Lecture Notes on History (2025)
Clausius Scientific Press, Canada

DOI: 10.23977/history.2025.070114
ISSN 2616-227X Vol. 7 Num. 1

The Manchurian Lifeline: From Imperial Japan's Fantasy to Communist China's Foundation

Zihang Ding[1,a,*]

[1]*Woodberry Forest School, Virginia, 22989, USA*
[a]*Philip_ding@woodberry.org*
**Corresponding author*

Keywords: Manchurian Lifeline, Japanese Imperialism, Chinese Communism, Extractive Logic, Regional Development

Abstract: This article explores the emergence of a Manchurian Lifeline as a concept in 20th-century Northeast Asian political economy. It claims that the latter concept, an endogenous (Imperial) Japanese idea conceived to rationalize colonial expansion and resource extraction in Manchuria at its apex, was functionally invariant over succeeding periods and traceable into the post-World War II era. Its logic of extraction was bequeathed to and reconstituted by the postrevolutionary People's Republic of China, which made the region one of the poles of industrial development in its national project. Thus, by comparing the case of Japanese occupation (1931-1945) with that of early Maoism in the region, this study demonstrates how Manchuria was constantly deployed as an "umbilical cord" supporting external powers. The paper examines the theory's fascist parallels in practice, the colonial dualism of Japanese rule — of brutal atrocities and rapid industrialization during its occupation — and the continuation of this basic model under Chinese Communist governance. It can thereby foreground the one-hundred-year history of the region as a lifeline to others, rather than for itself, which helps to explain the subsequent economic decline and ambiguous historical identity of the region.

1. Introduction

In 1929, a global economic crisis dragged the world's capitalist countries into the depths of depression, and Japan was no exception. Within its society, class conflict was exaggerated, unemployment increased, and hyperinflation surged. Against this backdrop, rightist and fascist politicians came to dominate the Japanese Diet, and even the plutocrats, whose interests were harmed in the crisis, sought to communicate with the military government to find a way to alleviate their losses. They quickly came up with a common solution: Manchuria—a region Japan had long coveted. In January 1931, Japanese diplomat Yōsuke Matsuoka first proposed the "Man-Mon Lifeline" theory, claiming that Manchuria and Mongolia were inherently Japanese territories that must be conquered. “If the Japanese people do not wish to become a nation of the defeated,” Matsuoka argued in his speech, “they must protect the sources of their food, clothing, and shelter, and ensure their land (Manchuria) is not violated” [1]. He scapegoated Manchuria, and this imagined lifeline appeared to offer a perfect solution for revitalizing the economy, asserting

regional dominance, and silencing domestic dissent.

The paper suggests that the "Manchurian Lifeline" was an effective and powerful political-economic concept, which served as propaganda. It was first conceived by Imperial Japan as a rationale for its colonization, exploitation and industrial development of Manchuria, but this central concept as "blood transfusion for the nation" was soon after adapted to serve its state building project. The shift placed Manchuria as the industrial base of the early People's Republic. This evolution of the idea depicts how Manchuria changed from a chess piece in the imperial strategy to a "national development sacrifice," a tragic phenomenon that shaped its entire 20th-century history. This is how this paper is structured to explain this central thesis in three parts. It begins by looking at the ideological underpinnings of lifeline theory and its correspondence with fascism. And finally, it looks at the afterlife of lifeline extraction logic in New China and what this means for the long game.

2. The Birth of a Theory: Japan's "Lifeline" and Fascist Parallels

The "Manchurian Lifeline" theory did not fall from the sky, it was a concentrated expression of Japan's militaristic ideology which had been forming for some time in the context of concrete historical conditions. Already by the mid-19th century Japanese imperial policymakers had identified this region as essential to national survival. The Meiji Restoration had heaved Japan into the company of modern industrial nation-states; but it had also laid bare a critical weakness: an absolute reliance on imported raw materials. A nationalist line even more narrow than in the thought of Satō Nobuhiro, who had proposed Japan as the country of everything began (konpon kuni: roots land), was developed by the leading office Yoshida Shōin with his theory loss and gain compensation. This idea argued that the economic dislocation and perceived humiliation Japan had suffered from opening its ports to the West under the Treaty of Kanagawa (1854) had to be made up for by territorial aggrandizement in regions such as Manchuria [1]. In this latter conception, Japan fit into the still larger idea of a "Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere," with itself at the center as first among equals. This idea was thinly veiled as promoting a vision of common prosperity, but rooted in deep resource insecurity. Already an island nation dependent upon resource imports, Japan was perhaps more fearful of such isolation than any other power, so Manchuria looked a good place to start. Yoshida did not cloak his plan: he declared, "If you wish to conquer China, you must first conquer the Northeast; if you wish to conquer the world, you must first take China." That notion of distribution — the imperative to expand for survival — is what will eventually lead to a "lifeline" theory.

It was the great global economic downturn that began in 1929, however, which provided both the proximate instigation and definitive formulation of the theory. It resulted in a marked decrease of Japanese exports, such as raw silk, and devastated the nation's rural areas, leading to massive urban unemployment. In this backdrop, the junior and mid-level officers in Japan began to lose their confidence in liberal bourgeois democracy. Mostly recruited to the officer corps from the rural agrarian class, these troops saw peasant families whoring their daughters and starving their sons, with one generation being reduced to prostitution so that another could escape starvation [2]. Western-style capitalism, they found, had left the Yamato people at a loss for how to adapt their economic reality. By 1941, one historian estimated, Japan had produced some 800 to 900 fanatical, emperor worshipping expansionist protofascist groups [2]. The road to transcend Japan's limitations seemed obvious for these people — Manchuria. It was because of this that the "lifeline" theory emerged, turning economic desperation into an outward desire for aggression and serving as a panacea to unite national consensus and resolve domestic problems.

The "lifeline" theory that Japan invokes is eerily reminiscent of the Nazi notion (in fact, it's hard

to miss) known as Lebensraum. Hitler defined his predatory vision absolutely in Mein Kampf, arguing that the most important goal was to protect the German race by establishing its people on land they had a right to possess [3]. Both ideologies provided moral justification for expansion in the name of national survival and resource security, a logic that served each regime's agenda. Internal contradictions were channeled away from state power by directing propaganda and repression against common internal enemies — the Jews in Germany, the Chinese in Japan — and, especially when the societal panic induced by economic crises was available for tactical exploitation, extremist leaders leveraged their fringe status to push their political programs. Hitler blamed the "November Criminals" for Germany's defeat in World War I to stir revanchism and Japanese militarists declared that the cause of the depression was a failure to formally recover their "ancestral land," Manchuria.

Initially, they sound the same but there is a very slight important difference in them. Hitler needed less than twenty years to move from a mere officeholder to author of his own destruction, achieved with the speed induced by both unique, charismatic leadership and total national humiliation felt in Germany after World War I; Japan's course was forged by a more steady militarism, one that grew out of a long-brewing ideology [4]. The comparison is not just a narrative of history but an attempt to illustrate that the "lifeline" theory was only one thread deeply buried within the fascist zeitgeist of 20th century, in terms of global historical sense.

3. The Lifeline in Practice: Occupation, Atrocity, and Industrialization (1931-1945)

3.1. Establishment of Rule: Manchukuo and Political Propaganda

A full-scale Manchurian invasion by the Imperial Japanese Army's Kwantung Army on September 18, 1931, was based on the pretext of the "Mukden Incident". Faced with the Japanese offensive, China's Northeastern Army commander Zhang Xueliang ordered his troops not to resist. Zhang placed a large amount of faith in the League of Nations, feeling that only an intervention by the League or other outside powers could recover Manchuria [5]. Unfortunately, this proved unfounded. Without the support of the U.S. (which was not in the League), its condemnations were toothless. After the Lytton Commission found that Japan had fabricated the Mukden Incident and demanded a retreat, Japan left the League of Nations in early 1933, demonstrating its unyielding resolve [2].

Japan defended itself by invoking the bogeyman of communism, arguing that it could not “regard with equanimity the bolshevization of China,” something it contended would endanger Korea as well as Japan. This appeal was a tactic to gain sympathy from Western powers while hiding Japan's real interests: obstructing American economic expansion and keeping China divided [6]. This allowed the Japanese military to secure all of Manchuria with almost no fighting. In March 1932, the Japanese created the puppet state of "Manchukuo" and installed Puyi, the ex-emperor of the Qing dynasty, as its nominal head of state. This was supposed to give the impression of legitimacy to Japan's colonial control – but Puyi would quickly realize that he and the state over which he reigned were only props for Japanese militarists who pulled all the strings. Every Chinese official in Manchukuo had a Japanese advisor who made the real decisions, rendering the state's sovereignty a complete fiction.

In order to cement its rule, Japan embarked on an extensive propaganda campaign in Manchukuo. At the core of this campaign was the so-called "Harmony of the Five Races," which proclaimed that Manchukuo was a "kingly land of the benevolent way" (ōdō rakudo) where Japanese, Han Chinese, Manchus, Mongols, and Koreans coexisted peacefully. This ideal was visually represented in its five-colored flag, with each color representing one ethnicity and the central yellow symbolizing the Manchus and unity [7]. According to the official "Document of the Explanation of the National

Flag," the colors also represented directions and virtues—a carefully constructed narrative of inclusive unity. Yellow represented the center and the Manchus; red the south and the Han Chinese; blue the east and the Mongols; white the west and the Japanese; and black the north and the Koreans.

However, propaganda posters exposed the hypocrisy of this vision. In one leaflet hailing the harmony of the five peoples, representatives are shown arm-in-arm, but the rising sun—symbolizing Japan—hangs in the background, looming over the land of Manchuria and suggesting total control. In another poster, a child waves both the Japanese and Manchukuo flags, but underscores Japan's superior status by placing the Japanese flag more prominently. These propaganda tools were designed to create an illusion of a multi-ethnic utopia, thereby masking the brutal reality of colonial subjugation and resource plunder.

3.2. The Dark Side of the Lifeline: The Atrocities of Unit 731

On the one hand, there was the benevolent facade of a "lifeline" seen through political propaganda, and on the other, the horrendous fact of the biological warfare experiments carried out by Unit 731. The invasion of Manchuria presented a perfect testing ground for Japan, which had been developing biological weapons for years. Military planners saw an opportunity in its distance and lack of accountability; as the land in question was not a Japanese home island, it could effectively become a lawless playground [8]. To the Kwantung Army's young officers, Manchuria would become their "experimental test bed"; to scientists, it was a "Garden of Eden" providing unbridled freedom from budgetary and political constraints to do their work [8]. The choice of Harbin as a base was also strategic; as a diverse, cosmopolitan city with a large, transient population, it provided a ready supply of human "shop window dummies" for experimentation.

Unit 731, located in Ping Fang near Harbin and overseen by General Shirō Ishii, performed some of the most sadistic experiments on humans in history. The vast — for its time — "death factory" had been built by Chinese labourers pressed into service to build it, many of them illiterate peasants who had been sold false stories about well-paying jobs or simply conscripted, with each household obliged to provide one male for a year's service. Many sadly became the victims of these factories they helped foster [8]. They experimented on the human beings that they referred to as maruta (literal translation: lumber), and performing vivisections unconcerned of anesthesia so that they could conduct researches regarding impersonal outlines of diseases. These slaves were purposefully infected with diseases like cholera, typhoid, and the plague. In order to test their victims' limbs for the cold combat, researchers would expose them to freezing temperatures until they froze solid—the frozen limbs would then be either amputated or subject to blunt force trauma, in order to determine what form of damage might occur. Other experiments entailed holding victims in high-pressure chambers until their eyeballs would pop and lethal doses of X-rays. Sometimes they would take a prisoner, use an ax to smash their head open, and then rush the brain back for immediate analysis so that they could study it while the rest of the body was sent off for dissection [8].

Ishii's rationale was that in the field of science, "killing can result in new findings or revolutionary breakthroughs," but his actions were driven by personal ambition and he regarded his victims as research materials to be abandoned as waste products. His work was also given a nod of approval by the military leadership in Tokyo, who saw such work as an integral part of modern warfare preparations. General Okamura Yasutsugu bragged in his memoirs that Ishii had generated over 200 patents [8]. Some 3,000 individuals were murdered outright in such experiments, with tens of thousands of additional civilians in surrounding regions dying as a result of deliberately induced epidemics. Behind the rhetoric of Manchuria being an "inherent territory" or "lifeline," the anti-human atrocities clearly deflated both beliefs. For them, Manchuria was never a patriotic home to

defend, but instead the gory laboratory of an empire using human lives as guinea pigs.

3.3. Forging the Lifeline: The Industrialization of Manchuria

This horror was brutally expanded by a time of ferocious and quick industrialization. Though Japan was an aggressor with solely self-serving motives in carrying out its program to industrialize Manchuria, by the 1940s that territory had become the most industrialized region in all of East Asia. Both the Japanese government and private companies poured capital into the region. Total investments, which were only 1.75 billion yen before 1931, surged to over 7 billion yen between 1932 and 1943 [9]. Such capital was channeled towards heavy industry, most notably via the Manchuria Industrial Development Corporation. For comparison, in 1940, British total investment of all kinds, including industry, was about 4.4 billion yen in India—a territory with a much larger population that also included plantations, railways, and commerce. This is more than what Japan invested in Manchurian heavy industry alone, and this investment speaks to the region's importance as an imperial hub [9].

Up to 1931, the industry of Manchuria was largely a processing agricultural products. In just eight years, by 1942, its output climbed to millions of tons of iron and steel per annum, produced up to 25 million tons of coal per year and manufactured locomotives, automobiles, and airplanes [9]. In 1944, 17 companies were manufacturing steel, including the Showa Steel Works and the Benxi Coal and Iron Company. It had 42 coal mines running and another 52 mines to extract the necessary raw materials from lead, tungsten, and manganese. This industrialization, however, was geared one-sidedly specifically to feed the Japanese war machine. During this time, Japan launched two significant programs: the Five-Year Industrial Plan (1937-1941) and the Northern Frontier Revitalization Plan, both of which aimed at achieving an autarkic economy and fortifying its border against what they perceived as Soviet Union expansionism. Though Japan did spend money for technical schools, the expansion of university students by more than 40 percent by 1940 benefited mostly the Japanese war machine and colonial administration [9].

The managers, engineers, and technicians were mainly Japanese, and the construction work was performed predominantly by millions of Chinese workers, with an utter disregard for their health and well-being. Still, Japan had established a mighty industrial base in Manchuria by 1945. This left behind a dual legacy: the deep trauma of colonial violence and a ready-made, modern industrial infrastructure. It was the legacy of the latter that ultimately would prove instrumental in helping the next regime seize control of this area.

4. The Lifeline Inherited: Manchuria as the "Eldest Son" of the PRC

4.1. From Japan's Power Source to the CCP's Foundation

The "Manchurian Lifeline" did not end after 1945 when Japan was defeated and shortly afterwards the Communists won the Chinese Civil War; it simply changed hands. The industrial system which Japan left behind fell into the eager hands of the new People's Republic of China, established in 1949. The area, now called Dongbei (the Northeast), became the "Eldest Son of the Republic," tasked with powering the industrialization of the entire nation. It was seen as so strategically important that, when the Politburo deliberated what capital to choose for the new nation, Harbin was the first candidate, owing to its developed infrastructure and proximity to the Soviet Union.

During China’s First Five-Year Plan (1953–1957), many of the 156 key Soviet-aided projects were located in the Northeast, built upon the existing Japanese industrial foundation. These included massive enterprises like the Anshan Iron and Steel Works and the Fushun coal mines [10].

By the early years of the PRC, Manchuria accounted for a staggering percentage of the country's heavy industrial output, producing over 90% of the country's machine tools and around 80% of its steel and iron by 1960.

4.2. The Continuation of Extractive Logic

This essay's main argument is that while the political rhetoric switched from 'Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere' to the 'socialist family,' the essential operation of the 'lifeline'—siphoning off resources from Manchuria for use in other parts of country—was passed on virtually intact. The area was notoriously generous with one another. The oil from Daqing, steel from Anshan and coal from Fushun were trucked south to help other provinces grow while the Northeast was increasingly left behind. The story of the Daqing oil field, China's biggest had an annual production quota leaving less than one percent consumed locally with 99+ (sometimes as close as 95%) sent down south. The extraction process Imperial Japan implemented to fuel its war machine was the same logic reused by the new Chinese state for national construction. Even while peasants and workers experienced a measure of dignity that had been denied them under Japanese colonization, the prevailing economic relationship between the territory and its central state signaled subordination.

4.3. The Erasure of Name and History

In addition, the communist regime attempted to construct a uniform national identity that included the suppression of regional identities. The prevalence of the unique term “Manchuria”, which was tied up in strong historical and cultural images with a clear geographical focus, has disappeared from official rhetoric in favour of the administrative term “Dongbei” [11]. The Maoist history of the anti-Japanese war was marked by class struggle, with the narrative emphasizing the role of governance in freeing China from outside ownership. From as early as 1939, efforts had been carried out by forces under Mao Zedong to remove localist factions that may impede the revolution [11]. Along the way, the particular agonies and idiosyncratic experiences of the Manchurian people with fourteen years of occupation collapsed into a single national metanarrative of shame and defiance [12]. The story of national embarrassment has been suppressed in favour of a tale of Dialectical Materialist victory. Its history had been muzzled; it no longer determined its own future.

5. Conclusions

The story of 20th-century Manchuria perhaps provides the clearest example of a region as an imperial and revolutionary plaything. How the Manchurian Lifeline served two very different political needs demonstrates a breathtaking unity of purpose. Despite the years and the revolutions, its logic never fundamentally changed; the natural wealth of the region along with its strategic positioning on a geopolitical crossroads have always made it an irresistible prize for any central seated power.

China had once been proud of its strong, perfectly layered architecture—then Japan came, not only attempting to tear it down but to also convince the Chinese that there was never any order here at all, only devastation neutralized by put-upon states of exceptionalism. As it did with Imperial Japan and Maoist China, Manchuria proved an implement for political liars, who were deceiving themselves if they believed they acted on behalf of the greater good. The result of this century-long extraction is all too obvious today in the economic woes of the Northeast, so common that there exists even slang for it — "Dongbei Plight." Now, the GDP of its three provinces put together is less than that of a single southern province (Guangdong) The “lifeline” sucked the life out of the

area, which in turn was left with little more than Air Pollution Red Level and an eerie feeling of sinking into economic oblivion. The blame game of who ought to pay back what Manchuria lost is a question that can only be discovered through confronting this centuries puzzle of serving as a lifeline for everyone, except yourself.

References

[1] Paine, S. C. M. (2017). The Japanese Empire: Grand Strategy from the Meiji Restoration to the Pacific War. Cambridge University Press.

[2] Clubb, O. E. (1978). 20th Century China. 3rd Edition, Columbia University Press.

[3] Hitler, A. (1998). Mein Kampf. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

[4] Childers, T. (2018). The Third Reich: A History of Nazi Germany. Simon & Schuster Paperbacks.

[5] Elleman, B. A. (2001). Modern Chinese Warfare, 1795-1989. Routledge.

[6] Akagi, R. H. (1933). Japan and the Open Door in Manchukuo. The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 168, 54-63.

[7] Brand, J. and Wang, Y. (2018). Politics behind the Imperial Palace of Manchukuo. Changchun.

[8] Harris, S. H. (2002). Factories of Death: Japanese Biological Warfare, 1932-1945, and the American Cover-Up. Revised Edition, Routledge.

[9] Grajdanzev, A. J. (1945). Manchuria: An Industrial Survey. Pacific Affairs, 18, 321-339.

[10] Chung, J. H. (2009). Assessing the 'Revive the Northeast' Programme: Origins, Policies and Implementation. The China Quarterly, 197, 108-125.

[11] Mo, T. (2022). The Legacy of the Second Sino-Japanese War in the People's Republic of China: Mapping the Official Discourses of Memory. The Asia-Pacific Journal, 20.

[12] Coble, P. M. (2007). China's 'New Remembering' of the Anti-Japanese War of Resistance, 1937-1945. The China Quarterly, 190, 394-410.