

## Summary

### The Memory of the National Border in Modern and Contemporary China: China's Imagined Original Territory

KAWASHIMA Shin

This article explores the memory of China's national border and the revision of national history. The main discourse on the national border in China maintains that the modern border was determined under pressure from foreign powers, and that the border had shrunk from its original size. Such discourses were created in the process of nation-building, thus connecting Chinese nationalism to empire-ness.

The juxtaposition of the real national border and the imagined original border indicate the border's fragileness; while foreign powers are to blame for the shrinking of China's national border, the imagined original border remains along with the movement to recover it. China has now become a strong power that poses as threats toward the surrounding countries partly because of the fluctuating borders, though China peacefully negotiates with these countries for the resolution of territorial disputes.

Chronologically, the virtue of the Chinese emperor has been imagined as unlimited and borderless, with people being separated into two categories: the *Hua* (華 Chinese) and the *Yi* (夷 barbarians). The barbarians were further divided into two groups: those (*Hua* 華 or 化) who received the emperor's virtue and Chinese culture, and those who did not receive them (化外). The Chinese dynasties had their own territories and borders, which often covered all the Middle Kingdom (the region of the *Hua* people 華), including some barbarian regions. The border was sometimes smaller than the Middle Kingdom, and was usually decided by the dynasties together with the surrounding kingdoms. However, the borders were established out of necessity due to reasons such as, for example, the collection of taxes or the management of roads. The borders would never have been defined unless otherwise.

After China reset its national borders under the pressure from Western powers, the Qing Dynasty and Min-kuo were eager to modernize China as a sovereign state and to eliminate the vagueness of the border. China intentionally created a new national history highlighting the loss of national rights and of territory, including the loss of suzerain countries. This narrative cultivated the imagination of the original border of the Qing Dynasty, though they were sometimes decided indefinitely.

After the 1930s, partly because of Japanese aggression and rising Asianism, Chinese scholars carried out historical studies on the formation of its territories in support of national rights, and Chinese intellectuals sometimes imagined wider borders and vast territories. The official discourse denied the revival of Chinese traditional empire which borders were imagined to be more vast by modern Chinese intellectuals, though they had not been decided so clearly.

Where was China? The modern Chinese intellectuals and officials did not have a clear and unified definition. The Constitutionals in the Min-kuo era offered two interpretations; one was real territories, and the other was imagined original territories. After the 1930s, China started to edit official historical maps, followed by scholars arguing about these interpretations. In the 1960s, scholars in the PRC argued that the original Chinese territory was set during the most glorious period of the Qing Dynasty, though the territory and border were not so clear in the eighteenth century.

In the 1990s, the PRC successfully negotiated with neighboring countries and resolved most territorial disputes. Though the political context largely determined China's new border, it was far from a repudiation of the imagined original border. If so, China's border remains fragile.

## China's "Frontiers": Issues Concerning Territorial Claims at Sea

SATO Koichi

The South China Sea Islands are composed of four groups, namely, the Paracel Islands, the Pratas Islands, the Macclesfield Bank, and the Spratly Islands. The Paracel Islands are occupied by China (the People's Republic of China: PRC), and the Pratas islands are occupied by Taiwan (Republic of China: ROC), though the reefs of Macclesfield Bank are all sunken reefs with the exception of the two rocks of Scarborough Shoal being occupied by the Philippines armed forces. Therefore the focal point is the territorial dispute over the Spratly Islands. According to Chinese sources, the sea area of the Spratly Islands is around 800,000 square km, or 38% of the total sea areas of the South China Sea; the area includes 230 islands, reefs and cays.

All the islands, reefs, and cays are claimed by China, Taiwan, and Vietnam, and some part of the islands and reefs are claimed by the Philippines, Malaysia, and Brunei. The sea area of the Spratly Islands is believed to be rich in oil and fishery resources. The four claimants, namely Brunei, Malaysia, the Philippines, and Vietnam are members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). China occupies 7, Taiwan occupies 1, Vietnam occupies 21, Malaysia occupies 5, and the Philippines occupies 8, though most of them are rocks and sunken reefs. Almost all of the claimants except Brunei have built artificial islands and emplacements to station troops. Some have even built airstrips on them.

China is the biggest claimant of the Spratly Islands. People's Liberation Army (PLA) naval ships attacked Vietnamese troopships around Johnson Reef of the Spratly Islands in March 1988, sinking two Vietnamese ships and wrecking one. Further, Chinese relations with Vietnam and with the Philippines have been aggravated for some time, because the PLA navy built a territorial marker at the

Gaven Reefs in July 1992, and built some military posts for stationing troops on the Mischief Reef, which was also claimed by Vietnam and the Philippines, in February 1995, expanding them in October 1998. The ASEAN foreign ministers expressed several times their serious concern over Chinese military actions which have affected the peace and stability in the South China Sea at the ASEAN Ministerial Meetings.

The Chinese broken U-shaped line on the map of the South China Sea is also the focal point of ASEAN countries. The broken U-shaped line was officially drawn in the map of the ROC in 1947, and on the map of the PRC in 1953. It includes all four groups of the South China Sea islands, and the broken line appearing in a Chinese map also seemed to indicate that a part of the Natuna Islands of Indonesia belonged to China. A Taiwanese researcher pointed out that it is unclear as to whether the cartographer had full knowledge of international maritime law. If so, the legality of the broken line may be in doubt, though China claims that the broken line is the Chinese boundary of the historical waters.

The Indonesian government had requested the Chinese government to explain the implication of the broken line in 1994 and again in 1995. The Chinese government denied having territorial claims on the Natuna Islands, though they refused to explain the details of the meaning of the broken line. ASEAN leader tried to settle the South China Sea conflict peacefully at the ASEAN-China Summit Meeting which they had begun in 1997. Further, the ASEAN leaders agreed on the treaty on the Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone (SEANWFZ) in 1995, and they planned the Regional Code of Conduct for the South China Sea to check the Chinese claim in the South China Sea.

This article follows the process of the South China Sea dispute between China and ASEAN countries in the post Cold War era, and analyzes the security implications of the broken U-shaped line on the Chinese map.

## The Frontier Issue between China and its Neighboring Countries

LI Guoqiang

China is vast both in land and maritime territories. China has more than 18,000 kilometers of coastline, more than 6,500 islands bigger than 500 square meters; it has jurisdiction over three million square kilometers of sea area and has eight marine neighbors. Compared with other countries, China has more marine neighbors and more complicated marine surroundings. The disputes in the Yellow Sea, the East China Sea and the South China Sea still remain unsettled. The dispute between China and South Korea over the border demarcation of the Yellow Sea is not only over the boundary of an exclusive economic zone but also over the continental shelf. The main dispute over this issue is that China advocates applying both the natural extension principle and the "equity" principle. South Korea, however, advocates applying the "intermediate line" principle. Since the late 1960s, huge amounts of undersea oil reserves have been discovered in the East China Sea, highlighting the issue in this region. In the east continental shelf of the East China Sea, there are considerable overlaps among China, South Korea and Japan. Among the 560,000 square kilometers of marine jurisdiction China claims on the East China Sea, there are about 210,000 square kilometers overlapped between China and Japan, and 120,000 square kilometers between China and South Korea. Because of disagreements among China, South Korea and Japan over principles and standpoints on the boundary issues of the East China Sea and relevant islands including the Diaoyu Islands and Suyan Island, it is hard to achieve substantial progress in the border demarcation of the East China Sea. In the South China Sea, there remain many challenging issues among China, Vietnam, Philippines, Malaysia and Brunei relating to the border demarcation of the exclusive economic zone and the continental shelf. The issue of the South China Sea borderlines has yet to be put on the agenda of the relevant countries because of unresolved issues. Maritime boundaries not only relate to vital political benefits but also to economic benefits.

There is a long way to go until these disagreements among relevant countries can be radically resolved. Territorial disputes may be settled through the observation of international practices and through bilateral diplomatic negotiation. In recent years, concerning sea boundary issues, China and its neighboring countries put in a great deal of effort to achieve some success through diplomatic negotiations. Relevant countries can resolve these problems through consultation and peace negotiations. Moreover, relevant countries have discussed temporary agreements which can lay the foundation for a final settlement of the boundary question. It is possible for these countries to either cooperate or collide on the issue of the sea frontier and other unresolved difficulties. The methods, ways and measurements to settle the issue still need improvement, and it is hard to predict the time when it can be totally resolved. If the concerned countries follow the basic principles of the boundary issue, they can promote mutual trust to properly settle maritime boundary problems.

## **India's China Relations and Border Disputes**

YOSHIDA Osamu

India's relations with China had long been dominated by border disputes. India's position that its border was clearly demarcated had not been the official view of the government until Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru issued his directives on the border for his government following India's signing of the Agreement of Panchsheel or the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence with China in 1954. Nehru told his Secretary General to withdraw old maps and print new ones "showing our northern and north eastern frontier without any reference to any 'line'" or any statement that "there is undemarcated territory."

The 1954 Agreement has been understood to be instrumental for India to barter India's recognition of China's claim to Tibet for the declaration of peaceful coexistence with China, thus illuminating the superiority of peaceful Asia over the Cold War-torn West. Contrary to this conventional view, Nehru saw the objective of the agreement as finalizing the frontier between the two countries. However, while the agreement specifies six passes and the Indus Valley as points of transaction in the

middle sector, there was no mention of the eastern and western sectors. Moreover, China didn't share Nehru's view and claimed in 1960 that the understanding at the time was that "no boundary question would be addressed during negotiations."

Nehru's attitude may be understood from other parts of his directives. The directives include those to extend India's control to the territories up to the boundary by setting up checkpoints along the border, by maintaining local border militias with their principle duties being construction or supporting cottage industries, or by encouraging border trade between India and Tibet. In other words, he attempted to demarcate the boundaries through the unilateral but manifested actions of effective control, as the frontier between the two was now opened to traffic. China, too, extended its tangible control over the frontier region, but they believed the border had to be decided eventually through bilateral agreements.

Differences in style of diplomacy between the two emerging Asian powers may have complicated the problem. Because India followed the British way of diplomacy, those unilateral but clearly manifested actions were to be understood as the beginning of the diplomatic process. And if China failed to respond in due course, India would claim that China acquiesced in India's unilateral demarcation. On the other hand, China ignored diplomatic issues for which they were ill-prepared and assigned priority to the effective control over territorial claims. Thus the two countries squandered the chance for defining their common border before the break out of military clashes.

Another factor behind Nehru's unilateral actions was how India and China defined the border. For China, it was the act to transform itself from a pre-modern East Asian empire to a sovereign territorial state, which was indispensable for being a modern state. China therefore assigned priority to the effective exercise of sovereignty, and holding discussions with its neighbours including India about the border was left for the future. For India, and for Nehru in particular, its territory and frontier were inherited from the British, and he might have been deeply influenced by the notion that even borders left 'undefined' by the British had to be treated as defined or demarcated.

From the end of the border war in 1962 to 1976 when they exchanged ambassadors once again, relations between India and China were antagonized. It was not until Rajiv Gandhi's visit to China, the first for an Indian prime minister in 34 years, in 1988 that talks on the border started to produce results. A series of

confidence-building measures have since been implemented, including the reduction of border forces and the shelving of border issues. China came one step closer to India in 2003 by allowing trade through Sikkim, whose merger with India in 1975 had been opposed by China.

China's concession to India on Sikkim should be understood in terms of its wish to complete the delineation and demarcation process of its land border. China's eagerness seems to reflect its desire to expand bilateral trade across land routes. However, India has reasons to be not as eager as China, such as the characteristics of its export items and its trade deficit with China, besides the domestic political cost possibly involved in the quick settlement of border disputes. Moreover, India's effective control over the people in the eastern sector or Arunachal Pradesh is recognized by the international community, while Chinese control over the western sector is just the military occupation of no man's land and thus lacks international recognition. This difference in position on the respective occupying territories in the disputed areas creates current political tension, and the reference to the imperial 'line' may spur domestic agitation. However, these two Asian regional powers have implemented measures for confidence-building over the past years and should achieve success in managing the relationship between competition and cooperation.

## **To Which Country Does the Ryukyu Islands Belong? An Analysis of Chinese Views**

ISHII Akira

The Ryukyu Kingdom was traditionally a tribute state of the Ming Dynasty and later the Qing Dynasty; at the same time, it was a tribute state of Japan. However, by taking advantage of a weakened Qing Dynasty, Japan encouraged the Ryukyu Kingdom to break diplomatic ties with the Qing Dynasty and became Okinawa Prefecture in 1879. Thus, the Ryukyu Kingdom was absorbed into Japan; however, it is not to say that the Qing Dynasty accepted this matter.

During the Sino-Japanese War, the history in which the Ryukyu Islands was once



---

part of China had not been forgotten in the Republic of China (ROC). In addition, they became more assertive over the Ryukyu Islands, or “the lost territory,” insisting that the ROC should reclaim it from Japan.

This paper mainly discusses the ROC government’s attempts to reclaim the Ryukyu Islands and explores the ROC government’s position on the Ryukyu Islands dispute. In Chinese mainland the People’s Republic of China (PRC) was founded in 1949. PRC’s policy towards the Ryukyu Islands will also be discussed.

Moreover, the name Ryukyu indicates island isthmuses roughly between Kagoshima Prefecture in Japan and Taiwan. In contrast Okinawa is the name used by the Japanese side and indicates the area Okinawa Prefecture governs. The ROC has used the name Ryukyu. But the PRC first used the name Ryukyu but changed the name to Okinawa in mid-1950’s.

Regarding the ROC’s Ryukyu policy, during the Sino-Japanese War, a disagreement within the government broke out between the group accepting Japan’s possession of the Ryukyu Islands and the other group insisting the Ryukyu Islands should not belong to Japan because it was forced to be a Japanese colony.

The Discussion Group on International Affairs, which was established under the Supreme Council for National Defense, led by Jiang Kai-shek completed the document on November 10, 1943, stating the conditions of Japan’s unconditional surrender. It is written as follows: “the Ryukyu Islands belonged to the ROC. If and when the U.S. and Britain firmly maintain objection, it will be under international control and be a demilitarized zone.” This document, which was prepared for the U.S., Britain, and ROC summit in Cairo, indicates giving the maximum demand on its territory. Whether bringing forward this claim or not at the U.S. and Britain summit depended on Jiang Kai-shek’s judgment. In the end, he did not bring up the territory of the Ryukyu Islands at this summit with the U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The reclamation of the Ryukyu Islands became intense in the ROC after winning the war against Japan. The National Consultative Council submitted a proposal for a peace treaty with Japan to the government, and it specified that the Ryukyu Islands be placed under the ROC’s trust territory. At that time, the U.S. made clear its intentions to put the Ryukyu Islands under sole trust territory.

The media in the ROC created a clamor for reclaiming the Ryukyu Islands however, the government had not officially demanded the Ryukyu Islands, and it

remained at the level of domestic discussion.

Then the ROC lost the Chinese civil war to the Chinese Communist Party, and the capital was moved to Taipei in December 1949. Taiwan did not raise the Ryukyu Islands dispute in the Japan-China Peace Treaty which had begun in February 1952 in Taipei. It held the opinion that the dispute over the Ryukyu Islands was between the U.S. and Japan.

Taiwan changed its position that the dispute over the Ryukyu Islands was between the U.S. and Japan when Amami Oshima was returned to Japan. Taiwan had no choice but to clarify its position because Taiwan had protested that Amami Oshima was a part of the Ryukyu Islands.

After that, the Chinese Nationalist Party (Guomindang) strengthened its support of the Ryukyu Revolutionary Party (Ryukyu Geming Tongzhihui) which aimed at the Ryukyu Islands being independent. The leader was Tsugumasa Kiyuna (Chinese name, Cai Zhang). The Ryukyu Nationalist Party (Ryukyu Guomindang) formed on November 30, 1958, with Kiyuna as its vice president.

However, the movement toward the independence of Ryukyu Islands was unsuccessful and lacked broad support. Jiang Kai-shek, too, had taken measures to strengthen economic and trade relationships and cross-cultural relations.

Meanwhile, the PRC had concluded the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance with the Soviet Union, and this treaty stipulated that a peace treaty with Japan be concluded under both parties' agreement. The Soviet Union envisioned the Ryukyu Islands becoming a military base. The Soviet Union and the PRC strongly opposed U. S. control of the Ryukyu Islands. But the PRC never stated that the Ryukyu Islands should be restored to the PRC.

The PRC formulated its policy toward Japan freely after the Soviet Union resumed diplomatic relations with Japan. The PRC's media released a comment on Japan by using the name Okinawa, taking the position that Okinawa clearly should be restored to Japan. Since the end of the 1950s, it had supported the Okinawan people's struggle for the return of Okinawa to Japan in relation to the Japan - U. S. Security Treaty.

In the 1970s, the PRC formally announced to a delegation from Okinawa its support of Japan's reclaiming of the Northern Territories. Back then, the PRC considered the Soviet Union as a major enemy.

Meanwhile, another territorial issue appeared in Taiwan at the end of the 1960s:

the territorial dispute over the Senkaku Islands (Chinese name, Diaoyudao). The PRC sees Diaoyudao as a “China’s sanctuary” and is taking the same position with Taiwan in principle on this dispute.

## **Is Sino-Japanese Reconciliation Possible? A Case Study of Forced Chinese Laborers in the 1940s**

LI Enmin

Serious war history issues have marred Sino-Japanese relations and public opinions since the 1980s. The Chinese grievances about wartime suffering and the lack of Japanese contrition became major sources of Chinese popular animosity toward Japan. Is Sino-Japanese reconciliation possible in the future? Based on findings of a case study on the Hanaoka Incident, this paper suggests that it is possible. It uses a wide selection of primary sources in Japanese and Chinese languages, including documents of NGO or NPO organizations, diplomatic archives and interviews with attorneys representing both the victims and the perpetrators of the incident.

During World War II, Japan forced a large number of Chinese commoners and war prisoners into slave labor in Japan. There were 986 forced Chinese laborers in Hanaoka in northeastern Japan, working on a river project run by Kajima-gumi, the wartime predecessor of Kajima Construction Corporation, the largest general contractor in Japan now. The forced laborers rioted in June 1945, protesting against their ruthless Japanese overseers, the cruel working conditions and the inadequacy of food. But the Japanese military police suppressed the rebellion and 113 laborers were killed. By the end of World War II, a total of 418 Chinese laborers in Hanaoka had allegedly died. This is known as the Hanaoka Incident.

In November 2000, Kajima and the Committee of the Sodality of Hanaoka Victims, which represents all survivors and the families of the perished laborers, succeeded in reaching a conciliation agreement at the Tokyo High Court, ending a five-year court battle over a lawsuit filed by 11 Chinese plaintiffs. According to the conciliation

documents, Kajima agreed to establish a fund with 500 million yen, or \$4.6 million, for compensation payment or postmortem consolation payment to all 986 Chinese victims of the Hanaoka Incident. The International Committee of the Red Cross in China and the newly established Hanaoka Peace and Friendship Foundation in Beijing have been administering the fund for the past ten years. They have been making efforts to reach conciliation through offering compensations and providing memorial services as well as scholarships. In April 2010, many NGOs and NPOs jointly founded the Hanaoka Peace Memorial Museum at the site of the Hanaoka Incident. The money for this museum came from civic movement organizations and their campaigns. This is the first war memorial museum constructed by perpetrators rather than victims in Japan. This paper argues that the core context of the Hanaoka conciliation consists of three elements: the compensation payment, the construction of a memorial museum and making public apologies to victims by a corporation. These are different from what Germany did in the 1990s (both the German government and corporations accepted joint responsibilities for the lawless acts of the Nazis conducted on forced foreign laborers).

The Hanaoka conciliation was the first time that a major Japanese corporation has compensated foreign wartime victims through a fund. Looking through the lens of resolving war history issues, it can be seen as providing a new framework or model for reaching conciliation. It is really a bold effort to develop a universal approach to reaching conciliation in Asia.

The central point of this paper is that a court-connected reconciliation must be understood fundamentally as a process, not as an end result because a purely judicial approach to reconciliation is limited. The central aspects of real reconciliation, which should be understood as heart-to-heart reconciliation, are recognition of truth, which serves to redress the past, giving voices to victims in the present, and creating a communal memory for the future. Establishing truth is the cornerstone of reconciliation. As the case study indicates, there is still a long way to go for China and Japan before real reconciliation could be reached.

## Image and Reality of the Penal Colony in Sakhalin: Prejudice and Adaptation

AMANO Naoki

Sakhalin in the czarist era was the island of exiles. They laid the foundations of Sakhalin as a colony. In those days many Russians viewed Sakhalin Island as a non-Russian territory, because of their low regard of the exiles. In this paper I will address the following four questions. First, how was such a negative image created and stereotyped? Second, how did the exiles live in the penal colony, and how different were the realities of their life from the image? Third, how did the image operate on the realities in Sakhalin? Fourth, why could the reality not change the image? From these points of views I will analyze Sakhalin's history from the 1850s to the eve of the Russo-Japanese war.

In 1871, Vasilii Vlasov, the head of a branch of the Department of Executive Police, visited Sakhalin to investigate hard-labor institutions. After returning to St. Petersburg, he submitted a report to the Ministry of Interior. His report was extremely influential in creating the negative image of the penal colony in Sakhalin. He described the corrupt life of the exiles and of the officials living on the island. According to him, the island's chaos was caused by a lack of policy.

In the 1870s, various newspapers and journals reported on the situation in Sakhalin. Many of them negatively depicted life in the penal colony, expressing prejudice toward the exiles. The discourses of government officials projected a negative image of the exiles. Russian citizens imagined the exiles as vicious, and the island akin to hell. This was the common stereotype of the island at the end of the 1870s when the Russian government began to accelerate the settlement of Sakhalin.

One of the major goals in the penal colony was to develop agriculture. However, the officials abandoned this dream as early as the 1880s. An authority on geography argued against the possibility of developing agriculture because of the severe climate. The inspectors of agriculture on the island repeated the same opinion. Moreover, the officials regarded the exiles as corrupt and incompetent.

It was Anton Chekhov's *Sakhalin Island* (1895) that popularized this negative

image among Russian citizens. Before and after visiting Sakhalin in 1890, Chekhov exhaustively read materials on the island, and was influenced by the stereotype. He did not change the image. Indeed, his description of miserable scenes made it more influential.

However, Chekhov also illustrated the positive side of life on the island. He described the germ of agricultural development, though not much. From the middle of the 1890s, the realities of the penal colony began to change. That is, Sakhalin was becoming an agricultural colony.

There were three categories of exiles in the Russian system. The convicts-in-exile were put in prison and forced into servitude. The settled-exiles were released from prison, lived in designated settlements, and worked on the land unguarded. The peasants-in-exile were treated as free populations, although with some restrictions. They were free to select their settlements, and had the right to return to the continent. The last two categories were de facto free peasants. The number of peasants-in-exiles exceeded convicts in the 1890s. In 1900 the number of de facto peasants was three times as large as the convicts. When the Russo-Japanese war broke out, the majority of them stood on their own feet without aid from the Sakhalin administration.

The Sakhalin administration neither controlled nor supported them. This means that they adapted to the land on their own. However, the officials did not see reality on the ground. Their prejudice blinded them. They did not view the settled-exiles and the peasants-in-exile as able peasants, but as corrupt exiles. They lived in a different world from the de facto peasants. They were indifferent to the exiles' land. The realities did not change the image.

Before the Russo-Japanese war reached as far as the island, Sakhalin already had been abandoned. The Russian government discussed the abolition of the penal system and even the sale of the hopeless colony to the U. S. The outcome of the war had been decided before the fight.

## On Gleb Struve: Historian of Russian Emigrant Literature

NAKANO Yukio

This paper deals with the problems of “Russian literature in exile” from the contemporary perspective of literary studies, focusing on the life and works of Russian literary historian Gleb Petrovich Struve (1898-1985). Despite his important contributions to the study of the history of Russian literature, we know little about his life and his close relationships with contemporary writers such as Marina Tsvetaeva (1892-1941), Vladimir Nabokov (1899-1977), George Orwell (1903-1950) and Paul Celan (1920-1970).

The first part of this paper covers the period from his birth in 1898 to his employment at the University of London’s School of Slavonic and East European Studies in 1932. In this period his relationships with other contemporary writers deserve attention. His correspondence with Nabokov in his Russian-writing period tells us the role Struve played in the life of Nabokov as an adviser not only in his life in emigration, but also in his literary debut in emigrant journals and books in translation. After graduating from Oxford, Struve was engaged in journalism. He found jobs mainly at the publishing houses owned by his father. In 1922 he met Marina Tsvetaeva in Berlin and in 1923 Struve named his daughter Marina after Tsvetaeva. Tsvetaeva gave a copy of her new collection of poems, *Remeslo*, to Struve’s daughter with her dedication. Using his excellent knowledge of foreign languages, he worked as a translator in commercial companies and translated the works of economist John Maynard Keynes, politician Thomas Woodrow Wilson into Russian and Ivan Bunin, winner of the 1933 Nobel Prize for literature, into English. The second part covers the period from his employment in 1932 to his move to the United States in 1947, focusing on his life during World War II and his publications of Soviet Russian literary history. Since his employment as lecturer at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies, like his predecessor, Prince Dmitry Petrovich Svyatopolk-Mirsky (1890-1939), he taught Russian language and literature until his retirement and his eventual employment at the University of California, Berkeley

in 1947. Also, Struve was known for his works on Russian literary history written in English (*History of Soviet Russian Literature* (1935), *25 years of Soviet Russian Literature: 1918-1943* (1944) and *Russian Literature under Lenin and Stalin, 1917-1953* (1971)). Following his predecessor at King's College, Prince Dmitry Svyatopolk-Mirsky, a well-known literary critic and historian, the influence of Struve's English works went beyond Russian emigrant readers. George Orwell, one of Struve's non-Russian readers, found Zamyatin's anti-utopian novel *We in the History of Soviet Russian Literature* and got the idea for his anti-utopian novel 1984.

The third part covers the period from 1947 to 1985, focusing on his emigrant publishing including the Chekhov Publishing House. During World War II Struve lost his parents: his father died in 1944 in Paris, following the death of his mother in 1943. In 1946, Struve accepted an offer from the University of California at Berkeley as a visiting professor. In 1947 he accepted the position of professor at the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures at the University of California at Berkeley, and spent almost the rest of his life in the United States. In this period Struve's main contribution in the study of Russian literary history could be defined in his publications of the works of the depressed poets in the Soviet period and his studies and writings on "Russian literature in exile." In collaboration with publisher and literary critic, Boris Filippov (1905-1991), Struve published the works of writers banned in the USSR: Nikolai Gumilyov, Osip Mandelshtam, Marina Tsvetaeva, Boris Pasternak, Anna Akhmatova, Nikolai Zabolotsky and Iosif Brodsky. In 1959, German poet, Paul Celan found Mandelshtam in the first collection of Mandelshtam published by Struve and Filippov and began to translate his poems into German and introduced him into German literature.

His *Russian literature in Exile* (1956) still remains one of the most comprehensive works on Russian emigrant literature. He considered this book to be an "inventory" of the knowledge on Russian emigrant literature. This book was connected with the end of the Chekhov Publishing House subsidized by the Ford Foundation, and despite its short-lived existence of only four years, it published many legendary books banned in the USSR: the first collections of Nikolai Gumilyov (1952), Osip Mandelshtam (1955), and the original Russian version of Zamyatin's novel *We* in 1952. Behind the publication of these works, we can detect Struve's effort to disseminate the legacy of twentieth century Russian literature to the world.

On the basis of these observations, Struve's effort to disseminate Russian literature



to non-Russian readers materialized in the works of Orwell and Celan. His life was seemingly divided into two phases: before and after the American period, reminding us of Nabokov, one of Struve's most eminent contemporary writers. But his continuous interest in recording his contemporaries could be a unifying thread between these two phases. His writings on Russian literary history covering emigrant literature remain unfinished and should be rewritten and renewed by the generations that follow, positioning Struve himself in the context of the history of contemporary Russian literature.