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Abstract The formation of the Japanese colonial empire entailed major population movements and important socio-economic and territorial impacts in East Asia. These were particularly relevant in Manchuria, where important Japanese immigration also occurred, especially after the establishment of Japanese-sponsored Manchukuo in 1932. This paper focuses on the location of co-ethnic concentrations of the four major population groups of immigrant background in Manchukuo. The aim of the study is to re-examine the reality of Manchukuo’s inclusive ideology of ethnic harmony and the blurring of ethnic borders from a spatial viewpoint. The location of co-ethnic concentrations of Han Chinese, Koreans, Japanese and Russians was identified by calculating the Location Quotients for each group at national and urban (Mukden’s railway town) scales. The results were mapped, showing uneven ethnic distributions and concentrations at both scales. This analysis confirmed the existence of clusters of affluent co-ethnic concentrations in Manchukuo, including some recent concentrations, such as the Japanese deliberate segregation in the North Manchuria countryside and in the Mukden railway town. Thus, the inclusive ideology of the new State coexisted, paradoxically, with high levels of co-ethnic spatial concentrations. This occurred not only because of group interest in achieving community cohesion, but also because of exclusions and restrictions resulting from official segregationist settlement policies. According to the results of the spatial analysis, the article concludes that Manchukuo’s utopian ideals of equal coexistence and concord among all ethnicities were not realized.
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Introduction

New trends in the study of empires and imperialism have shifted attention away from politics and economic issues towards social and cultural issues and transnational approaches, encouraging many scholars of the Japanese empire to examine social, cultural and intellectual issues in comparative and associative analyses, and to incorporate new actors into the conventional narrative of the empire (Yamamuro 1989, 2006; McCormack 1991; Teow 1999; Duara 2003; Asano Tamanoi 2005). Hence, the Japanese empire is now considered as a social and cultural project as well as a set of political and economic relationships between mainland Japan and its overseas territorial possessions, thus revealing the overall importance of the colonial peripheries in the formation of Modern Japan (Yamane 2013).

New geographies of Japanese empire

In Japanese geography, this new academic focus has been initially linked to the critical re-examination of the relationship between the discipline of geography and Japanese geopolitics prior to 1945, and the evaluation of the colonial complicity of geography. These interests were primarily cultivated by a representative historian of geographical thought, Professor K. Takeuchi, at Hitotsubashi University, and were later shared by other geographers of his circle (Takeuchi 1974, 1980, 1994; Fukushima 1997; Takagi 2002). Following this, new geographical investigations on a wide range of inquiry about Japanese colonialism started to appear in the country in the latter half of the 1980s. Among them were studies on colonial urbanism and residential differentiation, the ethnic geography of former colonial subjects in Japan, as well as the past role of geographers in Japanese imperialistic policy and their links with the military. Initially, these studies mainly involved both Japanese and foreign post-graduate students of the Geography Department of Kyoto University, such as Mizuuchi (1985), Yamazaki (1997), Avila Tàpies (1998), Fukumoto (2004), and Shibata (2005) conducting empirical studies, bibliographical surveys and documentary analyses from different points of view. This situational coincidence is partly explained by the fact that this Geography Department has a long tradition of research in historical and settlement geography, and openly supported imperialistic geopolitics immediately.
before and during World War II. Furthermore, it originated a school of geopolitics oriented towards indigenous Japanese traditions (Takeuchi 2000: 128; Yamazaki et al. 2012) that gained prominence with the rise of fascism and disappeared along with it. These ‘new geographies of the Japanese empire’ were also taking advantage of a period of retrospective studies on Japan-China relationships in the same university, in the middle of a general editorial “boom” of works on Manchuria, associated with the global success of Bertolucci’s film “The Last Emperor” (1987), which reopened public interest in this period of Japanese history (Yamamuro 1989).

Ethnicity and space as a topic for analysis

Within the framework of this growing geographic interest in Japanese imperialism and colonialism, this article examines the formation, composition and spatial distribution of the multi-ethnic society of Manchuria during the period of Japanese-ruled Manchukuo (1932–1945). This was the largest territory of Japan’s imperialist sphere, which claimed to be based on ideologies of ethnic/racial harmony, equality, and Oriental civilization to hold its multi-ethnic society together. Thus, from the spatial analysis of the settlement patterns of major ethnic and national groups at different scales, the author reflects on Manchukuo’s ideals of ‘concord among all ethnicities’ and the real opportunities for socio-spatial interaction and coexistence among people of different ethnicities, an issue not so well addressed in the relevant literature to date.

This paper focuses, in particular, on the location of spatial concentrations of the four largest population groups of immigrant background in Manchukuo, as they were classified under the organizing principle of race/ethnicity or nationality according to the statistical bureaus of the Japanese Kwantung Leased Territory (KLT) and the Japanese-controlled Manchukuo governments for the years 1936 and 1940, respectively. The four selected population groups are: the Han Chinese, the Koreans, the Japanese and the ‘Foreigners’ (1936) or ‘Denationalized people’ (1940). The analysis was performed at the national scale throughout the state, where the Hans constituted the large majority, and at urban scale, taking as a study case the South Manchuria railway town of Mukden (Fengtien, or Hoten, present day Shenyang), which was mostly populated by the Japanese.

Data and methodology

The statistical information for the analysis of the location of the four population groups was drawn from “The 1940 Provisional National Census of Manchukuo/Kotoku 7 nen. Rinji kokusei chosa hokoku” (hereafter, 1940 census) for the entire territory population distribution on October 1, 1940; and the ‘31st Statistics of Kwantung’/Kantō-kyoku dai 31 kai tokei-sho. Showa 11 nen (published by Kwantung government, 1936: hereafter, Statistics of Kwantung) for the population distribution of the Mukden railway town on December 31, 1936. These two statistical sources provide data on the population subdivided by gender, ethnicity and nationality at the prefecture, banner/chi and large city level, in the case of the 1940 census, and at the city police district level, in the case of the Statistics of Kwantung, facilitating the study of the distribution of the population of Manchukuo across a number of scales.

An important methodological problem arises, however, when we use any population data for both Manchukuo and Kwantung during this period due to the criteria for the classification of people in groups according to their respective statistical bureaus. As was the case of other coetaneous colonial empires, racialization of groups was produced. Racial/ethnic classifications of people closely linked to social Darwinism and scientific racism were made (Panelli 2004: 90), ignoring subjects’ self-identification. Thus, Manchu bannermen, Hans, Mongols, Hui Muslims and other native population categories were constructed and recognized generically as ‘Manchurians’ (Manshu-jin), and provided data accordingly, often without more disaggregation. In this case, the 1940 census offered disaggregated population data both by nationality and ethnic groups, such as the Hans, that enable us to analyze the 1940 national patterns. On the contrary, the Statistics of Kwantung for the Mukden railway town only published the data for ‘Manchurians’, as a general category including the Hans, Manchus and other supposedly indigenous groups of Manchukuo. Although, actually, these ‘Manchurians’ were mostly Hans born in China according to other official statistical sources such as the 1940 census and 1935 Kwantung census/Kantō-kyoku Showa 10 nen kokusei chosa kekkahyo (Avila-Tàpies 2013). Therefore, for convenience sake, I refer to them with the term ‘Chinese’ when contrasting them with the other three population groups analyzed. With regard to the ‘Foreigners’ category of the Statistics of Kwantung, I also know that they were mainly Slavic population, from other statistical sources of the city of Mukden, where the ‘Denationalized Russians’ composed 78.57% of the foreign population of the Mukden railway town on December 31, 1936. Thus, I refer to
this group as ‘Russians’ instead of 'Foreigners' (Statistics of Kwantung), or ‘Denationalized persons’ (1940 census), using ‘Russians’ as a generic term, which embraces Russians and Ukrainians, among other immigrants who came from different parts of the old Russian Empire (and later, the Soviet Union) to Manchuria (Cipko 1992).

The spatial patterns of ethnic distribution were empirically identified when analyzing the location of the different population groups for both national and urban scales. The levels of co-ethnic spatial concentration in particular areas were quantified by calculating the Location Quotient (LQ) for 192 administrative districts (hsien and banners) in Manchukuo, and for 16 police districts in the Mukden railway town. The results were mapped separately for each population group and scale to reveal concentration differences across the space and subsequently compared and interpreted considering the connection among ethnicity, power relations and space. Finally, as high co-ethnic spatial concentrations are expected to restrict the opportunities of inter-group relations and are generally associated with a lack of inter-ethnic social integration and exclusive society, I shall contrast these high concentrations with the ideology of ethnic coexistence and equality among the different communities of Japan’s 1930s Manchukuo project.

**Rhetoric of equality and difference**

Manchukuo proudly boasted that it was the melting pot of five large ethnic groups (go-zoku)—Hans, Manchus, Mongols, Japanese and Koreans—living in harmony and equal conditions, as was reportedly assured by its Chief Executive, Pu Yi (later, the Emperor of Manchukuo) who attested in the proclamation of the founding of Manchukuo in March 9, 1932: ‘There shall be no discrimination, with respect either to race or creed, among those people who now reside within the territory of the new state, including the races of the Hans, Manchus, Mongols, Japanese and Koreans; nationals of other countries as well may, upon application, acquire as permanent residents equal treatment with others, and their rights shall be guaranteed thereby’ (quoted in The Manchoukuo Year Book 1934: 31). This new State declared itself to be under the principles of ‘morality and benevolence’, with the ideal of becoming a land of peace and happiness under the Confucian principle of the Wangtcao, according to the Wangtcao meaning the ‘way of the benevolent ruler’ or the ‘kingly way’ of peace and harmony, under which the people’s welfare was secured (S.M.R.Co. 1934: 10). Manchukuo was then designed to be a happy home for minorities, an earthly paradise for discriminated religious groups, an ideal and moral state aiming at the coexistence and co-prosperity among large ethnic groups, a kind of utopia (Tokayer and Swartz 1979: 53; Yamamuro 2006: 4).

**Contradicting ideals and realities**

Scholars of Manchukuo had already contradicted the aforementioned official pan-Asian rhetoric of Manchukuo's multi-racial identity and its ideal of ethnic harmony and unity among the various ethnic groups (minzoku kyowa) with real life inequalities, prejudice and discrimination. For example, political historian Yamamuro (2006) has challenged Manchukuo's rationale, stating that 'in the “ethnic melting pot” of Manzhouguo, the Japanese had almost no contact whatsoever with other ethnic groups and lived apart from them' (Yamamuro 2006: 201), though he did not analyze this fact empirically. In an attempt to prove Yamamuro’s statement from an ethnic geographical approach, I shall look for the existence of enclaves, segregations and exclusions as a result of unequal power relationships in Manchukuo. This will complement and add new meaning to the findings of the recent scholarship on the Japanese empire.

**Imperialism and the formation of a multi-ethnic society in Manchuria**

Although regarded as the Manchus’ homeland, with the lapse of time and during the course of Chinese, Russian and Japanese expansionism, Manchuria became increasingly more diverse. Its crucial geographical position, sparse population, and the abundance of natural resources of the Northeast, as well as the weak Manchu administration, made it easier for the Russians and the Japanese to penetrate the region just before the turn of the 20th century, armed with their modern railway technology (Fisher 1950; Clausen and Thogersen 1995; Matsusaka 2001). This imperialist expansion resulted in a rapid industrialization and economic development under colonial patterns, which stimulated population movements chiefly from North China, facilitated by the Chinese government reverse of the exclusion policy in Manchuria and the strict border crossing prohibitions that had lasted for two hundred years, and by the establishment of modern forms of transportation in East Asia (Lattimore 1934; Gottschang 1987; Avila-Tápies 2016). This gave rise to an enormous population growth that affected not only Manchuria’s ethnic composition but also its distribution, as the newcomers settled in different locations than the existing population (Avila-Tápies
Chinese concessions and Russo-Japanese rivalries in Manchuria

With their dream of empire construction and imperialist modernity, the Russians and the Japanese entered Manchuria through the privileges and exclusive economic and political rights granted by China, such as: concessions of territories, railway construction rights and extraterritorial privileges. Among them, the railway construction rights, which included the right to station railway guards and the administration of the ‘railway attached lands’—the South Manchuria Railway Zone—allowed them the territorial integration, the control and the economic exploitation of a strategic part of the Manchurian territory (Chou 1971), shaping the territory for occupation.

Since the Russo-Japanese War (1904–1905), through the railways Russia and Japan competed with China for the management and use of land in the region to expand their hegemonies, creating two spheres of influence in what was usually called North Manchuria and South Manchuria, respectively. Although there was no accepted line of demarcation between the two (Murakoshi and Trewartha 1930: 482), borders could be drawn along a parallel of latitude passing through Changchun (renamed Hsinking during the Manchukuo period). North Manchuria came to mean the Russian sphere, served by the Chinese Eastern Railway (CER)—partly Russian, partly Chinese—with Harbin as its centre. South Manchuria was the Japanese sphere, run by the South Manchuria Railway (SMR) owned by Japan and operated by the SMR Company (hereafter Mantetsu). The SMR terminated in the Japanese Leased Territory of Kwantung (KLT) and had Mukden as its hub (Murakoshi and Trewartha 1930: 482). These Russian—and Japanese—controlled railways would become a development axis of these spheres, and the main agents of trade and settlement until the establishment of Manchukuo, when this status quo would be altered in favour of Japan, which ultimately controlled the whole territory and expanded its settlement areas also to North Manchuria.

Manchuria’s population increase

These geopolitical and economic developments stimulated an extraordinary immigration and population growth in the area for half a century, transforming Manchuria into one of the most important settlement areas of the world. However, its exact population growth is difficult to quantify because there was no authentic general account of its population until the modern statistical systems were introduced by the Japanese during the period of Manchukuo. Estimations for 1907 situat ed the population of Manchuria—the ‘Three Eastern Provinces’ of Fengtien, Kirin and Heilungkiang—at 14,917,000, according to the preliminary official enumeration by the Mingchenpu (Ministry of Interior) of the imperial Chinese government, although population units were counted by household, not by individuals, and the number of individuals was derived by assuming a certain number of persons for each household (Hsiao 1929: 36). Most probably, the estimation of 17 million in 1904 made by the British Consul at Yingkou, Sir Alexander Hosie, was nearer the truth of that time (Ho 1967: 160–161). By 1924, Mantetsu’s Research Bureau estimated the total population of Manchuria at 25,706,307 (Hsiao 1929: 37), and by 1930, at 34.3 million (Pan and Taeuber 1952: 95–96; Ho 1967: 163). On October 1, 1940, the total population had reached 43.2 million, according to the 1940 census.

Therefore, despite the problem of reliability of the sources, we can assume a continuous growth of the Manchurian population from around 15 million at the turn of the 20th century to 43.2 million in 1940. That is, the total population of Manchuria almost tripled during this short period, becoming the ninth largest population in the world. This large population increase was mostly due to continuous immigration—the major demographic growth engine. As stated by R. B. Hall, the plain of Manchuria had become ‘the scene of possibly the greatest migration in human history’ (Hall 1930: 285) due to its vast agricultural possibilities for millions of Han Chinese living to the south of the Great Wall.

The Sinification of Manchuria

Immigration increased the ethnic and cultural diversity of Manchuria during the first half of the 20th century, chiefly in urban settings and border regions. Paradoxically, however, it also produced a Sinification of the territory due to the large inflows of Han Chinese, who took advantage of the opening up of Manchuria by the construction of railways to push northward gradually from North China, in search of opportunities not available there. Assimilation by the Hans of the native Manchu population—as well as of those Manchus who left Manchuria for China proper to undertake the task of ruling the Empire after the establishment of the Qing Dynasty in China (Sakatani 1980: 11)—had turned Manchuria into an ethnically and culturally Chinese territory, where the ratio of the Hans to Manchus had
become about 100: 7 in 1940. Thus, on October 1, 1940, the Hans accounted for over 36 million people or 85.3% of the overall Manchukuo population. The other ‘Manchurian’ nationals, the Manchus (the second largest ethnic group) were just 6.2%, and the Mongols (the fourth) accounted for only 2.5% of the total population. (Figure 1).

The increase of Koreans and the ‘alien’ element
As was the case of the Han Chinese, geographical pro-pinquity facilitated the Koreans’ infiltration over centuries. As a result, the 1940 census provided a total of about 1.45 million legal Koreans, who represented 3.3% of the total population of Manchukuo, the third largest ethnic group after the Hans and the Manchus. However, the real number of ethnic Koreans should have been far greater due to those who were naturalized as Chinese citizens and to the presence of political exiles from Japanese-occupied Korea, who avoided being counted (Hsiao 1929; Lee 1932). Thus, statistics must be used with caution. According to the same source, there were 820 thousand Japanese from Japan proper, accounting for 1.9% of the total population; and 69 thousand ‘Denationalized’—for the most part White or Czarist Russians—accounting for 0.2%, and 3,732 foreign nationals, accounting for 0.01% of the total, among other groups.

The more detailed 1940 census report on the Japanese residents (mainland Japanese, Koreans and other imperial subjects) revealed the immigrant nature of Japanese nationals, as 86.3% of the Japanese and 69.9% of the registered Koreans living in Manchukuo were categorized as foreign born. However, as commented on above, these figures did not include naturalized Koreans; thus, the percentage of foreign-born ethnic Koreans’ figures had to be much lower.

As to be expected and due to their recent immigration and selective migration processes, the gender gap of the ‘alien’ populations was high, with the maximum average values for the Japanese, with sex ratios of 142.0 males to 100 females, followed by the foreign nationals’ group (sex ratio = 141.7), as compared to the Han Chinese (sex ratio = 124.7), or the Koreans (sex ratio = 119.4), who showed one of the lowest among all Manchukuo’s ethnic groups or nationalities, indicating that theirs was mostly a migration of families for permanent settlement.

Location of ethnic concentrations at a national scale
By 1940, population was unevenly distributed over Manchukuo, as a consequence of constraints presented by the distinct natural features of the territory, accessibility, levels of economic development and investments and, ultimately, of the Powers’ colonization schemes. In general, Manchukuo presented various degrees of occupation with relatively high population densities in the Manchurian Plain and very low densities in the Khingan Mountains in the north and northwest.

In particular, the fertile Plain of the Liao River in the south was the most populous and more economically and culturally developed. It lay in the sphere of Japan’s SMR since the early 20th century and it had increased its population due to heavy Han Chinese immigration. In this area, the SMR Zone and the districts adjoining the Zone were the most densely populated. Population density had become so great that it, too, had become a centre of migration to North Manchuria (Hall 1930: 285; Murakoshi and Trewartha 1930: 482), especially to the Plain of the River Sungari (Songhua) and its tributaries—dominated by the North Manchuria’s CER lines—which constituted the real frontier of settlement in Manchuria during the 1930s.

Ethnic spatial concentrations in Manchukuo
Despite these general patterns, each ethnic group showed a distinct location of co-ethnic concentration, as revealed in the statistical data of the 1940 census. There were also important differences in the propensity to concentrate among ethnic groups. The highest spatial co-ethnic concentration levels were found for the Russians and Koreans, followed by the Japanese, who tended to congregate in some districts. In contrast, the Han Chinese
settlement was more widely dispersed across Manchukuo.

Based on this 1940 census data, the level of spatial concentrations of each ethnic group was established by calculating the LQ of the four population groups (Hans, Koreans, Japanese and Russians). The LQ was calculated for each of these four major ethnic groups for a total of 192 territorial units of administration (i.e. all Manchurian hsien and banners). The use of LQ allows us to determine the concentration of each ethnic group in a district as compared to the national average, showing the ethnic characteristics of each district. The resulting maps and their interpretation are presented below.

The Han Chinese concentration patterns

By looking at the location of Hans’ co-ethnic concentration through their LQ values (Figure 2), it can be affirmed that the Hans were at their national average (85.3%) or over it in the contiguous province of Jehol (Rehe), on the northern side of the Great Wall, and in most of the Manchurian Plain and in many of the districts of the south bank of the Amur River, which formed the natural border between Manchukuo and the Soviet Union. In contrast, they were below their average in the Manchukuo northeast borderland provinces with Korea and the Soviet Union, and in the provinces of the Greater Khingan Range in the east, where other
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ethnic groups such as the Mongols (South Hsingan and West Hsingan provinces) and the Japanese and Russians (North Hsingan province) tended to concentrate. They were widely and quite evenly distributed over the tilled land of Manchukuo compared to other ethnic groups or nationalities. In general, they tended to settle along the railway lines, and from them towards the interior, more fertile lands of Manchuria. Concretely, the locations with higher and larger concentrations were found in the Jehol Province—with a large Han population of 4,243,912 that accounted for 93.2% of all Jehol inhabitants—as a result of spontaneous Han infiltration over time. However, as noted, relatively high and larger concentrations were also identified towards the northeast of the Manchurian plain and also in the provinces bordering the northern frontier with the Soviet Union: Heiho and Sankiang—with a Han population of 123,139 and 1,259,398, respectively. The latter was a result of a chain migration from Shantung Province in North China for opium cultivation on the lower Sungari, which had a great poppy-growing region around Fuchin (Lattimore 1932a: 192).

The Koreans concentration patterns

According to the 1940 census, the Koreans presented very high co-ethnic concentration levels (Figure 3) in the Chientao Province (present day China’s Yanbian
Korean Autonomous Prefecture) and the basin of the Yalu River, on the border between the Korean peninsula and Manchukuo. Korean concentrations were decreasing progressively from this area in a westward direction into the Kirin Province, a northward direction into Pinkiang, Sankiang and Peian Provinces, and into Manchukuo’s northeastern corner. Their expansion into overall Manchuria was more recent than that to Chientao and was facilitated by the opening of the CER and SMR lines and, later, by the Manchukuo immigration policy.

Chientao Province served as home to 616,019 Koreans (72.6% of Chientao population). It presented a high LQ value, with the Koreans being 21.6 times more concentrated in this province than in the nation, making Chientao a unique territory where the Koreans outnumbered the Chinese. According to the 1940 census, 42.5% of Manchuko’s Koreans were living in Chientao Province, which boasted a larger Korean population than any other province in Manchukuo. The main reasons for this high concentration were its spatial contiguity with the motherland, the right to own land in Chientao, just like the Chinese (Lee 1932), and the Manchukuo designation of Chientao Province and the adjoining eastern section of Manchukuo as the residential district for Koreans where new immigrants and floating Korean farmers should be directed.

After the creation of Manchukuo, land ownership restrictions for foreigners were removed, and the advance of Korean migrants to Manchuria was encouraged by Japan under subsidized Farm-Settlement plans for Koreans already in Manchuria and for those in the Korean Peninsula (Yoda 1976) in the eastern part of Manchukuo. The immigration control aimed to concentrate Koreans in special designated districts,\(^17\) giving them economic assistance and looking after their ‘racial welfare’ through the cooperation of the Concordia Society (Kyowa-kai)—the mass political party in Manchukuo to raise awareness of ‘ethnic harmony.’ Their occupation was mainly agriculture, especially rice cultivation, thus they were able to occupy land in significant numbers and high population densities, making them resistant to Chinese linguistic and cultural influences (Lattimore 1932b: 239) and facilitating the preservation of their distinctive cultural heritage in Manchuria.

**The Japanese concentration patterns**

The major spatial concentration of the Japanese in Manchukuo (Figure 4) was found, on the one hand, in the districts that contained large cities such as Mukden, Fushun, Anshan, Hsinking, Kirin, Chinshien, and Antung in South Manchuria and Harbin, Mutankiang, Mishan and Tsitsihar in North Manchuria, where the Japanese were numerically important and were mostly employed in transportation, commerce, manufacturing, hospitality and entertainment (including sex trade) or were liberal professionals, following the same settlement pattern prior to Manchukuo in the Japanese colonial territories. On the other hand, a significant new trend was revealed: high concentration ratios of Japanese in the Manchukuo’s north-east (Mutankiang, Tungan, south of Sankiang and east of Peian provinces) and north-west (north of Peian, and North Hsingan provinces), mostly due to the establishment of group settlement villages for Japanese agricultural colonists and Youth Volunteer Corps, and the training camps for the latter in these provinces. Although the absolute numbers of Japanese were low in those remote regions, the highest LQ value (LQ = 9.5) was found there, in Tiehli-hsien in the Peian province, where the Japanese constituted 6,831 of its 37,856 inhabitants. This was because a major training camp was constructed there, surrounded by many settlement villages for the Japanese. Thus, the 1940 census reveals both continuation and change in the Japanese patterns of settlement in Manchuria; that is, the Japanese still concentrating in large cities, especially those along the former SMR lines, while they gradually started populating the entire territory, and then filling North Manchuria (Miyakawa 1940: 14). This change responds to the new Japanese settlement policy for Manchukuo and the organization of Japanese government-sponsored colonization programs,\(^18\) with the military and political objectives of increasing Japanese presence in Manchuria in order to have a loyal population that could preserve peace and order against the Chinese Resistance attacks and strengthen national defence from the Soviet Union (Avila Tàpies 1998: 743), making Manchukuo a firm part of the Japanese empire.

**The Russians’ concentration patterns**

The highest concentration ratios of White or Czarist Russians—‘Denationalized persons’—\(^19\) in Manchukuo (Figure 5) were found in the districts along the former CER lines and those near the Manchukuo borders with the Soviet Union and Mongolia in the north and north-west of Manchukuo. As in the Japanese case, this distribution reflects the early and new patterns of settlement: firstly, the early pattern prior to the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917, when officials, railway employees, merchants, soldiers and their families entered Manchuria for the construction and management of the CER by the Czarist
regime. They settled mainly in Harbin, the new city built by the Russians as a base of operations for the construction of the CER, and along its lines. And, secondly, the later and greater settlement pattern of political refugees and exiles from various parts of the Russian Empire also settled along the same CER lines, particularly in Harbin (Cipko 1992: 160), and along the north and northwest border of Manchukuo, where they engaged in dairy farming or in crop cultivation along with livestock raising, especially in the northern part of the North Hsingan Province. This second pattern also included out-migration from Harbin from 1935. As expected because of being a small minority, the Russians congregated in certain areas, showing the highest concentration levels of the present study as both urban and rural settlers. Thus, in the Harbin Special Municipality, which concentrated more than half of the Russian population in Manchukuo and where 36,114 Russians were living, LQ values of 34.2 were found. In the northwest corner of Manchukuo also the North Hsingan Province, as a whole, showed high values (LQ = 87.2). In the latter, the spatial concentration of Russians in the Argun Left Wing Banner—north of Hailar—was unusually high (LQ = 366.6). There, 7,156 persons were Russians and accounted for around 60% of all inhabitants, as a result of the presence of numerous Russian Cossack villages in the region (Zatsepine 2013).

Figure 4. Representation of LQ values for the Japanese population in Manchukuo (October 1, 1940). Source: Manchukuo government. 1940. Kotoku 7 nen. Rinji kokusei chosa hokoku.
Location of ethnic concentrations at an urban scale

Economic and demographic expansion in Manchukuo was particularly visible in its large cities, which increased their population extraordinarily due to domestic and international immigration. Their concentration of functions and opportunities attracted young immigrants, who clustered together. As in the rest of the nation, the Han Chinese constituted the majority of the population also in Manchurian cities. On average, the 15 largest cities\textsuperscript{21} in Manchukuo were inhabited by 81.5% Han Chinese and Manchus (\textit{Manshu-jin}), 0.2% Mongols, 14.2% Japanese, 3.3% Koreans, and 0.7% ‘Denationalized persons’ (White Russians) as of December 31, 1941. Unlike other groups, the Japanese were better represented in cities than in the national total, with 14.2% versus 2.4%. This was also the case of White Russians, who were mainly concentrated in the city of Harbin. Koreans maintained exactly the same proportion as in the rest of the country, and the Hans were distributed throughout the state, although they were 10% less than their national average, due to the strong Japanese presence in the cities (Avila-Tàpies 2013).

Mukden and its South Manchuria railway town

Among all Manchurian cities, Mukden was the most
highly populated and was the major destination of young immigrant flows, mostly from Manchurian rural areas, North China and Japan. As a consequence, its population increased from around 14 thousand in 1910 to 1.9 million in 1944,\textsuperscript{22} with the maximum increases after the creation of Manchukuo. The distribution patterns of ethnic groups differ greatly in Mukden after the Russo-Japanese war, when Japan gained control of the SMR Zone and started to develop a new town along the railway lines and towards the Chinese native city of Mukden. From that time on and until the abolition of extraterritorial rights in 1937, Mukden was spatially divided into three sections: the railway town (the Japanese concession), the International commercial area (the foreign settlement) and the Native Chinese city (the walled city); and two competing administrations: the Chinese (the International commercial area and the Native Chinese city) and the Japanese (the SMR town) (Nishizawa 1996; Avila-Tàpies 2012).

**Mukden railway town**

This oblong area of about 11.7 km\(^2\) (1936) was a Japanese concession from China and was administrated by the SMR Company from 1907 to 1937, when it was transferred to Manchukuo. The area to the west of the tracks was planned for industrial uses, and to the east for commercial and residential uses. The railway town was the largest town in the SMR zone and the main Japanese residential district in the city of Mukden. However, it also presented ethnic diversity, being one of the best examples of long-term ethnic interaction in a Manchurian urban space. The Japanese started clustering there from 1907, when Mantetsu undertook the planning and building of a modern town in the Railway zone, and it remained so until the collapse of Manchukuo in 1945. Moreover, the Japanese population rapidly increased after the establishment of the new State, in contrast to the small growth or even decrease of the Chinese and foreign residents. The population of the railway town as of December 31, 1936 was 89,480, with 73.3\% Japanese, 24.1\% Chinese, 1.9\% Koreans, 0.7\% Russians, with extraordinarily high ratios of males to females for Chinese and Korean populations, i.e., 420.9 and 221.3 males to 100 females, respectively.

I present below the location of the co-ethnic concentration of the four ethnic groups in the railway town according to the calculation of their LQ values in the year 1936 for sixteen police districts. The corresponding four maps show how the Japanese were present in all the districts east of the tracks, but with a remarkable co-ethnic concentration in certain exclusive residential districts. In contrast, other ethnic groups were much fewer in number and highly concentrated in some districts of the Japanese railway settlement. These findings are consistent with a previous study by the author of the levels of inter-ethnic residential segregation in the SMR towns through the calculation of the Dissimilarity Index for 11 cities (1920), 14 cities (1926 and 1930), and 17 cities (1936). That study (Avila-Tàpies 2003, 2004) clearly indicated that ethnic residential patterns in the Japanese railway settlements remained uneven also after the creation of Manchukuo, and that specific residential segregation patterns were common in other railway towns along the SMR Zone.

**The Chinese urban concentration patterns**

The Chinese showed their highest LQ values (Figure 6) in the industrial western part of the trunk line of the SMR and in the central business area of the railway town. Looking at their absolute numbers, the Chinese ended up settling in the northern part of the railway town, which was better connected to the International commercial area and closer to the native city of Mukden. These location preferences were determined by their own economic activities and by Mantetsu’s policies on the uses and occupation of land in the railway municipality. The Chinese had populated the city in large numbers from its very beginning and they were mostly engaged in commercial activities (large and small merchants, peddlers, etc.), hospitality, sex trade, or working as employees of Japanese enterprises as day labourers handling cargo, in the construction industry or as blue-collar workers of Mantetsu. Many of them lived in the central business area and other shopping areas in the railway town. According to Kinnosuke Adachi, from early times, many Chinese merchants had made their headquarters in the railway town, moving their old quarters in the walled city into the railway town for economic and physical safety reasons, because it was free from the likin tax and the numerous bandits who operated in the region (Adachi 1925: 86; Avila-Tàpies 2002: 45–51). The same movement was also observed by other witnesses (Ochi 1937; Fukuda 1976). Initially, Chinese residences and businesses (small shops targeting travellers, money exchange houses, brothels, etc.) occupied the most central position in the railway town, in a large Chinese settlement near the station, in the police districts of Aoba-cho and Hoten-eki, which still concentrated 38.5\% of the Chinese population in 1936. According to the report of the resident geographer, Ochi (1937), their location in this central area was part of a land development policy of Mantetsu in the early 1910s. However, over the course of time, they became
surrounded by the southward expansion of Japanese residences and pushed out by the Japanese commercial businesses, especially after the creation of Manchukuo. As a consequence, the Chinese population decreased in the centre, as well as in the rest of the railway town. Aside from these main concentrations, there were also minor settlements in other surrounding police districts (Chiyoda-dori, Miyajima-cho, Naniwa-dori, etc.) where they also engaged in commercial activities but, in general, the pressure of Japanese residential and business areas resulted in their progressive shift away from the central districts to the other side of the border of the railway town with the International commercial area (Ochi 1937: 279). High concentrations on the western side of the tracks in the districts of Yoshino-cho and Suehiro-cho were more recent and related to the creation in 1933 of a major industrial district (19 km² in 1936) on the other side of the western border. There, the LQ values are high because no other ethnic groups lived in there in large numbers, with the sole exception of the Koreans in Yoshino-cho. This was a peripheral district where the Mantetsu Institute for Animal Health, the crematorium and the cemetery were sited. There were 1,597 Chinese living in Yoshino-cho and they were mostly males (sex ratio = 551.8).

To this residential pattern it must be added that the daytime Chinese working population in the railway town was much higher than that indicated by the official statistics, as the Chinese (and Koreans) commuted daily to work in the railway town from the International commercial area (east) and from the villages of the industrial district west of the tracks.

The Koreans’ urban concentration patterns

Their LQ values (Figure 7) showed a high co-ethnic concentration in the northernmost part of the railway town which bordered with the lowlands on the other side of the railway town limits, also occupied by Koreans. Thus, LQ values of 6.3 were found at the Yoshino-cho and Hiyoshi-cho police districts in the northwest and northeast side of the railways lines, respectively, together accounting for a quarter of all Korean residents (448 of its 1,732 inhabitants). In the northernmost part of the Hiyoshi-cho district was the border quarter of Yanagi-
machi, where numerous Koreans also lived. Many Korean houses, small shops, hostels and eating houses were concentrated on both sides of it. Actually, the Koreans’ presence in the railway town started in 1914 in the southern part of the surroundings of Minami-go-jo street—a numbered major street (‘5th South Street’) which ran northwest-southeast and also served as a division between the districts of Kobai-cho and Minami-shichi-jo-dori—where they engaged in rice cultivation as agricultural labourers in the paddy-fields administered by the Japanese, and as rice sellers. The Korean population gradually grew, and new concentrations appeared in more central parts of the town, formed of small shop owners and day labourers (Ochi 1937: 279–280). As in the case of the Chinese population, numerous Koreans living on the other side of the border, in the northern part of the International commercial area, crossed it every day at its northeast corner (Kamo-cho district and the former parade ground) to work in the railway town.

The Japanese urban concentration patterns

The railway town was born and developed mainly for the Mantetsu Japanese employees and its affiliated and subsidiary organizations, the numbers of which grew by the year, especially after the foundation of Manchukuo, which stimulated Japanese commercial and industrial activities in Manchuria. Thus, Mantetsu employees’ households accounted for almost half of the Japanese households of the railway town in 1935 (Ochi 1937: 320). The Japanese resided in the eastern part of the trunk line of the SMR, although they were less dominant in the central commercial quarter, where the Chinese had settled in large numbers since the 1910s. Concretely, the major LQ values (Figure 8) were found in the southern part of the railway town, which was further enlarged after the creation of Manchukuo to accommodate the growing number of Japanese residents, in particular the employees of Mantetsu and Tetsuro Sokyoku—the General Direction of Manchukuo State Railways— and also of other Japanese residents. As a consequence, the Japanese accounted for 90% or more of the population in these four southern police districts (Minami-shichi-jo-dori, Hagi-cho, Heian-dori and Takachiho-cho), which concentrated 41.8% (27,413) of the total Japanese popula-
tion in the railway town. Altogether, they formed a large Japanese residential area ‘Nihon-jutaku-ku’ (Ochi 1937)—mostly a Mantetsu residential district organized in strictly hierarchized five-quality levels of residences—known by the Japanese residents in Mukden as ‘Nihonjin-gai’,24 the Japanese quarters. This was divided into: on the one hand, a general housing area (ippan jutaku-ku) from Minami-go-jo street to the south, which included shops, schools, the Infectious Diseases Hospital, several Chinese houses, the Tenri-kyo facilities, the brewery, the racecourse, etc. (Ochi 1937: 291), and, on the other hand, a Mantetsu company housing area (shataku-ku) reaching from the International Sports Stadium to the south. The latter was the principal and newest Japanese residential area in the town. It was initially developed as an ideal Garden city-style, a pure company residential district (Ochi 1937: 324) for the Mantetsu and Tetsuro Sokyoku Japanese employees, around the SMR employees cooperative stores and the Mantetsu employees clubs.

In addition, other Japanese not working for the SMR, such as Japanese civil servants, military officers, merchants, manufacturers, constructors, restaurant and cafe owners, entertainers, etc. also lived in the railway town. As a result, all the districts east of the tracks had at least one thousand Japanese inhabitants, and some of them showed a disproportionately high number of Japanese females, e.g., 44.2 males to 100 females (sex ratio for the entire Japanese population in the town being 117.3 males to 100 females). This was the case of the Hiyoshi-cho district, which was the site of a large red-light district at its Yanagi area (Figure 8), between the quarters of the military police and the railway guards and the limits of the SMR Zone. According to Fukuda (1976), this Yanagi Japanese red-light district of barmaid-prostitutes (shakufu) was the counterpart of that on the other side of the SMR Zone boundary, specialized in geishas (geigi) (Fukuda 1976: 227). The Kwantung government statistics reveal that this fluidity of the border and the new trans-border complementary sex trade activities of the Yanagi area started with Manchukuo and the complete Japanese control of Mukden.

With the creation of Manchukuo, the limits to Japanese mobility disappeared, and many Japanese working places moved outside the railway town, to which the Japanese

![Figure 8. Representation of LQ values for the Japanese residents in the SMR town of Mukden (December 31, 1936).](source: Kwantung government. 1936. Kanto-kyoku tokei-sho. Dai 31 kai (Showa 11 nen)).
commuted daily by special busses from the railway town (Ochi 1937: 355). The reasons for the maintenance of this Japanese enclave even during the Manchukuo period were due not only to the convenience of this modern town, but also to the lower cost of living, as the goods that crossed the boundary of the Railway zone were subject to taxation.

The Russians’ urban concentration patterns

Although the statistical data refers to ‘Foreigners,’ as we stated above, 78.6% of the foreigners living in the railway town in 1936 were White Russians, whose settlement in large numbers in the railway town started just after the Russian Revolution. They were under the protection of the Japanese, and numbered around two thousand at their peak (Fukuda 1976: 153–154). Mostly, they used to operate small-sized stores, industries, restaurants, etc., and undertook some forms of labour in the town, although their number had been decreasing since the establishment of Manchukuo, as with other foreign nationals everywhere.

Their LQ values (Figure 9) indicate a distinctive settlement pattern, preferring the districts near the north-east border of the railway town with the International commercial area—the open area in which foreigners were allowed to acquire property and where the residences, consulates, stores and firms of foreigners, including Russian shops, stood. Thus, LQ high values of 14.2 and 4.0 are found in Sumida-cho and Kamo-cho police districts at the east of the Grand Circle at the end of Naniwa avenue. These two police districts contained 75.2% of the foreigners in the railway town—90% according to Ochi—and both were crossed by the Naniwa avenue, a busy commercial boulevard that linked the station with the International commercial area and the walled city. There, the Russians’ stores mingled with the Chinese and the Japanese ones.

The rest of the Russians congregated in the two most important commercial districts: Chiyoda-dori and Naniwa-dori, where they ran stores of western merchandise (blankets, western liquors, tobacco, western cakes, etc.) (Ochi 1937; Fukuda 1976; Takahashi 1995). They were completely absent from the Mantetsu company housing area.
Conclusion

Japan's empire-building entailed major population movements and important socio-economic and territorial impacts in East Asia under the guiding ideology of pan-Asian brotherhood. Also, Japanese-sponsored Manchukuo supposedly embraced its multicultural society under the ideal of ethnic harmony and equality. Recent historiography of Manchukuo, however, has been critical, emphasising the realities of this 'ideal' (Yamamura 2006: 6), such as antagonism, marginalization, and the existence of borders among the various ethnicities.

In an attempt to re-examine Manchukuo's contradiction from a spatial perspective, this paper has examined the settlement structures of the Hans, Korean, Japanese and Russian populations by analyzing the location of the co-ethnic concentrations at national and urban levels, assuming that spatial proximity between ethnic groups is important for inter-ethnic social interactions and multicultural coexistence, as was supposedly the goal of Manchukuo's ideologists. The results of the quantitative analysis revealed, however, high Location Quotient values for all four ethnic groups at national and/or urban scales, meaning affluent co-ethnic concentration and scarce possibility for physical inter-ethnic contact and cultural intermixing in many cases. At the national scale, high and very high co-ethnic concentration levels were found in the year 1940 for the Korean, Japanese and Russian populations in certain hsien and banners, which reflected both early and new structures of settlement under colonial patterns. At the urban scale in the Mukden railway town, high co-ethnic concentration levels were also found in the year 1936 for the Hans, Koreans and Russians in some police districts. Also, large urban areas reserved only for the residence of the Japanese were identified. Those clusters resulted from the persisting residential segregationist policy of Mantetsu for its employees, which does not seem to have been affected by the creation of Manchukuo and its principles of equal coexistence.

Thus, the settlement structures of these major population groups during the 1930s do not reflect utopian ideals of concord and equality, but rather (semi)colonial policies of territorial control and settlement on the Manchurian land. More specifically, the settlement policies of Manchukuo responded to Japan's interests and favoured Japanese settlers. They were particularistic and segregationist for rural as well as for urban areas, assigning special residential districts to particular groups and thereby limiting the opportunities for positive equal-status inter-action among people from different ethnic groups and statuses. The spatial analysis of settlement patterns reveals that Japan's concord project for Manchukuo failed to fulfil its commitments for equal coexistence and ethnic harmony as a principle of the new state.
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Notes

1. Manchuria, now referred to as 'Northeast China' (Dongbei), is a term used herein for historical convenience.
3. The author has primarily used the geographical names as Romanized in the coetaneous English documents of Japanese publishers.
4. This 1940 census of Manchuria was conducted on October 1, 1940 by the Manchukuo government. It was the first complete and modern census of the region, synchronized and organized under the same principles as the one conducted throughout the Japanese Empire. It provides the population by nationality/ethnic group, gender, age and administrative division, calculated for those who had permanent residences, temporary dwellings or were temporarily visiting Manchukuo (Beal 1945: 246). More detailed data for the Japanese subjects were published separately in 1944.
5. The statistics do not identify first- and second-generation immigrants (or later generations).
6. For a reflection on the organizational interrelation between both statistical offices, see Kanehashi and Yasutomi (2011). On the characteristics and the reliability of the 1940 census, see Beal (1945), Taeuber (1958) and Kanehashi and Yasutomi (2011), the latter two studies also for a discussion of the problem of the 'missing' young men aged between 16–26 for the total population, and between 21–25 (conscript ages).
7. Prior to the establishment of Manchukuo, the same Statistics categorized them as 'Shina-jin'.
9. Followed by the Soviet Russians (the second foreign group) with 5.48% of the total population.

10. I prefer to use the modern term ‘ethnic group’ rather than ‘race’ for the translation of the Japanese term ‘minzoku,’ although ‘race’ was the term used in the coetaneous English translations, as it was common in the political and academic world at the time. Besides, and for the sake of convenience, I have herein considered the ‘Russians’ as an ‘ethnic group’ also when using the latter term in a broad sense, although original Japanese statistical sources did not call them ‘minzoku’ but ‘Foreigners,’ or ‘Denationalized persons.’

11. Location quotients for each ethnic group are calculated using the following formula: percentage of the ethnic group in hsiien or banner X ÷ percentage of the ethnic group in Manchukuo. LQ >1 = higher concentration than in Manchukuo. LQ <1 = lower concentration than in Manchukuo. (In the Mukden railway town: percentage of the ethnic group in the police district X ÷ percentage of the ethnic group in the railway town).

12. The nineteen large cities and towns’ disaggregated data have been included in their respective hsiien.

13. Although in some texts, also the Russians were included in the five major ethnic groups, then becoming: the Manchus, Japanese, Koreans, Mongols and the Russians (The North-China Herald. ‘Organization of Dairen Russians: Gen. Doihara referred to as motivating factor.’ February 20, 1936.), with the Manchus being a combined category of Manchu and Hans.

14. Manchukuo (the ‘State of Manchuria’) became the ‘Empire of Manchukuo’ in 1934.

15. As this preliminary population count also excluded some counties newly created by the new era of civil administration and there were no figures for the Manchup population in the Fengtien province or for part of the Korean immigrants, this total count of 1907 was necessarily incomplete.

16. For maps of land utilization of Manchuria see Murakoshi and Tewartha (1930).

17. A comparison of the changes in distribution of the Koreans in Manchuria between 1929 and 1940 is possible through the dot maps presented by Lee (1932) and Kanehashi and Yasutomi (2011).

18. Under these programs executed by the Manchuria Colonization Company, 220,359 Japanese agricultural colonists, and 101,514 Youth Volunteer Corps or apprentice settler corps for the Colonization of Manchukuo—actually a paramilitary force with the mission of guarding the border and detecting possible Russian activity—were sent to North Manchuria, in the vast areas opened up for Japanese immigration (Manshu Kaitaku-shi Fukkan Iinkai Tetsuro Sokyoku Company Housing Area (Ochi 1937: 62). Most of its staff were Manshu Sokyoku Mantetsu (each with more than 500,000 inhabitants); Antung, Fushun, Kirin and Anshan (each with more than 200,000); Mutiansheng, Yingkou, Fushin, Penhsihu, Chinhshien, Tsitsihar, Chiamussu and Liaoyang (each with more than 100,000).

19. According to the June 30, 1935, Manchukuo counting, there were 44,359 Russians without nationality and 5,054 naturalized White Russians (The North-China Herald. ‘Population of Manchukuo: Estimated total of 33,000,000 with 3,000,000 growth in past three years.’ January 29, 1936).

20. This is the year when the CER was sold to Manchukuo, and thousands of Soviets left for the USSR. According to the register of the Harbin Commercial Museum, there was in 1922 a peak of Russian population of Harbin, including Soviets: 155,402 (S.M.R.Co. 1937: 19). Sakatani accepted an estimated 140 thousand for 1927 (Sakatani 1980: 13). But the population gradually diminished afterwards, especially after 1935, when the CER was transferred to Manchukuo, and more than 20 thousand Soviets had to leave Manchukuo during that year. Most of the remaining Russians (around 37 thousand in 1940) lived in poor conditions, led a wandering life, without consular protection from abuses.

21. At the end of 1941, the 15 largest cities in Manchukuo were in order: Mukden (1.2 million inhabitants); Harbin and Hsinking (each with more than 500,000 inhabitants); Antung, Fushun, Yingkou, Fushin, Penhsihu, Chinhshien, Tsitsihar, Chiamussu and Liaoyang (each with more than 100,000).
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