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## Prof. Peter O’Connor (Musashino University) – Opening lecture on Friday 20th March 2020, at 4.15pm TBC, chair Alexander Philippov

## Adventurers in opinion: Influencers, chancers and fairweather friends on the road to systemic change in Northeast Asia

This talk is focused on the travels and exploits of a small, uncategorised group of operators in the transnational political media of Northeast Asia. Through sheer charm, manner and a flexible agenda, these people were able to sidestep established groupings and leverage their access to other power centres to exercise a disproportionate influence on the closing stages of the imperial contest in Northeast Asia.

In examining the progress of these adventurers, the aim is to show how a historically under-explored arena can turn into fertile ground for untested but nimble opinion formers during the feverish prelude to systemic change. In the fog and desperation of Japan’s War on China, these commentators used their public forums and backchannels to join the cluster of factors leading to irreversible systemic change in Northeast Asia.

In the wake of the Communist unification of China in October 1949, the speaker will also explore the afterlife of these opinion formers during the onset of the Cold War in Asia.

# Conference day on Saturday 21st March 2020

### DE ANGELI, Aglaia (Queen’s University Belfast)

### Maps of Manchuria: towards new visualisation of global, transnational or cross-border activities.

The current study of borderlands and customs, started together with Dr Emma Reisz, is focusing on Chinese customs on the border with Russia, and seeks to explore various ways of re-defining it as a global, transnational or cross-border phenomenon. From this initial research, there developed an appreciation of the great potential for advancing our understanding of competing imperialisms in Northeast Asia through a combined use of traditional written sources and more modern sources and methods, such as database and digital visualisation, specifically digital map representations.

This paper first presents the sources for the first set of static maps, compiled in 2018, and then explains the methodology used for making the second set of interactive maps. This new set of maps allows us to visualise the region of Manchuria in an entirely new way, focusing particular on exchange of goods, transport networks, localities hosting commercial hubs and customs offices, as well showing more clearly movements of people.

As territoriality, taxation, and border control are main attributes of a sovereign state, their study through application to a dynamic digital map can help us to analyse from a new perspective competing powers in the region, namely China, Russia, Japan, Britain and the United States. The enforcement of law, the collection of customs dues, and taxation are indicative of a cross-border reality, where many powers dispute one another’s authority and territoriality.

### KHARITONOVA, Anna M. (Saint Petersburg State University)

### Contribution of G.A. Planson in the Foreign Policy of the Russian Empire in the Far East in the Early 20th century

At the beginning of the 20th century, many essential changes took place in the relations between Russia and China. Issues related to the demarcation of the state border in the Ili region and the implementation of trade in Western China were resolved. In the 1890s, an allied Russian-Chinese treaty was signed, which included a clause on joint opposition to the Japanese expansion in East Asia, as well as on the construction of the Chinese Eastern Railway (1896). In 1897, the Russian squadron was located in Port Arthur, and a year later the Russian Empire signed a convention with the Qing government on leasing part of the Liaodong Peninsula with the ports of Port Arthur and Dalny located there. However, good neighborly relations began to deteriorate rapidly after the Russian troops took part in the suppression of the Boxer rebellion (1898-1901). At the end of hostilities in 1901, the eight powers, including Russia, signed the Final Protocol, which finally consolidated the semi-colonial status of China.

In the early years of the 20th century, the Russian Empire outlined two main approaches to building public policy towards China. One of them was promoted in separate circles in the Russian military elite and was expressed in the implementation of armed expansion in Manchuria. Such a policy turned out to be ineffective, and resulted in the signing in March 1902 of the disadvantageous Russo-Chinese agreement providing for the withdrawal of Russian troops from Manchuria.

The other approach was advocated by the financial and economic elite led by S. Witte, who called for deepening trade and economic cooperation with China. However, this policy also did not have much success.

Such was the background on which G.A. Planson, a prominent Russian diplomat, performed his service in China. Since 1902 G.A. Planson was a diplomatic official under Admiral E.I. Alekseev, head of the Kwantung region. The main diplomatic event, which distinguished G.A. An outstanding diplomatic event, which distinguished G.A. Planson as a diplomat, was filing a note including seven conditions on the withdrawal of the Russian troops from China and delivering it to the Qing government. The relevance of this study dictates to apply to the diplomat’s diary entries. Sources containing personal information can shed light on those events, since during that period the position of the Russian Empire was ambiguous in China. Thus, talk is dedicated to the contribution of G.A. Planson to the Russian foreign policy in the Far East at the beginning of the 20th century.

### KOBAYASHI Akina (Tama University)

### From Japanese militarism to the Soviet communism – the “change of heart” of Japanese POW through the Soviet indoctrination.

The collapse of the Great Japanese Empire had a major impact on the fate of Japanese servicemen who fought in the Soviet-Japanese war in 1945. This report focus on the “change of heart” of Japanese prisoners of war during the detainment in USSR. After the defeat of Japanese Kwantung Army, these servicemen were given the propaganda education in the Soviet prison camps as soon as they arrived. The main purpose of the Japanese POWs’ transportation to Siberia was to use them as laborers, but the second purpose was to create “soviet seeds” who sympathized with socialism and communism.

Political indoctrination in the USSR began in 1945 and lasted until 1949, by which time most of the POWs had been repatriated to Japan. The Soviet authorities hoped that through this political indoctrination, the Japanese POWs would experience a “change of heart” from the militaristic ideology they had blindly espoused, with the result that they would sympathize with the USSR’s ideology when they returned to Japan, which was under US military occupation at the time.

The author provides three specific examples of prisoners who underwent their “change of heart” during the determent. One is Tadashi Itagaki, another is Masatsugu Shii, and the other is Goro Shikoku. Itagaki Tadashi whose father Itagaki Seishiro was the General and executed in 1948 had undergone a conversion from militarism to communism in USSR. Masatsugu Shii who was an intelligence stuff of Kwantung Army became a soviet espionage in Siberia. Goro Shikoku (is known as anti-wat artist in Hiroshima) was one of common soldiers who had military service for 10 months and held in Soviet for 3 years. In this presentation, the author would like to discuss his “changed of heart” by examining his diary brought from Siberia.

### KOBAYASHI Somei (Nihon University)

### Public Diplomacy of Japanese Empire and Imperial/Colonial Fraternity: The Carnegie Endowment’s Tour for American Journalists to the “Orient” in 1929

Recently, the animated debate regarding Public Diplomacy has been the focus of attention among both government officials and academic scholars. Non-militaristic diplomacy has a long and ever-evolving history. In the case of Japan, it began a campaign of public diplomacy toward the United States, Europe and Asia at the end of the 19th century. In 1929, the Carnegie Endowment planned and executed a tour for American journalists to the “Orient”; Japan, Korea, Manchuria and China. The purpose of my presentation is to explore the public diplomacy of Japanese Empire *vis a vis* the tour and it aims to shed light on an aspect of imperial and colonial fraternity among the U.S.-Japan relations at least in the latter half of 1920s.

The paper clarifies that the tour was part of the public diplomacy strategy of the Japanese empire in two key ways. Firstly, the tour aimed to generate Western knowledge and positive attitude regarding the “orient.” The Japanese government intended to propagate and control its image in the eyes of the American people through the reports by the journalists in the tour. It hoped to raise American awareness of Japan within the Asian situation.

A second goal was to promote a shared sense of imperialistic recognition between Japan and the U.S. The American journalists grasped the “oriental” situation by accepting Japanese propaganda during the tour. They regarded Japan as Asia’s only westernized, civilized country. The goal was to distinguish Japanese from other Asian people by the standard of “civilized” versus “barbarian.” This cynical ploy helped to maintain discrimination among the Asian countries. It was a resource not only for Japan to maintain its imperialistic power but also for fraternal relations of U.S.-Japan by sharing the imperial and colonial gaze on “uncivilized” countries and people.

The use of Carnegie’s tour for American journalists to the “Orient” as a public diplomacy method for Japan thus played a key role in establishing the hegemony of the Japanese empire. This study identifies the imperial and colonial fraternity between U.S. and Japan, but also the structure and meaning of Japan’s public diplomacy in depth as a valuable lesson that still resonates today.

### KOVRIGIN Nikita (Saint Petersburg State University)

### Shaping the Chinese Community in Japan and Russia: the role of political factor

In the XIX – first half of the XX century, Chinese migrants had played a visible role in the economy and social life of many countries of the world, including Japan and Russia. On different historical stages, the role of Chinese migrants was also very important to the Japan’s and Russia’s economies. In these two nations, conventional migration factors had mostly been favorable for the inflow of Chinese migrants. The existed migration situation suggested that well-rooted and developed Chinese communities should have formed in both Japan and Russia. Moreover, in the discussed period, the process of Chinese migration to Russia and Japan, as well as the process of formation of ethnic communities there had been influenced by a similar set of factors. The nature of migration to these countries also drastically differed from that of the other parts of the world. This paper aims to demonstrate that despite favorable economic and legislative conditions, political events played the pivotal role in fate of Chinese migration to Japan and Russia. Political factors gave impetus to migration waves, and ironically, those waves were put to end by the other political events. The paper also shows how Soviet policy toward the Chinese migrants was affected by Japan’s policy in East Asia. The paper argues that the role and influence of irregular migration factors at the main historical stages had proved to be much stronger than that of conventional ones. As a result, unlike the U.S., Canada, European and Southeast Asian nations, no Chinese community existed in the USSR until 1980s. In Japan, such community was extremely small, divided and isolated from the Mainland China.

### MUMINOV, Sherzod (University of East Anglia)

### The Myth of Soviet Superiority: Explaining Japanese Strategists’ Preoccupation with Soviet Power in East Asia in the Early 1930s.

In the early 1930s, some Japanese military strategists displayed a preoccupation with the Soviet Union that bordered on obsession. In what has been a well studied phenomenon, Japanese senior military officers in the Army Ministry and the General Staff, notably Ishiwara Kanji and his followers, viewed the Soviet Union as the most significant threat to Japan’s imperial expansion on the continent. For Ishiwara in particular, Soviet capabilities in the Far East were the chief menace to Japan’s Manchurian enterprise - the puppet-kingdom of Manchukuo he himself had helped create by masterminding the 1931 Manchurian Incident, and which he saw as a matter of Japan’s “life and death.”

While this preoccupation has been well documented in Japanese (and less well in Anglophone) historiography, the Soviet side of things is largely missing from the picture. While the USSR’s domestic problems of the period (e.g. collectivization) have been researched extensively, these are rarely connected to Moscow’s strategies and plans in the Far East vis-a-vis an increasingly confident Japan. On the diplomatic front, the first decade of official Soviet-Japanese relations (1925-1935) saw repeated attempts by the USSR to tie Japan to a neutrality pact, calls that were largely ignored by Tokyo. The influence of strategists who believed that such a pact would further strengthen Stalin’s hand partly explains the unwillingness to sign one with the USSR.

In this paper I critically investigate the Japanese strategists’ preoccupation with the USSR’s influence and potential threat to Japanese interests in Manchuria and greater East Asia. While I stop short of questioning the USSR’s significance as a military player in East Asia in this period, I argue that the nationalist officers in Japan’s military agencies had clearly overestimated the capabilities, intentions and international standing of the Soviet Union. I will specifically focus on the thinking of Ishiwara Kanji and other officers, which I will analyze against the backdrop of Soviet official documents from the period.

### SAMOYLOV Nikolay (Saint Petersburg State University)

### Ivan Korostovetz and his role in Russian Diplomatic Activities in the Far East before and during the Xinhai Revolution.

 Ivan Yakovlevich Korostovetz (1862-1933) – a famous Russian diplomat and sinologist. He was the author of a large number of books and articles on China and Russian policy in the Far East. He served in the Asian Department of the Russian Ministry for Foreign Affairs. In 1890, Korostovetz was appointed a second secretary of the Russian Diplomatic Mission in Peking.

 In 1905, as a member of the Russian delegation he participated in conclusion of the Russian-Japanese Peace Treaty in Portsmouth, after which he was appointed Vice-director of the 1st Department at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

 After the unexpected death of the Russian Envoy, the famous sinologist D. Pokotilov, in Peking on May 9, 1908, I.Korostovetz was appointed as the Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Qing Empire (served until 1911).

 Korostovetz played a decisive role in the preparation of the Qiqihar Protocol and its signing on December 7, 1911 (“the Border Treaty at Manchuria Station”, 满洲里 界 约- a border demarcation agreement in the region of the Argun River). It was the last of the border treaties between the Russian and the Qing Empires, signed with the Chinese imperial government after the outbreak of the Xinhai Revolution. The Qiqihar Protocol of 1911 set the last point in the long history of the border demarcation between Russia and Qing China.

 In 1912, Korostovetz led the Russian diplomatic mission in Urga and on October 21 (November 3), 1912, signed the Russian-Mongolian agreement recognizing the autonomy of Outer Mongolia, and also giving a number of privileges to Russian citizens in Mongolia. This treaty, which played a decisive role in the process of the formation of Mongolian state, was one of the major diplomatic successes of imperial Russia before the World War I. The treaty and the negotiations held thereafter were of great political importance to Mongolia. This treaty not only made Mongolia officially recognized by the Russian Empire, but also gave the future legal basis for consolidating Mongolian state sovereignty.

 Bogd Gegeen sent congratulations to Korostovetz after the signing of the agreement through his Minister for Foreign Affairs Handdorzhi. And on May 15, 1913, by the decree of Bogd Gegeen of Mongolia, Korostovetz was awarded the title of a Prince of the first degree and a special Order.

 In August 1913, Korostovetz was dismissed from his post. This happened just after a scandal that arose as a result of the love affair of the then married Korostovetz with a young girl - a daughter of Théophile Piry (1851-1918), the Commissioner of Customs and first Postmaster General of the Imperial Postal Service in China (1911-1915). However, the scandal was resolved, and Korostovetz was allowed to continue his diplomatic career in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

 After 1917, Korostovetz emigrated from Russia. He died on January 1, 1933, in Paris.

 At the turn of the 20th century Korostovetz was one of the most capable diplomats in the Russian Empire and stood at the origins of an active Russian policy in Outer Mongolia. Having a deep understanding of the Russian geopolitical interests in the Far East and Central Asia, he was able to clearly formulate the main goals of Russia’s policy in this region at the time when the Xinhai revolution broke out in China.

### SHULATOV, Yaroslav (Kobe University)

### Russia as a “Trauma”: The Rise and Fall of Japan as a Great Power.

The present paper discusses the so-called “Russian factor” in the political development of Japan over a period from the late 19th century till the present day. The rise and fall of Japan as a “great power” in the 20th century is tightly linked with its relations with Russia (the Russian Empire and the USSR), which became a specific factor of the Japanese imperial project. Russia served as a challenge to Japan that triggered its social mobilization and militarization in 1895-1905.

The victorious Russo-Japanese War made Japan a “great power” with colonies on the continent. However, it also predetermined the political rise of its military circles, which ultimately worked as a time bomb breaking the foundation of the newborn empire. Cooperation with Russia after 1906 was the most effective instrument for Japan’s further expansion on the continent, while the intervention into Siberia after 1917 came as the first alarm signaling the limits of that expansion.

The paper also examines the harsh geopolitical rivalry between the two countries during the 1930s, “strange neutrality” during WWII, and the Soviet-Japanese war in August 1945 as the final factor that brought Japan to a surrender and drove the final nail in the coffin of its imperial project.

The study shows an unprecedented transformation of Russia’s image in Japan over the years and analyzes the Russo-Japanese territorial dispute in a new perspective.

### TITOV, Alexander (Queen’s University Belfast)

### Empire into nation: Mechanisms of national appropriation of imperial space by Russia and its rivals in modern Northeast Asia.

The paper examines the difference between Russian imperial territories and national territories, taking the Russian Far East as a case study. The central research question is about how a territory becomes “appropriated” as a national territory.

Such appropriation was not automatic. A simple fact of inclusion of a territory into the Russian state’s possession, as per international treaties, did not mean that it was recognised by the Russian public or officials as belonging in symbolic geography of Russian nationalism.

The Far East territories presented a specific challenge to the Russians for a number of reasons, which are explored in greater detail. Yet the mechanisms by which such appropriation was affected are broadly universal, and indeed were often employed by Russia's rivals in the region, particularly Japan and China.

The core is that the process of transition an imperial territory into a national one is important for understanding broader concepts of relations between empire and nation. Finally, it also offers the basis for a comparative analysis of competing imperial and national projects in North East Asia and beyond.

### TSUCHIYA Reiko (Waseda University)

### Anti-British Propaganda as a part of Japanese Imperialism over China in 1930’s

This paper examines external propaganda by Japanese over China in 1930’s, especially anti-British propaganda from 1937 to 1938 in English and other foreign languages, as an integral part of competing imperialism in 20th century Asia. Although it is usually said that Japanese external propaganda after the Manchurian Incident was unsuccessful, I argue that those propaganda shows us ideological conflict between imperialism and nationalism in northeast Asia. Japanese anti-British propaganda included criticism against colonialism by western countries in Asia and Japanese ambition to replace British Empire in Asia media system, but also contradictions that Japanese propagandists were promoting nationalism of China and other nations as a liberation from empires, but on the other hand they were trying to control the different nationalism in northeast Asia under Japanese imperial power for exploitation. As the Roman Janus, Japanese external propaganda at wars used deliberately two faces of nationalism and imperialism.

### YANCHENKO Denis G. (Saint-Petersburg State University)

### Nicholas II's economic policy in the Far East in the documents of the Russian State Historical Archive (RGIA)

The reign of Nicholas II is a short but eventful period of Russian history. Fate-bearing decisions for the Empire were made in different spheres of public life. The wars pushed the economic development of several regions of Russia (so-called «outskirts»), including the Far East and adjacent territories of other countries, particularly Chinese Manchuria. The uniqueness of the period we are studying is in a significant number of well-preserved archival documents. They describe in details government policy, political credo of top officials in the capital and in the regions, various economic measures – railway construction, development of cities and industry, resettlement from Central Russia to Far East, generally Russian colonization along Trans-Siberian Railway and Chinese Eastern Railway (CER).

Most of the documents on this theme is kept in Saint-Petersburg, in Russian State Historical Archive (RGIA). Correspondence and discussions of imperial ministers, materials of sessions of State Duma and State Council, documents of CER Board, activities of Committee on settlement of the Far East, issues of defense and partially of foreign policy, financing of Russian colonization of "the Far East outskirts" – that is not a complete list of topics that were considered in the capital of Russian Empire.

The uniqueness of the St. Petersburg archive is in the content of its documents. For example, the experience of studying of the materials of the only federal archive in Vladivostok – the Russian State Historical Archive of the Far East (RGIA DV) shows that in the region there remained documents about local economic activities, the practical implementation of the center's decisions and obstacles faced by local authorities and settlers in the Amur region, Kamchatka and Sakhalin. However, it is possible to characterize Russia's aims in the Far East at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries in a comprehensive manner only by obtaining access to Government documents, which is kept in St. Petersburg.