan and Manchukuo

Education of the Empire

As subjects of the Japanese Empire, Koreans in Korea, and in areas under Japanese control, received a colonial education. Historian Leighanne Yuh argues that this education balanced the objective of assimilating Koreans into the Japanese Empire as imperial subjects against the creation of a "subaltern Korean identity in contrast with a superior Japan" to maintain colonial hierarchies and control.[1] One of the contradictions of colonial policy in the eyes of ethnic Koreans— incorporating them into the Empire as "Japanese" but in many cases refusing to treat them as such—was salient in education policy.

The complexities of colonial education manifested in Manchukuo as well. Education in Manchukuo consisted of various overlapping regimes that shaped the education of residents in different ways depending on their nationality, ethnicity, and location of residency.[2] Koreans in Manchuria were especially subject to these complexities. Koreans were dispersed across the region, such as the majority-Korean region of Gando, primarily Chinese hinterlands, the Railway Zone governed by the SMR and Japanese consulates, and more. One system that enrolled Korean pupils was the constellation of "Overseas Designated Schools (*Zaigai shitei gakkō* 在外指定学校), noted in Fukushima Hiroyuki's research as a system applicable to seventeen primary and secondary schools in pre-abrogation Manchukuo.[3] Fukushima argues that while the system was originally designed to attract Japanese educators to schools outside of direct Japanese control,

---

[1] Leighanne Yuh, "Contradictions in Korean Colonial Education," *International Journal of Korean History* 15 (February 2010): 145.
[2] For an English-language overview of the education system in Manchukuo, refer to Andrew Reed Hall, "Constructing a 'Manchurian' Identity: Japanese Education in Manchukuo, 1931–1945" (Ph.D., Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh, 2003).
[3] Fukushima Hiroyuki, "'Manshūkoku' chigai hōken teppai to Chōsen-jin zaigai shitei gakkō" (Research Center for Korean Studies, Kyushu University, March 25, 2022), https://doi.org/10.15017/4797810, 56.

such as schools for Japanese residents in Shanghai and Manila, acceptance into this network was seen as a "privilege" (*tokken* 特権) for private Korean schools in Manchukuo.[4] The privilege in question was that pupils could graduate from Overseas Selected Schools and transfer directly into Japanese secondary schools without additional test or credit requirements. By attending a designated school, a Korean student in Manchuria effectively had direct access to Japanese secondary and subsequently advanced tertiary education, while their peers in Manchukuo-operated schools would have been forced to pass through additional bureaucratic procedures. Fukushima emphasizes that this system was not a loophole, as Japanese authorities usually had little issue with this application of the policy, in one case even suggesting it as an option to ethnic Korean schools in Manchuria.[5] The partial integration of *Zai-Man* Koreans into imperial education thus provided opportunities, albeit through the colonial dominator, within the broader Japanese Empire.

Zai-Man Koreans played an active role in establishing educational infrastructure for their communities. The assemblies of the All-Manchurian Korean Associations Congress, held annually in the 1930s before abrogation, included discussions and motions that concerned education for Koreans.[6] Representatives from Korean Associations across Manchukuo voiced their thoughts on the state of education, such as the lack of schools for Koreans relative to schools for Japanese and even created a system to establish and improve primary schools for Koreans.[7] The Congress, in lieu of lackluster support from Japanese authorities, encouraged each

---

[4] Fukushima Hiroyuki, "'Manshūkoku' chigai hōken teppai to Chōsen-jin zaigai shitei gakkō," 55, 59-60.
[5] Fukushima Hiroyuki, "'Manshūkoku' chigai hōken teppai to Chōsen-jin zaigai shitei gakkō," 59-60.
[6] Yin Hu, "'Manshūkoku' ni okeru Zai-Man Chōsen-jin shidō hōshin to 'minzoku kyōwa'" (Hosei University Repository, March 18, 2009), https://doi.org/10.15002/00003953, 43.
[7] Sin Kyu-sŏp, "Shoki 'Manshūkoku' ni okeru Chōsen-jin tōgōsaku: Chōsen-jin Rengōkai wo chūshin ni," *Nihon shokuminchi kenkyū* 9 (1997): 26-28

Korean Association branch to raise money locally and establish schools in their districts. These fundraising efforts for education even resulted in the establishment of a private Korean secondary school in Fengtian in 1937. Koreans were not passive actors in Manchukuo education, mobilizing local and national networks to build schools and promote education for ethnic Koreans.

However, the abrogation of extraterritorial privileges for Japanese subjects in Manchukuo marked a shift in *Zai-Man* education. The Kwantung Army outlined its objectives for *Zai-Man* Korean education as it prepared for the abrogation of extraterritoriality in 1937. The "Outline for the Guidance of *Zai-Man* Koreans" (Zai-Man Chōsen-jin shidō yōkō 在満朝鮮人指導要項), written in August 1936 by Kwantung Army command, noted the importance of education as the first item in its outline. As noted in Chapter 5 and its discussion of abrogation, the "Outline" called for Koreans to undergo reeducation to understand their roles as an "important constituent element" (*kōsei no jūyō bunsh* 構成の重要分子) of the Manchukuo state.[8] In a similar vein, the document reasoned that for Koreans to "happily" (*yorokonde* 喜ンテ) to take part in the development of Manchukuo, Koreans were to "thoroughly develop a consciousness of Manchukuo citizenship" (*Manshũkokumin taru no ishiki o tettei seshime* 満洲国民タルノ意識ヲ徹底セシメ). The Kwantung Army thus emphasized the role for Koreans within the Japanese colonial project in Manchukuo, as contributors and constituents. The document also called for the "development and understanding of a core leading class" (*kakushinteki shidō kaikyū o yōsei haaku shi* 核心的指導階級ヲ養成把握) toward the goal of re-education and incorporation into the Manchukuo Concordia Association.[9] The Kwantung

[8] Kantōgun Shireibu, "Zai-Man Chōsen-jin shidō yōkō no ken," August 15, 1936, C01003180100, JACAR, 1.
[9] Kantōgun Shireibu, "Zai-Man Chōsen-jin shidō yōkō no ken," 2.

Army's emphasis on making the *Zai-Man* Korean population understand their role in Manchukuo, and the need for leaders within the ethnic community to lead the way, underscore the importance of a "Manchukuo" education.

The abrogation of extraterritoriality compelled the transfer of Koreans into the Manchukuo school system. In November 1937, abrogation fragmented education for Japanese imperial subjects in Manchukuo into several jurisdictions. These can be categorized as follows:

1. Schools for ethnic Japanese (Naichi-jin 内地人), under the jurisdiction of the Japanese consulate.
2. Fourteen schools for ethnic Koreans remaining under Japanese consular jurisdiction.
3. Manchukuo schools for ethnic Koreans.[10]

The fourteen "retained" (*ryūho* 留保) Koreans schools were among the seventeen Overseas Selected Schools in Manchukuo, but the other three, located in Gando, lost their status. Therefore, only some schools serving *Zai-Man* Koreans retained direct access to Japanese secondary education, while some schools lost this privilege, and those under Manchukuo jurisdiction continued to be separated from the Japanese system. In addition, despite the rhetoric of *minzoku kyōwa*, Japanese authorities maintained Japanese schools, while relegating most Korean schools to the Manchukuo education system. This discrimination between Japanese and Koreans, both nominally Japanese subjects, was impossible to miss.

The records of the Concordia Association National Congresses indicate increased activity by Korean branches and members over *Zai-Man* Korean education and its post-abrogation predicament. In 1935, there were zero motions in the National Congress relevant to education for

---

[10] Fukushima Hiroyuki, "'Manshūkoku' chigai hōken teppai to Chōsen-jin zaigai shitei gakkō," 56, 60-61.

Koreans, while in 1936 there was one, and one in 1937. As abrogation was finalized in late 1937, the number of education-related motions increased to two in 1938 and three in 1939. The issue of education became more and more important, and the discussions of these motions in the National Congresses reflected a corresponding intensity of discussion and debate.

The 1938 National Congress

For the 1938 Congress, representatives from Binjiang Province proposed a "Motion Regarding the Unification of Education" (*Kyōiku no ichigenka ni kansuru ken* 教育の一元化に関する件). During the main session of the National Congress, Director of Education Tamura Toshio 田村敏雄 (1896-1963)[11] of the Ministry of Civil Affairs[12] (Minseibu 民生部) introduced the motion as one highly relevant to the success of *minzoku kyōwa* ideology. He admitted that the retaining of ethnic Japanese schools and the fourteen Korean schools in the Railway Zone "caused various contradictions or difficulties" (*shushu naru mujun arui wa konnan to iu mono ga shōjimashita* 種々なる矛盾或は困難と云ふものが生じました).[13] As Tanaka deemed the motion too complex to discuss during the main session, he elected to send the issue to a committee discussion, which would decide on how to resolve the motion and report back to the main session. Like the heated debate over Korean migration also from the 1938 National Congress, detailed in Chapter Two, the committee discussion for the education motion demonstrates the depth and complexity, as seen through the variety of actors, arguments, and narratives employed, of policy discussions in the National Congresses.

---

[11] Kobayashi Hideo, "Tamura Toshio-den: Jimintō habatsu Kōchikai shodai jimukyoku-chō, Ikeda Hayato no kōdo seichō seisaku wo sasaeta jinbutsu," *Ajia Taiheiyō Tōkyū* 28 (March 2017): 99–100.
[12] Refer to Chapter 2 footnote 24 for origin of translation.
[13] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo* (Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, 1938), https://dl.ndl.go.jp/pid/1449992, 198.

The committee discussion records for "Motion Regarding the Unification of Education" includes a list of committee members, many of whom were likely ethnic Korean. They included Pak Chun-byŏng 朴準秉 from the capital region of Xinjing, Cho Wŏn-gi 趙元璣 and Yi Kyŏng-myŏng 李景明 from Binjiang, Sin Dŏk-chun 申德俊 from Longjiang, Kang Wŏn 姜元 from Mudanjiang, Kim Kyŏng-tae 金京泰 from Tonghua, and Kim Hŏn 金憲 from Andong.[14] Pak and Kim Kyŏng-tae also participated in the committee discussion detailed in chapter two. This contingent of seven Koreans formed a majority in the committee of thirteen members, which also included Chinese and Japanese members. Other named attendees of the discussion included Director Tamura, Concordia Association Chief of General Affairs Minagawa Toyoji 皆川豊治 (1895-?), and Kwantung Army Chief of Staff Katakura Tadashi 片倉衷 (1898-1991).[15] The presence of Katakura at the hearing indicates that ethnic Koreans in the Concordia Association were able to petition to the military center of Japanese power in Manchukuo, in addition to the Manchukuo state.

Katakura and Tamura introduced the issue in successive speeches, laying out the basic premise of the education issue and the Manchukuo state's perspective. Katakura first acknowledged the various actors involved such as the Japanese state, Korean Government-General, the Manchukuo state, Kwantung Army, and others, emphasizing the scale of the issue at hand. He then emphasized the two years it took to research and finally complete the abrogation treaty, arguing that while the retention of select Japanese and Korean schools marked an incomplete transition from the "discriminatory treatment on account of the demands of the

---

[14] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 513.
[15] Manmō shiryō kyōkai, *Manshū jinmei jiten*, vol.3. (Tokyo: Nihon tosho center, 1989), 1445-46 and National Diet Library, "Katakura Tadashi kankei bunsho," National Diet Library Search, August 26, 2022, https://ndlsearch.ndl.go.jp/rnavi/kensei/katakuratadashi.

Japanese government" (*Nihon seifu no yōkyū kara suru sabetsuteki taigū* 日本政府の要求からする差別的待遇), Manchukuo still had good education available to Manchukuo pupils.[16] Katakura's comment on the available educational institutions countered arguments that contend that the end of access to Japanese educational system for *Zai-Man* pupils is a net negative, as to Katakura, the Manchukuo educational system was enough. Katakura ended his introduction with no concrete solutions or suggestions, instead emphasizing the importance of resolving the education issue as crucial to the development of the nation-building movement (*kenkoku undō* 建国運動), the Concordia movement, and Japanese-Manchukuo relations.[17] Despite the lack of an articulated solution or position, Katakura's emphasis on the ramifications in Japanese-Manchukuo diplomacy within the broader Japanese Empire and the framing of Manchukuo education as adequate thus framed the abrogation process as a *fait accompli*.

After Katakura's speech, Education Director Tamura provided a stance further dismissive of ethnic Korean concerns. Tamura first praised Katakura's speech, then began citing passages from the original text of the motion, criticizing calls to unify the education as premature.[18] To Tamura, the assimilationist slogans of *Naisen ittai*/*ichinyo* ("Japan and Korea as one [body]" 内鮮一体・一如)[19] implemented in the Korean peninsula were still just slogans. Despite the long years of assimilation efforts, Korea remained distinct from Japan and required more time and effort to become one with Japan. Therefore, citing slogans of assimilation as a tool to align *Zai-*

---

[16] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 515-16. One of the educational institutions that Katakura cites as available to Manchukuo pupils is Kenkoku Univeristy, which is analyzed in depth in Yuka Hiruma Kishida, *Kenkoku University and the Experience of Pan-Asianism: Education in the Japanese Empire* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020).
[17] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 516-17.
[18] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 517-19.
[19] For more on Japanese policies of assimilation toward Koreans, including the slogan of *Naisen ittai*, refer to Mark E. Caprio, *Japanese Assimilation Policies in Colonial Korea, 1910-1945*, (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2009).

Man Korean education with that in the home islands was unrealistic and unproductive in Tamura's view. He emphasized, "Manchukuo is assuredly not Korea, but is a separate national polity" (*Manshūkoku wa kesshite Chōsen ja naku, betsu na kokutai de ari* 満洲国は決して朝鮮ぢやなく、別な国体であり) as part of his assertion of Manchukuo independence and autonomy from Japan. Tamura thus distances Manchukuo domestic affairs from the overall designs of the Japanese Empire and its policies of Korean assimilation that were closely tied to education.

The rest of Tamura's speech continued to cite Manchukuo's nominal independence and sovereignty, along with the national projects of *minzoku kyōwa* and nation-building that differentiated it from Japan proper. Tamura dismissed specific complaints, such as the lack of textbooks and conflicting school holidays between transferred and retained *Zai-Man* schools, as "administrative" (*jimuteki* 事務的) issues.[20] At the end of his speech, Tamura echoed Katakura's message that in the end, the disparity between Japanese and most Korean pupils in accessing Japanese education was the result of Japanese state and its requests to retain schools for ethnic Japanese students and the Korean schools in the Railway Zone.[21] This argument shifted the burden of education away from the Manchukuo state, which is portrayed as a passive actor fulfilling the requests of the Japanese state and cannot do much more to influence the educational regimes for *Zai-Man* Koreans.

The position laid out by Tamura and Katakura led to backlash from ethnic Korean committee members. Representative Kang Wŏn, serving as the committee head, introduced the issue as concerning unequal treatment for Japanese and Korean schools "despite [Manchukuo's]

---

[20] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 520-21.
[21] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 521.

being the nation of concord among five races [*minzoku*]" (*gozoku kyōwa no kuni de arinagara* 五族協和の国でありながら).[22] The ideological basis of the Manchukuo state and the Concordia Association, that of *minzoku kyōwa*, was called into question. Kang indicated little intention of serving as an unbiased moderator in the committee discussion, encouraging attendees to voice their opinions "without reservations" (*fukuzō naku* 腹蔵なく).[23]

Kim Kyŏng-tae was the first representative to speak after the Kang's moderator introduction, and sought to refute the government stance. First, Kim argued that he "could not imagine this independent nation known as Manchukuo existing after separating from Japan" (*watashi no kangae de wa Nihon o hanarete, kono Manshūkoku to iu dokuritsu shita kuni wa kangaerarenai* 私の考へでは日本を離れて、此の満洲国と云ふ独立した国は考へられないゝ); therefore, it was an issue that Manchukuo discriminated against Koreans, subjects of the Japanese Empire, in education.[24] While making sure to call Manchukuo "independent," Kim invoked Manchukuo's *de facto* status as a Japanese puppet state and dependent state to position Koreans as belonging to the imperial state that held the true power in Manchukuo. Kim rejects the categorization of Koreans as a "constituent element of Manchukuo society" as the Kwantung Army leadership envisioned in the "Zai-Man Chōsen-jin shidō yōkō no ken." Instead, he sought to reap the potential privileges that came with being a Japanese imperial subject. Kim then argued that if Japan were calling for the liberation and equality of all Asians, and this was done for Manchurians and Mongolians, then it did not make sense to discriminate against Koreans.[25]

---

[22] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 521-22.
[23] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 522.
[24] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 522.
[25] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 523.

Like Kang, Kim pointed out the inherent contradictions in Japanese Pan-Asianist policies and slogans of wartime Japan to question what they saw as discrimination against *Zai-Man* Koreans.

Throughout the rest of the committee discussion, representatives continued to criticize the state of Korean education jurisdictions, highlighting the difficulties caused by the overlapping legal regimes of Japan and Manchukuo over *Zai-Man* Koreans. After his initial speech and a retort by Katakura, Kim Kyŏng-tae spoke once more, this time telling a story of when he visited a school in his province of Tonghua. There, Kim saw the words "Japanese imperial subject" (*Nihon teikoku shinmin* 日本帝国臣民) written in the classroom; however, the teacher in attendance became agitated, stating that as the students were to become Manchukuo nationals, they were not allowed to read materials that stated that they were Japanese subjects.[26] The historicity of this story and the details of what exactly the message was written on are unclear. However, Kim's story implies that the transfer of educational jurisdiction to Manchukuo caused tensions in the classroom, where Manchukuo teachers suppressed the identity of Koreans as imperial subjects and thus infringed on Japanese sovereignty. Pak Chun-byŏng also elaborated on the apparent tension between Manchukuo and Japan in *Zai-Man* education. Pak argued that ethnic Koreans had a "double burden" (*nijū no futan* 二重の負担) from their concurrent statuses as Manchukuo nationals and Japanese imperial subjects, and thus "cannot quit being Japanese to become Manchukuoan" (*Nihon-jin o yamete Manshūkoku-jin ni naru wake niha ikanai no de arimasu* 日本人を止めて満洲国人になる訳には行かないのであります).[27] Pak's language surrounding the "double burden" frames the desire to maintain the position of being Japanese subjects within Manchukuo as an act of imperial devotion.

---

[26] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 527-28.
[27] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 529-30.

Besides the Korean contingent, an unnamed representative who identified himself as ethnic Japanese sided with the Koreans argument. He emphasized that while Koreans had come to Manchuria as "children-subjects of his highness the Emperor of Japanese" (*Nihon Tennō heika no sekishi* 日本天皇陛下の赤子) and as Japanese subjects, they were treated differently from ethnic Japanese.[28] The representative warned that if the motion were simply sent to Headquarters for consideration, and representatives of the National Assembly went home empty-handed, those back home would be dissatisfied. This passage hints that the education issue was not only relevant to the ethnic Koreans who collaborated with the Manchukuo state through the Concordia Association, but also to the rest of the *Zai-Man* population.

Pak Chun-byŏng offered the first concrete proposal for the unification of education during the committee discussion. He proposed that schools for "our Japanese persons" (*waga Nihon-jin* 我が日本人) should incorporate the "Japanese spirit" (*Nihon seishin* 日本精神), combined with Manchukuo ideals, and transfer all Japanese education in Manchukuo to the Manchukuo state.[29] In this way, Pak argued, the overlapping bureaucracies could be simplified and the disparities between Japanese and Korean pupils could be resolved. Pak's proposal presents an alternative to reverting abrogation and moving back Korean schools into the Japanese fold. Instead of resisting imperial policy-makers that sought to bring Koreans into the framework of Manchukuo *minzoku kyōwa*, Pak proposed that Japan and Manchukuo should make ethnic Japanese join them as well.

The arguments from the Korean side met with opposition from Katakura, Tamura, and other committee members. Katakura questioned the viability of discussing the education issue in

---

[28] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 537.
[29] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 530.

the Concordia Association, considering it a waste of time. Emphasizing that the disparate treatment of Koreans and Japanese in Manchukuo was the result of Japanese imperial policy, Katakura argued that Koreans should not petition the Manchukuo state, and "if necessary, this is a matter that should be demanded of the Korean Government-General and the Japanese Empire" (*moshi hitsuyō nara Chōsen Sōtoku nari Nihon Teikoku ni yōkyū-su beki seshitsu no mono de arimasu* 若し必要なら朝鮮総督なり日本帝国に要求すべき性質のものであります).[30] Katakura also criticized Kim Kyŏng-tae's suggestion that Manchukuo could not exist without Japan, claiming it was a "great mistake" (*ōki na machigai* 大きな間違ひ) to consider Manchukuo a "vassal state" (*zokkoku* 属国) or a "protectorate" (*hogokoku* 保護国).[31] As Tamura had done earlier, Katakura asserted the autonomy and sovereignty of Manchukuo to frame the education issue as a Japanese issue divorced from Manchukuo internal affairs. As the Concordia Association was a domestic organization that sought to promote *minzoku kyōwa* within Manchukuo, Katakura argued that it had no stake in, or influence over, how Japan organized educational jurisdictions for its subjects.

Tamura continued the critique of the Korean position, arguing against Pak Chun-byŏng's proposal of total transfer of education for Japanese subjects to Manchukuo. Tamura argued that Pak's plan, which aimed to achieve the unification of *Zai-Man* education by transferring all schools for both ethnic Japanese and Korean pupils from Japanese consular jurisdiction into the Manchukuo education system, was ideologically suspect, and ultimately unnecessary. To Tamura, the plan would hinder *Naisen ichinyo* and efforts in Manchukuo to assimilate Koreans

---

[30] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 524-25.
[31] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 526.

into the Japanese Empire.[32] The logic went that the total split of ethnic Koreans from the Government-General and its mechanism of assimilation, the education system, would slow the integration of Korea. Tamura also raised concerns that, as Manchukuo was majority Han Chinese, the "current cultural level of the [Chinese] people" (*genzai no mindo*[33] 現在の民度) in Manchukuo education was a point of concern if Japanese consular education was integrated into the Manchukuo system.[34] Tamura's concern here did not lie with the effect of placing Koreans in majority-Chinese schools, as abrogation had already transferred most *Zai-Man* Koreans into the Manchukuo system. Instead, his statement implies concern over placing ethnic Japanese pupils into these schools. While the Koreans in the National Congress intensely debated in favor of preserving the "privilege" of maintaining access to Japanese schooling, Tamura and the Manchukuo state did not dare to question this status for Japanese. Finally, Tamura argued that the division of education was meant as a temporary measure that would eventually fade away once Koreans were assimilated into Japan, and Manchukuo society achieved total *minzoku kyōwa*.[35]

Other representatives voiced their opposition to the Korean position with dismissive attitudes toward the motion and its claims. Ōzawa Kōsaburō 小澤広三郎 from Fengtian echoed Katakura's belief that it was not productive to discuss the issue in the Concordia Association, believing that was "ultimately impossible" (*tōtei fukanō* 到底不可能) to reach a concrete resolution in the committee discussion.[36] If the division of *Zai-Man* education was indeed an

---

[32] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 532.
[33] Translation of *mindo* 民度 as "cultural level of the people" courtesy of Andrew Hall, "Japan's Education Policies in Korea in the 1910s: 'Thankful and Obedient,'" in *Education, Language, and the Intellectual Underpinnings of Modern Korea, 1875-1945*, ed. Andrew Hall and Leighanne Yuh (Leiden: Brill, 2023), 124.
[34] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 533-34.
[35] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 533-34.
[36] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 538-39.

issue of international diplomacy and Japanese state policy for its subjects as Katakura asserted, the Concordia Association could do little to affect the issue. An unnamed representative, identified as ethnic Japanese, argued that as Japan was vital to the national defense of Manchukuo, the retention of schools for Japanese was understandable. The goal of nation-building required some things to "be sacrificed for the time being" (*tōbun no aida wa gisei ni naru* 当分の間は犠牲になる).[37] Feng Hanqing 馮涵清, the appointed Chairman of the National Congress who was also in attendance at the discussion, agreed with the Japanese representative, and stated his belief that the issue will "naturally resolve" (*shizen ni kaiketsu* 自然に解決) itself, echoing Tamura's earlier argument.[38] Therefore, Feng said, it was better to send the motion up to deliberation by Central Headquarters than to continue discussion in the committee.

Representatives also argued that the root cause of Korean resistance to the educational divide was the desire for Korean pupils not to be in schools with ethnic Chinese students, rather than concerns over the implementation of *minzoku kyōwa* ideals in education. Fujita Masao 藤田正雄, from Rehe Province, stated that while Pak called for the unification of education under Manchukuo jurisdiction, he suspected that Pak wanted the opposite, and sought unification of Korean education under Japanese jurisdiction, basing his inference on the Korean resistance against the transfer of *Zai-Man* schools.[39] Tamura followed by arguing that Korean complaints calling for the transfer to Japanese jurisdiction was akin to that of a "whiny child" (*dadakko* 駄々っ子), and that the issue should be left to politicians.[40] Instead, Tamura said, Koreans should be

---

[37] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 540.
[38] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 541.
[39] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 541-2.
[40] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 543.

happy be in schools with their fellow Chinese countrymen and learn Chinese. Fujita and Tamura's suspicions that *Zai-Man* reluctance to Korean pupils studying with Chinese students was an important factor to the Korean representatives was likely correct. Later, Fujita began to express support for Pak's initial proposal of transferring Japanese and Koreans schools to Manchukuo jurisdiction. Pak interjected with a clarification, stating that "while it seems you are telling Koreans to engage in co-education with Manchurians [Chinese], Koreans are firmly different" (*Chōsen-jin to Man-kei to no kyōgaku o shiro to iu imi no yō desu ga, Chōsen-jin wa genzen to betsu de arimasu* 朝鮮人と満系との共学をしろと云ふ意味のやうですが、朝鮮人は厳然と別であります).[41] While Pak's initial proposal was presented as a solution that would eliminate disparity between the different peoples of Manchukuo, his clarification indicates the desire to keep Korean students separate from Chinese peers.

In the end, the "Motion Regarding the Unification of Education" was sent to Central Headquarters for deliberation. At the end of the discussion, Pak Chun-byŏng conceded that "it was pointless to debate with each other beyond this" (*mō kore ijō otagai ni giron suru koto mo muyō ja nai ka to omoimasu* もう是れ以上お互ひに議論することも無用ぢやないかと思ひます).[42] Ōzawa Kōsaburō concurred, alleging that "there is no other option aside from entrusting [the motion] to Central Headquarters" (*Chūō Honbu ni ichinin suru yori hoka ni nai to omou* 中央本部に一任するより外にないと思ふ).[43] The long discussion amounted to an exasperated concession from the Korean contingent, and with the proponents of the status quo moving on from the motion. In a way, concerns that the Concordia Association had little influence or stake

---

[41] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 545.
[42] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 553.
[43] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo*, 553.

in the issue were self-fulfilling, as the committee discussion ended without any concrete resolutions or declarations that could shift the eventual outcome.

The official Concordia Association response to the motion, and its efforts to unify Korean education in Manchukuo, amounted to little change for *Zai-Man* education. Small concessions to Korean schooling included the preservation of existing school year schedules, different from Manchukuo schools, for Japanese consular schools (including the fourteen Korean schools in the Railway Zone), and plans to study changing the Manchukuo school calendar to align with Japan's.[44] Schedules that aligned with the Japanese school year favored Korean students, as aligned school years allowed for smoother transfers and transitions to continued education. However, the response mentioned no change in jurisdictional boundaries or investigations into possible changes. The final item of the resolution asserted that "this issue is assuredly not solvable by this country alone" (*hon mondai wa tōkoku tandoku nite wa kesshi ezaru mono* 本問題は当国単独にては決し得さ[ママ]るもの) and required deliberation with "relevant parties" (*kankei hōmen* 関係方面).[45] The limits to the Concordia Association and the will of its political leadership were clear: if the issue of education jurisdiction for *Zai-Man* Koreans remained an "international" issue involving the Japanese Empire, it was not the Concordia Association's problem to solve.

Congresses 1939-1944

---

[44] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *(for 1938) Kōtoku 5-nendo zenkoku rengō kyōgikai teishutsu gian no kankei kikan setsumeisho (nichibun)* (Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, 1938), https://ndlsearch.ndl.go.jp/books/R100000002-I000001582108, 54.
[45] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *(for 1938) Kōtoku 5-nendo zenkoku rengō kyōgikai teishutsu gian no kankei kikan setsumeisho (nichibun)*.

The efforts of the *Zai-Man* representatives in the 1938 National Congress failed to reverse the effects of abrogation and to unify education for ethnic Korean pupils in Manchukuo. However, representatives in subsequent National Congresses continued to push for educational reforms meant to favor ethnic Koreans. Out of historian Hirooka Kiyonobu's compilation of motions relevant to ethnic Koreans in the National Congresses from 1939 through 1944, seven were related to education:[46]

National Congress motions concerning *Zai-Man* education

Year	Regnal Era, Yr	Title of Motion
1939	Kangde 康德 6	"Motion Regarding Methods of Improvement for Korean Education" *Sen-kei kyoiku kaizenhō ni kan suru ken* 鮮系教育改善方に関する件
1939	Kangde 6	"Motion Regarding Korean Middle School Education" *Sen-kei chūtō kyōiku ni kan suru ken* 鮮系中等教育に関する件
1939	Kangde 6	"Motion Regarding Compilation of Supplementary Books for Korean *Kokumin* Schools and *Kokumin* Superior Schools" *Sen-kei kokumin gakkō oyobi kokumin yūtō gakkō yō hojo yomihon hensan ni kan suru ken* 鮮系国民学校及国民優級学校用補助読本編纂に関する件
1940	Kangde 7	"Motion Regarding *Zai-Man* Korean Education" *Zai-Man Sen-kei ni kan suru ken* 在満鮮系教育に関する件
1941	Kangde 8	"Motion Regarding Improvement of Korean Schools and Education" *Sen-kei gakkō kyōiku kaizen ni kan suru ken* 鮮系学校教育改善に関する件
1942	Kangde 9	"Motion Regarding Promotion and System Improvement for Education" *Kyōiku shinkō narabi ni seido kaizen ni kan suru ken* 教育振興並に制度改善に関する件
1943	Kangde 10	"Motion Regarding the Renovation of the *Zai-Man* Korean Education System" *Zai-Man Sen-kei seido sasshin ni kan suru ken* 在満鮮系教育制度刷新に関する件
1944	Kangde 11	"Motion Regarding the Renovation of the *Zai-Man* Korean Education System and the Special Training and Strengthening of the Youth" *Sen-kei kyōiku seido sasshin narabi ni seishōnen tokubetsu rensei kyōka ni kan suru ken* 鮮系教育制度刷新並に青少年特別錬成強化に関する件

The 1939 National Congress saw the most activity within the five-year period, with three motions concerning *Zai-Man* education. While the number fell to one in each subsequent year

[46] Hirooka Kiyonobu, "Zai-Man Chōsen-jin no 'kōkoku shinmin' gensetsu: sōryokusen-ka no Manshū Kyōwakai wo chūshin ni," *Chōsen-shi kenkyūkai ronbunshū* 41 (October 2003): 119–43.

through 1944, as the overall number of Korean-relevant motions fell after 1939, education remained proportionally important. The setbacks seen in 1938 did not these efforts to improve *Zai-Man* Korean education.

Records are available for the 1940 and 1941 National Congresses. The provincial assemblies of Binjiang, Jilin, Andong, and Longjiang provinces jointly proposed the "Motion Regarding Zai-Man Korean Education" (*Zai-Man Sen-kei ni kan suru ken* 在満鮮系教育に関する件) to the 1940 National Congress. While the authors of the motion conceded that some requests by ethnic Koreans had been fulfilled after abrogation, "a fundamental solution was yet to be seen" (*konponteki kaiketsu wa ima nao mizaru* 根本的解決は今尚見ざる).[47] They also deemed a solution as important because it would affect more than just the Korean population, a mode of framing also used by the Korean representatives to the 1938 Congress. The motion problematized the existence of separate examinations for Korean pupils from Manchukuo schools when applying to middle schools under Japanese jurisdiction, along with the differences in academic calendars, as barriers to continued education for Koreans.[48] Concerns over access to Japanese secondary education, as seen in the case of Overseas Designated Schools before and during the abrogation process, remained salient to the *Zai-Man* Koreans. The response to this motion by the Ministry of Civil Affairs was mixed. While making some concessions, such as removing the additional test requirement to enroll in Japanese secondary schools, the Ministry stated that it had "no intentions to change the existing [academic calendar]" (*genkō seido o kaisei*

---

[47] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai giketsu jikō shori keika hōkoku (nichibun), Kōtoku 7-nendo* (Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, 1941), https://dl.ndl.go.jp/pid/1454680.
[48] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai giketsu jikō shori keika hōkoku Kōtoku 7-nendo*, 65-66.

suru ikō nashi 現行制度を改正する意向なし).[49] It also denied the motion's call for a reform to decentralize and devolve the organization of Manchukuo schools.

Another motion calling for a reform to *Zai-Man* Korean education made it up to the 1941 National Congress. The "Motion Regarding Improvement of Korean Schools and Education" (*Sen-kei gakkō kyōiku kaizen ni kansuru ken* 鮮系学校教育改善に関する件) called for the introduction of textbooks from Japan and colonial Korea, and repeated requests for educational decentralization and increased funding for ethnic Korean schools.[50] It also called for the unification of education through restoring Korean schools to consular control along the lines of ethnic Japanese and the fourteen retained Korean schools, effectively a reversal of the jurisdictional changes that accompanied abrogation in 1937. The authors of the motion argued that the progressive implementation of *Naisen ittai* assimilation policies in the Korean peninsula called for the same for Koreans in Manchukuo, realized through the return to Japanese jurisdiction in education.[51] The authors of the motion thus sought to leverage the assimilation of Koreans through wartime mobilization and demands as a means to pursue the long-sought goals of access to Japanese secondary education and better access to resources. While the exact response to the motion and the outcome of the 1941 National Congress is unclear, the continued efforts at Korean educational reform in the next three conferences, shown above, implies continued dissatisfaction by *Zai-Man* members of the Concordia Association. As the war entered its final stages, and both the Manchukuo state and the broader Japanese Empire neared the end of their lifespans, a resolution to the issue of *Zai-Man* Korean education remained elusive.

---

[49] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai giketsu jikō shori keika hōkoku Kōtoku 7-nendo*, 65-66.
[50] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai gian (nichibun), Kōtoku 8-nendo* (Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, 1941), https://ndlsearch.ndl.go.jp/books/R100000002-I000001582116, 15-17.
[51] Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai, *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai gian Kōtoku 8-nendo*, 15.

The debates over the fate of *Zai-Man* Korean education after the abrogation of extraterritoriality for Japanese imperial subjects reveal both extensive political activity by ethnic Korean members in the National Congresses of the Manchukuo Concordia Association, and the limits of *minzoku kyōwa* politics as pursued by ethnic Koreans. Manchukuo and Japan concluded a treaty in late 1937 to remove extraterritorial privileges for Japanese imperial subjects, including both ethnic Japanese and ethnic Korean residents of Manchukuo. While both groups were categorized as Japanese subjects, schools for ethnic Japanese were retained under Japanese consular jurisdiction, while most ethnic Korean schools were transferred to Manchukuo educational jurisdiction. As remaining under Japanese jurisdiction made continued education in Japanese secondary and tertiary schools easier for ethnic Korean pupils, Koreans in the Concordia Association rallied against the loss of what they saw as privileged access to Japanese schooling.

Zai-Man representatives debated with other Concordia Association members and representatives of the Manchukuo state over the state of ethnic Korean education in Manchukuo. Proponents of "unifying" Korean education, i.e. placing all Korean schools under one system, held that such divisions contravened Manchukuo's ideal of *minzoku kyōwa*, discriminating against Koreans, but not ethnic Japanese. Their opponents argued that the Concordia Association lacked standing over what they saw as an international issue. The debates also revealed the underlying reluctance of Koreans to place Korean pupils in the same schools as the majority Han Chinese populations of Manchukuo. The debates resulted in minor concessions to *Zai-Man* petitions, but little structural change, and no reversion to the pre-abrogation system. Koreans in the Concordia Association were thus unable to leverage their nominal legal parity with the ethnic Japanese, or the purported goals of Manchukuo toward ethnic harmony, for their own goals.

Their arguments that tied *Zai-Man* Koreans to the imperial project of assimilation that sought to eliminate a separate Korean identity amounted to little.

Conclusion

The *Zai-Man* Koreans outlasted the Concordia Association, Manchukuo, and the Japanese Empire. On August 9, 1945, the Soviet Union invaded Manchukuo, and on August 15, 1945, Japan surrendered unconditionally to the allied powers. These events marked the end of the double bind imposed on ethnic Koreans, which demanded their contributions both to Manchukuo and to Japan. Instead, the Communist victory in the Chinese Civil War led to the establishment of the People's Republic of China, who reclassified ethnic Koreans in Northeast China as Chinese Nationals and "Korean Chinese" (朝鮮族 C: Chaoxianzu, K: Chosŏnjok). Many Korean Chinese live in China today in Yanbian Autonomous Korean Prefecture (Yanbian Chaoxianzu Zizhizhou 延边朝鲜族自治州), a region roughly corresponding to Manchukuo-era Gando. Ethnic Koreans such as former North Korean leader Kim Il-Sung contributed to the communist cause during World War II against the Japanese occupation. As a result, Korean Chinese were afforded more political and cultural autonomy than what was seen in Manchukuo. While questions over language policy persist for the Korean Chinese, such as the economic primary of Mandarin and the management of Korean-language schools, the relative well-being of Korean Chinese in contrast to *Zai-Man* Koreans suggests was that the Koreans who sided against the empire achieved what the collaborationists in the Concordia Association could not.[1]

The course of *Zai-Man* Korean participation in the Concordia Association elucidates both the strategies of collaboration and the limits of collaborationist politics in Manchukuo. In the debate

[1] Chih-yu Shih, "Assimilation through Ethnicity: China's Ethnic Language Policy in Yunnan and Shenyang," *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights* 7, no. 3 (2000): 189–206, https://doi.org/10.1163/15718110020907990; Hao Xu, "Putonghua as 'Admission Ticket' to Linguistic Market in Minority Regions in China," *Language Policy* 18, no. 1 (February 15, 2019): 17–37, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-018-9462-x.

over ethnic organization of the Concordia Association, *Zai-Man* Koreans employed the logic of *minzoku kyōwa* and a teleological view of socio-cultural development by each ethnicity to promote a structure that would have created an institutional power base for *Zai-Man* Koreans. The debates seen in Concordia Association also couched *Zai-Man* Korean proposals in *minzoku kyōwa* terms, framing the solution of issues relevant to ethnic Koreans as a benefit to accomplishing nation goals. In the debates over Korean education and the conflicting jurisdictions of Manchukuo and Japan, representatives in the Concordia Association emphasized the role of ethnic Koreans as Japanese imperial citizens, demanding an end to what they saw as discrimination relative to the privileged ethnic Japanese population of Manchukuo. Rhetorical strategies were fluid; *Zai-Man* Koreans could emphasize their overlapping roles as constituent members of Manchukuo's *minzoku kyōwa* ideal or as duty-bound Japanese imperial subjects, depending on the context.

Zai-Man participation in Concordia politics failed to reconfigure the underlying system of relations between ethnic Koreans and Japanese imperial power. The emergence of the Concordia Association after the establishment of the new Manchukuo state appeared an opportunity to some, as seen through the debate over the ethnic organization of the association. As discussed in Chapter 1, the author of "Resonant Impression" saw a path forward for ethnic Koreans with a separate wing of the Concordia Association, complete with its own assembly and ethnic Korean branches. Instead of the existing Korean Associations, subject to Japanese consular authority and the affirmation of hierarchy within the category of "Japanese subject," the vision of an ethnically organized Concordia Association sought to secure political power for *Zai-Man* Koreans under the auspices of emerging *minzoku kyōwa* rhetoric. However, the rejection of these proposals and the affirmation of locational branches denied this vision. Chapters 2 and 3

demonstrate the struggle to translate the nominal privilege of Japanese subjectship and the proximity to Japanese colonial authority into concessions, agency, and power for Koreans. The perceived threat that abrogation posed to the position of *Zai-Man* Koreans, triangulated between the Japanese and Chinese of Manchukuo, led to active participation in the National Congresses of the Concordia Association. Ethnic Korean representatives and officials in the organization debated with Japanese bureaucratic and military officers directly, at points challenging the façades of Manchukuo and *minzoku kyōwa* as a negotiating tactic. Again, however, the persistence of colonial designs over Koreans prevented the emergence of *Zai-Man* power within the Concordia Association and Manchukuo politics.

Why did these *Zai-Man* collaborators fail? Over the course of *minzoku kyōwa* politics and the Concordia Association's existence, from the Manchurian Incident to the Soviet invasion of Manchukuo, *Zai-Man* Koreans remained inextricably tied to colonial governmentality. Hyun Ok Park's concept of osmotic imperialism, in which ethnic Korean migration into Manchuria constituted an expansion of Japanese imperial power connected to the bodies of its subjects, including Koreans, is crucial to understand the relationship between *Zai-Man* Koreans and colonial power in mass political arenas.[2] Korean bodies became the inadvertent carriers of colonial power, a reality that the *Zai*-Man representatives of the Association sought to leverage. The abrogation of extraterritoriality in the mid-1930s was only a nominal resignation of authority over the subjects of the empire in Manchuria. The loss of nominal privileges that came with imperial subjectship did not erase the legal status of Koreans as "Japanese subjects," preserving the ability of the colonial state to exert power over *Zai-Man* bodies, while Japanese-dictated

---

[2] Hyun Ok Park, *Two Dreams in One Bed: Empire, Social Life, and the Origins of the North Korean Revolution in Manchuria* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005), 41-56.

terms of ethnic existence in Manchukuo formed the lamented "double burden" as seen in Chapter 3. The Kwantung Army's prescription of *minzoku kyōwa* for Koreans and the narrative of the "constituent element" set *minzoku kyōwa* along Japanese terms that were not open to negotiation. Thus, strategies to find a middle ground between Japanese imperial subjecthood and participation in the Manchukuo project were fated to choose between two forms of colonial governmentality in the broader empire.

The Concordia Association, for all its records of negotiations and debates that produced motions that shaped itself and the areas of Manchukuo society that it touched, was a single organ of the vast Manchukuo and Japanese state projects of societal transformation in Manchuria. The committee discussions of the 1938 National Congress came to an impasse where it became clear that neither the committee nor the Concordia Association was in any position to negotiate with the Japanese to resolve the issues of the *Zai-Man* Koreans. As Hyun Ok Park and Erik Esselstrom have demonstrated, ethnic Koreans and their legal personhood both were keystones in the Japanese colonial projects of Northeast Asia, in a scale of political importance extending far beyond the capacity of any committee discussion in Xinjing, much less the Concordia Association.[3] The outcome was a lack of interest in resolving these issues due to the stakes involved. Thus, the double projects of the Japanese Empire bound *Zai-Man* Koreans between Japan and Manchukuo, resident and subject, defining and re-defining the space in between.

The participation of *Zai-Man* Koreans in Concordia Association politics raises questions of the nature of colonial subjectivity in the Japanese Empire. The persistent question in any context of collaboration, whether its participants were simply opportunists seeking personal gain

---

[3] Erik Esselstrom, *Crossing Empire's Edge: Foreign Ministry Police and Japanese Expansionism in Northeast Asia* (University of Hawai'i Press, 2009), https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt6wr0v1 and Park, *Two Dreams in One Bed.*

or had an agenda that sought to benefit Koreans in Manchukuo, remains difficult to answer in full without testimonies and confessions by the actors involved. The cases presented in this work, focusing on the rhetorics of anonymous or little-known *Zai-Man* members of the Concordia Association, lends some credence to both interpretations. Koreans living in pre-1931 Manchuria had a difficult existence. Ethnic Koreans dealt with encounters with Japanese consular and border police, negotiations with the Chinese Northeastern Army and its state security forces, and conflicts with Han Chinese neighbors over water and land rights. The Japanese invasion in 1931 led to little improvements in the material conditions and struggles present in *Zai-Man* Korean life.

However, Manchukuo promised a new future, one that included ethnic Koreans in the five ethnic groups outlined as constituents of the *minzoku kyōwa* vision. Manchukuo presented the dream of opportunity, to create a place for Koreans beyond the formal borders of the oppressive Japanese state. While Japanese colonial designs and the arrival of total war extinguished these dreams, the specter it offered led to real mass political participation and activity. The active participation of ethnic Koreans in Concordia Association debates and politics reveals that Korean involvement in the organization went beyond simple incorporation of Korean Associations into the consolidated organization. *Zai-Man* Korean representatives proposed motions, managed to bring them up through the regional assembly system, and spent considerable time and effort advocating for their causes to their fellow representatives and Manchukuo officials. The Concordia Association was both a site for an opportunist to climb the ranks of a society ostensibly dedicated to *minzoku kyōwa* and Korean participation within it, and a place where Koreans could promote the needs and causes of their own. Their eventual failure to secure political power and alter their relation to Japanese colonial authority underlines the

failure of the *minzoku kyōwa* project in Manchukuo: a dream of harmony superimposed onto a system of colonial domination.

Glossary

All-Manchurian Korean Associations Congress 全満朝鮮人民会連合会

Concordia Party 協和党

Concordia Association 協和会

Dairen 大連

Gando 間島

Katakura Tadashi 片倉衷

Korean Associations 朝鮮人民会

Kwantung Army 関東軍

Kwantung Leased Territory 関東租借地

Manchukuo Concordia Association 満洲(帝)国協和会

Manchurian Incident 満洲事変

Manchurian Youth League 満洲青年連盟

National Congress 全国連合協議会

minzoku kyōwa 民族協和

SMR Railway Zone 満鉄付属地

South Manchurian Railway (SMR) 南満洲鉄道（満鉄）

Yamaguchi Jūji 山口重次

Zai-Man Koreans 在満朝鮮人

Zhang Zuolin 張作霖

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Kantōgun Shireibu 関東軍司令部. “Zai-Man Chōsen-jin shidō yōkō no ken” 在満朝鮮人指導要項ノ件, August 15, 1936. C01003180100. JACAR.

Manchuria Daily News. “Concordia Talks Preservation of Peace and Order.” October 1, 1938. Mobilizing East Asia Online.

Manmō shiryō kyōkai 滿蒙資料協会. *Manshū jinmei jiten* 満洲人名辞典. 3 vols. Tokyo: Nihon Tosho Center 日本図書センター, 1989.

Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai 満洲帝国協和会. *Kōtoku 5-nendo zenkoku rengō kyōgikai teishutsu gian no kankei kikan setsumeisho (nichibun)* 康徳五年度全国聯合協議会提出議案之関係機関説明書(日文). Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai 満洲帝国協和会, 1938. https://ndlsearch.ndl.go.jp/books/R100000002-I000001582108.

Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai 満洲帝国協和会, ed. *Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai soshiki enkakushi* 満洲帝国協和会組織沿革史. Fuji Shuppan 不二出版, 1982.

Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai 満洲帝国協和会. *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai gian (nichibun) Kōtoku 8-nendo* 全国聯合協議会議案(日文) 康徳 8 年度. Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai 満洲帝国協和会, 1941. https://ndlsearch.ndl.go.jp/books/R100000002-I000001582116.

Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai 満洲帝国協和会. *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai giketsu jikō shori keika hōkoku (nichibun), Kōtoku 4-nendo* 全国聯合協議会議決事項処理経過報告(日文) 康徳 4 年度. Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai 満洲帝国協和会, 1938. https://dl.ndl.go.jp/pid/1454676.

Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai 満洲帝国協和会. *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai giketsu jikō shori keika hōkoku (nichibun), Kōtoku 7-nendo* 全国聯合協議会議決事項処理経過報告(日文) 康徳 7 年度. Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai 満洲帝国協和会, 1941. https://dl.ndl.go.jp/pid/1454680.

Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai 満洲帝国協和会. *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 3-nendo* 全国聯合協議会記録 康徳 3 年度. Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai 満洲帝国協和会, 1937. https://dl.ndl.go.jp/pid/1270240.

Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai 満洲帝国協和会. *Zenkoku rengō kyōgikai kiroku Kōtoku 5-nendo* 全国聯合協議会記録 康徳 5 年度. Manshū Teikoku Kyōwakai 満洲帝国協和会, 1938. https://dl.ndl.go.jp/pid/1449992.

Manshūkoku Kyōwakai Harbin Chihō Jimukyoku 満洲国協和会哈爾濱地方事務局. “Bō yūshiki Senjin no kyōwa undō ni taisuru kyōmeiteki kansō Daidō 2-nen 4-gatsu” 某有識鮮人の協和運動に対する共鳴的感想 大同２年４月, April 1933. C12120177400. JACAR.

Manshūkoku Kyōwakai Hōten Chihō Jimukyoku 満洲国協和会奉天地方事務局. “Kyōwakai no minzoku betsu saisoshiki teishō ni taisuru hihan daidō 2-nen 5-gatsu” 協和会の民族別再組織提唱に対する批判 大同２年５月, May 1933. C12120177500. JACAR.

Manshūkokushi Hensan Kankōkai 満洲国史編纂刊行会, ed. *Manshūkokushi kakuron* 満洲国史各論. Tokyo: Manmō Dōhō Engokai 満蒙同胞援護会, 1971.

Manshūkokushi Hensan Kankōkai 満洲国史編纂刊行会, ed. *Manshūkokushi sōron* 満洲国史総論. Tokyo: Manmō Dōhō Engokai 満蒙同胞援護会, 1970.

Noguchi Tauchi 野口多内. “Jikyoku ni tsuki zai-man chosenjin hogo kyuzai narabini shorai no hatten ni kansuru seigansho 時局に就き在満朝鮮人保護救済並に将来の発展に関する請願書,” October 21, 1931. C05021897200. JACAR.

Secondary Sources

Asada Kyōji 浅田喬二 and Kobayashi Hideo 小林英夫. *Nihon teikoku shugi no Manshū shihai: 15-nen sensōki o chūshin ni* 日本帝国主義の満洲支配―15 年戦争期を中心に―. Tōkyō: Jichōsha 時潮社, 1986.

Brooks, Barbara. “Japanese Colonial Citizenship in Treaty Port China: The Location of Koreans and Taiwanese in the Imperial Order.” In *New Frontiers: Imperialism’s New Communities in East Asia, 1842-1953*, edited by Robert Bickers and Christian Henriot, 109–24. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2000.

Caprio, Mark E. *Japanese Assimilation Policies in Colonial Korea, 1910-1945*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2009.

De Lisle, Andrew James. “Japanese Borderland Colonialism and the Koreans in Jiandao, 1905-1932.” Phd Diss., Australian National University, 2020.

Doak, Kevin M. “The Concept of Ethnic Nationality and Its Role in Pan-Asianism in Imperial Japan.” In *Pan-Asianism in Modern Japanese History: Colonialism, Regionalism and Borders*, edited by Sven Saaler and J Victor Koschmann. Routledge, 2006.

Dornetti, Filippo ドルネッティ・フィリッポ. “Chiiki shakai ni okeru Manshū Kyōwakai no tenkai to nōmin no dōkō: Hōten-shō Bujun-shi o chūshin ni” 地域社会における満洲協和会の展開と農民の動向―奉天省撫順県を中心に―. *Mita Gakkai zasshi* 三田学会雑誌 110, no. 3 (2017): 83–107.

Dornetti, Filippo ドルネッティ・フィリッポ. "'Manshūkoku' Kyōwakai kenkyū no seika to kadai" 「満洲国」協和会研究の成果と課題. *Mita Gakkai zasshi* 三田学会雑誌 105, no. 4 (2013): 693(171)-717(195).

Duara, Prasenjit. *Sovereignty and Authenticity: Manchukuo and the East Asian Modern*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2003.

Duus, Peter. *The Abacus and the Sword: The Japanese Penetration of Korea, 1895-1910*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Egler, David George. "Japanese Mass Organizations in Manchuria, 1928-1945: The Ideology of Racial Harmony." Phd Diss., The University of Arizona, 1977. http://hdl.handle.net/10150/565382.

Esselstrom, Erik. *Crossing Empire's Edge: Foreign Ministry Police and Japanese Expansionism in Northeast Asia*. University of Hawai'i Press, 2009. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt6wr0v1.

Fukushima Hiroyuki 福嶋寛之. "'Manshūkoku' chigai hōken teppai to Chōsen-jin zaigai shitei gakkō" 「満洲国」治外法権撤廃と朝鮮人在外指定学校. Research Center for Korean Studies, Kyushu University, March 25, 2022. https://doi.org/10.15017/4797810.

Fogel, Joshua A., and Yamamuro Shin'ichi. "Chimera: A Portrait of Manzhouguo. Harmony and Conflict." *The Asia-Pacific Journal: Japan Focus* (blog), March 1, 2007. https://apjjf.org/joshua-a-fogel/2384/article.

Feng Ya 冯雅 and Zhu Lixin 祝力新. "'Manzhou ping lun' zhong de 'Man qing lian' yu 'Xie he hui'" 《满洲评论》中的"满青联"与"协和会" *Wai guo wen ti yan jiu* 外国问题研究, no. 3 (January 2012): 20–23.

Garon, Sheldon M. *Molding Japanese Minds: The State in Everyday Life*. Princeton University Press, 1997. https://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb04089.0001.001.

Hall, Andrew. "Constructing a 'Manchurian' Identity: Japanese Education in Manchukuo, 1931–1945." Ph.D., University of Pittsburgh, 2003.

Hall, Andrew. "Japan's Education Policies in Korea in the 1910s: 'Thankful and Obedient.'" In *Education, Language, and the Intellectual Underpinnings of Modern Korea, 1875-1945*, edited by Andrew Hall and Leighanne Yuh. Leiden: Brill, 2023.

Hirano Kenichirō 平野健一郎. "Manshū jihen mae ni okeru zaiman Nihon-jin no dōkō:Manshūkoku seikaku keisei no ichi yōin" 満州事変前における在満日本人の動向 —満州国性格形成の一要因—. *Kokusai seiji* 国際政治, no. 43 (1970). https://doi.org/10.11375/kokusaiseiji1957.43_51.

Hirooka Kiyonobu 廣岡浄進. "Kantō ni okeru Chōsen-jin minkai to ryōjikan keisatsu: Zai-Man Chōsen-jin to shokuminchi teikoku Nihon" 間島における朝鮮人民会と領事館警察—

在満朝鮮人と植民地帝国日本. *Jinbun gakuhō* 人文学報 106 (April 2015): 169–204. https://doi.org/10.14989/200248.

Hirooka Kiyonobu 廣岡浄進. "Zai-Man Chōsen-jin no 'kōkoku shinmin' gensetsu: sōryokusen-ka no Manshū Kyōwakai o chūshin ni" 在満朝鮮人の「皇国臣民」言説―総力戦下の満洲協和会を中心に―. *Chōsen-shi kenkyūkai ronbunshū* 朝鮮史研究会論文集 41 (October 2003): 119–43.

Kazama Hideto 風間秀人. "Nōson gyōsei shihai" 農村行政支配. In *Nihon teikoku shugi no Manshū shihai: 15-nen sensōki o chūshin ni* 日本帝国主義の満洲支配―15 年戦争期を中心に―, edited by Asada Kyōji 浅田喬二 and Kobayashi Hideo 小林英人, 256–326. Tokyo: Jichōsha 時潮社, 1986.

Kishida, Yuka Hiruma. *Kenkoku University and the Experience of Pan-Asianism: Education in the Japanese Empire*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2020.

Kobayashi Hideo 小林英夫. "Tamura Toshio-den: Jimintō habatsu Kōchikai shodai jimukyoku-chō, Ikeda Hayato no kōdo seichō seisaku o sasaeta jinbutsu" 田村敏雄伝 ―自民党派閥宏池会初代事務局長・池田勇人の高度成長政策を支えた人物―. *Ajia Taiheiyō Tōkyū* アジア太平洋討究 28 (March 2017): 99–161.

Kristof, Nicholas D. "Zhang Xueliang, 100, Dies; Warlord and Hero of China." *New York Times*, October 19, 2001. https://www.nytimes.com/2001/10/19/world/zhang-xueliang-100-dies-warlord-and-hero-of-china.html.

Li Xujuan 李淑娟. "Xie he hui yu wei man zheng fu guan xi xu lun -- yi Xie he hui gai zu wei he xin zhan kai" 协和会与伪满政府关系述论--以协和会改组为核心展开. *Qiu shi xue han* 求是学刊 32, no. 5 (2005): 119–25. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1000-7504.2005.05.022.

Matsusaka, Yoshihisa Tak. *The Making of Japanese Manchuria, 1904–1932*. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2001.

Mimura, Janis A. *Planning for Empire: Reform Bureaucrats and the Japanese Wartime State*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011. https://muse.jhu.edu/pub/255/monograph/book/26168.

Mizuno Naoki 水野直樹. "Pak Sŏk-yun: shokuminchi-ki saikō no Chōsenjin erīto" 朴錫胤―植民地期最高の朝鮮人エリート. In *Kōza higashi-Ajia no chishikijin* 講座東アジアの知識人, edited by Cho Kyŏng-dal 趙景達, Harada Kei'ichi 原田敬一, Murata Yūjirō 村田雄二郎, and Yasuda Tsuneo 安田常雄, 4:326–41. Tokyo: Yūshisha 有志舎, 2014.

National Diet Library 国立国会図書館. "Katakura Tadashi kankei bunsho." National Diet Library Search 国立国会図書館サーチ, August 26, 2022. https://ndlsearch.ndl.go.jp/rnavi/kensei/katakuratadashi.

O'Dwyer, Emer Sinéad. *Significant Soil: Settler Colonialism and Japan's Urban Empire in Manchuria*. Harvard University Asia Center, 2015.

Ogata, Sadako N. *Defiance in Manchuria: The Making of Japanese Foreign Policy, 1931-1932*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1964.

Okabe Makio 岡部牧夫. "Shokuminchi fashizumu undō no seiritsu to tenkai: Manshū Seinen Renmei to Manshū Kyōwatō" 植民地ファシズム運動の成立と展開—満洲青年連盟と満洲共和党—. *Rekishigaku kenkyū* 歴史学研究 406, no. 3 (1974): 1–16.

Okumura Hiroshi 奥村弘. "Chihō seiji ni okeru Manshūkoku Kyōwakai no ichi: Manshūkoku Kyōwakai dai 7-ji zenkoku rengō kyōgikai no bunseki o tōshite" 地方政治における満洲国協和会の位置—満洲国協和会第七次全国連合協議会の分析をとおして—. In *"Manshūkoku" no kenkyū* 「満洲国」の研究, edited by Yamamoto Yūzō 山本有造, 157–89. Kyoto: Kyoto University jinbun kagaku kenkyūjo 京都大学人文科学研究所, 1993.

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

Shih, Chih-yu. "Assimilation through Ethnicity: China's Ethnic Language Policy in Yunnan and Shenyang." *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights* 7, no. 3 (2000): 189–206. https://doi.org/10.1163/15718110020907990.

Shin, Ki-young. "The Politics of the Family Law Reform Movement in Contemporary Korea: A Contentious Space for Gender and the Nation." *Journal of Korean Studies* 11, no. 1 (September 1, 2006): 93–125. https://doi.org/10.1353/jks.2006.0005.

Sin Kyu-sŏp 申奎燮. "Chigai hōken teppai to Zai-Man Chōsen-jin tōgō seisaku: chigai hōken teppai kara Kyōwakai e no hen'nyū made" 治外法権撤廃と在満朝鮮人統合政策：治外法権撤廃から協和会への編入まで, In *Nitchō kankeishi ronshū: Kang sensei koki, taishoku kinen* 日朝関係史論集：姜徳相先生古希・退職記念, 661–81. Tokyo: Shinkansha 新幹社, 2003.

Sin Kyu-sŏp 申奎燮. "Shoki 'Manshūkoku' ni okeru Chōsen-jin tōgōsaku: Chōsen-jin Rengōkai o chūshin ni" 初期「満洲国」における朝鮮人統合策 —朝鮮人連合会を中心に—. *Nihon shokuminchi kenkyū* 日本植民地研究 9 (1997): 16–31.

Suzuki Takashi 鈴木隆史. "Manshūkoku Kyōwakaishi shiron 1" 満洲国協和会史史論（一）. *Kikan gendaishi* 季刊現代史 2 (May 20, 1973): 28–51.

Suzuki Takashi 鈴木隆史. "Manshūkoku Kyōwakaishi shiron 2" 満洲国協和会史史論（二）. *Kikan gendaishi* 季刊現代史 5 (Spring 1974): 102–33.

Tamanoi, Mariko Asano. “Knowledge, Power, and Racial Classifications: The ‘Japanese’ in ‘Manchuria.’” *Journal of Asian Studies* 59, no. 2 (May 1, 2000): 248–76. https://doi.org/10.2307/2658656.

Tanaka Ryūichi 田中隆一. “‘Manshūkoku’ki Harbin Chōsen-jin no ‘tainichi kyōryoku’” 「満洲国」期ハルビン朝鮮人の「対日協力」. *Jinbun gakuhō* 人文学報 91 (December 2004). https://repository.kulib.kyoto-u.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/2433/48656/1/91_97.pdf.

Tsukase Susumu 塚瀬進. “1940-nen dai ni okeru Manshūkoku tōchi no shakai e no shintō” 1940年代における満洲国統治の社会への浸透. *Ajia keizai* アジア経済 39, no. 7 (July 15, 1998): 2–21.

Uchida, Jun. *Brokers of Empire: Japanese Settler Colonialism in Korea*. Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Center, 2011.

Wang Changhuan 王长欢. “Ri wei shi qi ‘Manzhou qing nian lian meng’ yan jiu” 日伪时期“满洲青年联盟”研究. *Xian dai jiao ji* 现代交际, no. 10 (January 2018): 44–45.

Wang, Changhuan 王长欢. “Zhan hou wei Manzhouguo Xie he hui zhong ri yan jiu zong xu” 战后伪满洲国协和会中日研究综述 *Zhongwai jiaoliu* 中外交流, no. 30 (January 2017): 44–45.

Xu, Hao. “Putonghua as ‘Admission Ticket’ to Linguistic Market in Minority Regions in China.” *Language Policy* 18, no. 1 (February 15, 2019): 17–37. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-018-9462-x.

Yamaguchi Jūji 山口重次. *Kieta teikoku Manshū* 消えた帝国満洲. Tokyo: Mainichi Shinbunsha 毎日新聞社, 1967.

Yamamuro, Shin’ichi. *Manchuria under Japanese Dominion*. Translated by Joshua A. Fogel. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.

Yin Hu 尹虎. “‘Manshūkoku’ ni okeru Zai-Man Chōsen-jin shidō hōshin to ‘minzoku kyōwa’” 「満洲国」における在満朝鮮人指導方針と「民族協和」. Hosei University Repository, March 18, 2009. https://doi.org/10.15002/00003953.

Young, Louise. *Japan’s Total Empire: Manchuria and the Culture of Wartime Imperialism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

Yuh, Leighanne. “Contradictions in Korean Colonial Education.” *International Journal of Korean History* 15 (February 2010): 121–49