

## Introduction

### Malthusian Expansion and Settler Colonialism

---

In 1924, the year when the United States shut its doors to all Japanese immigrants, Nagata Shigeshi embarked on a trip to Brazil to complete a land purchase. As the president of the Japanese Striving Society (Nippon Rikkō Kai), a leading Japanese migration agency of its day, Nagata planned to build *Aliança*, a new Japanese community, in the state of São Paulo to accommodate the supposed surplus population of rural Nagano. In addition to poverty relief, Nagata envisioned that the migration would turn the landless farmers of Nagano prefecture into successful owner-farmers in Brazil, who would not only serve as stable sources of remittance for their home villages but also lay a permanent foundation for the Japanese empire in South America. Rooted in social tensions in the archipelago, the anxiety of “overpopulation” in Japan was intensified by decades of anti-Japanese campaigns that raged in North America. White racism in the United States forced many Japanese migration promoters, including Nagata, to abandon their previous plans of occupying the “empty” American West with Japan’s “surplus” population. Instead they turned their gaze southward to Brazil as an alternative, seeing it as not only an equally rich and spacious land but also free of racial discrimination. A direct response to Japanese exclusion from the United States, the community of *Aliança* was designed to showcase the superiority of Japanese settler colonialism over that of the Westerners.<sup>1</sup> Meaning “alliance” in Portuguese, *Aliança* was chosen as its name to demonstrate that unlike the hypocritical white colonizers who discriminated against and excluded people of color, the Japanese, owners of a genuinely civilized empire, were willing to cooperate with others and share the benefits.<sup>2</sup> This idea quickly grew into the principle of *kyōzon kyōei* – coexistence and coprosperity – a guideline of Japanese Brazilian migration in general.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> In this book, I define some Japanese migration campaigns beyond the territorial boundaries and the spheres of influence of the Japanese empire as practices of settler colonialism because of the settler colonial logic and intentions behind these campaigns. This definition is explained in detail later in the introduction.

<sup>2</sup> Nagata Shigeshi, *Shinano Kaigai Ijūshi* (Nagano: Shinano Kaigai Kyōryokukai, 1952), 79–80, and Nagata Shigeshi, *Kaigai Hatten to Wa Ga Kuni no Kyōiku* (Tokyo: Dōbunkan, 1917), 19–21.

<sup>3</sup> A 1924 article in *Shokumin*, a leading Japanese journal promoting colonial migration, claimed that the ultimate goal of Japan’s migration-centered expansion should be the coexistence and coprosperity of the entire human being. Responding to the US government’s ban on Japanese

2 Introduction

As the main direction of Japanese expansion shifted from South America to Northeast Asia in the 1930s, overpopulation anxiety was utilized by the imperial government to justify its policy of exporting a million households from the “overcrowded” archipelago to Manchuria, Japan’s new “lifeline.” Nagano prefecture continued to take on a leading role in overseas migration, sending out the greatest number of settlers among all Japanese prefectures to the Asian continent.<sup>4</sup> Nagata Shigeshi served as one of the core strategists assisting the imperial government’s migration policymaking, and he often referred back to Aliança as a model for Japanese community building in Manchuria.<sup>5</sup> Coexistence and coprosperity, the guiding principle of Japanese migration to Brazil, also became the ideological foundation of Japan’s Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere (Daitōa Kyōei Ken). After the empire’s demise, Nagata continued to identify overpopulation as the root of all social programs in the war-torn archipelago and kept on promoting overseas migration as the ultimate cure. Under his leadership, the Striving Society worked closely with the postwar government and managed to restart exporting “surplus people” from Japan to South America by reviving migration networks established before 1945.<sup>6</sup>

The claimed necessity for Japan to export its surplus population has been dismissed by postwar historians as a flimsy excuse of the Japanese imperialists to justify their continental invasion in the 1930s and early 1940s. Likewise, according to conventional wisdom, the slogan of coexistence and coprosperity is nothing more than deceptive propaganda that attempts to cover up the brutality of Japanese militarism during World War II. Common examinations of Japanese expansion usually stop at 1945, when the Japanese empire met its end.

However, submerged in archives across the Pacific are stories of hundreds of Japanese men and women like Nagata Shigeshi, which the current nation-based, territory-bound, and time-limited narratives of the Japanese history fail to capture. They embraced the discourse of overpopulation and led and

immigration going into effect the same year, the author believed that this new goal should guide Japanese migration to South America as well as other parts of the world in the following years. Arai Nobuo, “Shokumin to Kyōiku,” *Shokumin* 3, no. 3 (March 1924): 84. Moreover, Kurose Hiroshi, vice president of the Japanese-Brazilian Association (Nippaku Kyōkai), a major migration organization of the day, recognized in 1932 too “Kyōzon Kyōei” as the guideline for Japanese-Brazilian migration. Kurose Hiroshi, “Kyōzon Kyōei ni susume,” *Burajiru: Ishokumin to Bōeki* 6, no. 5 (May 1932): 2.

<sup>4</sup> Louise Young, *Japan’s Total Empire: Manchuria and the Culture of Wartime Imperialism* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 329–330.

<sup>5</sup> Nippon Rikkō Kai Sōritsu Hyaku Shūnen Kinen Jigyō Jikkō Iinkai Kinenshi Hensan Senmon Iinkai, *Nippon Rikkō Kai Hyakunen no Kōseki: Reiniku Kyūsai, Kaigai Hatten Undō, Kokusai Kōken* (Tokyo: Nippon Rikkō Kai, 1997), 213; Nagata Shigeshi, *Nōson Jinkō Mondai to Ishokumin* (Tokyo: Nihon Hyōronsha, 1933), 61–62.

<sup>6</sup> Nippon Rikkō Kai, *Nippon Rikkō Kai*, 332–343.

participated in Japanese migration-driven expansion that transcended the geographic and temporal boundaries of the Japanese empire. Their ideas and activities demonstrate that the association between the claim of overpopulation and Japan's expansion had a long and trans-Pacific history that began long before the late 1930s. The idea of coexistence and coprosperity, embodied by Japanese community building in South America, was both a direct response to Japanese exclusion in North America and a new justification for Japanese settler colonialism based on the argument of overpopulation. It emerged in the 1920s, long before the announced formation of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperty Sphere during the total war.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, not only did Japan's migration machine precede the war, it also survived it. The logic, networks, and institutions of migration established before 1945 continued to function in the 1950s and 1960s to spur Japanese migration to South America.

Why and how did the claim of overpopulation become a long-lasting justification for expansion? In what ways were the experiences of Japanese emigration within and outside of the empire intertwined? How should we understand the relationship between migration and settler colonialism in modern Japan and in the modern world? These are the questions that this book seeks to answer. This is a study of the relationship between the ideas of population, emigration, and expansion in the history of modern Japan. It examines how the discourse of overpopulation emerged in Japanese society and was appropriated to justify Japan's migration-driven expansion on both sides of the Pacific Ocean from the mid-nineteenth century to the 1960s. Through the history of the overpopulation discourse, this study redefines settler colonialism in modern Japan by demonstrating the institutional continuities and intellectual links between Japanese colonial migration in Asia and Japanese migration in Hawai'i and North and South America during and after the time of the Japanese empire. It further reveals the profound overlaps and connections between migration and settler colonialism in the modern world, two historical phenomena that have been conventionally understood in isolation from one another.

### **Malthusian Expansionism and Malthusian Expansionists**

I define the discourse of overpopulation that legitimized Japan's migration-driven expansion on both sides of the Pacific as "Malthusian expansionism." This is a set of ideas that demanded extra land abroad to accommodate the claimed surplus people in the domestic society on the one hand and emphasized the necessity of the overall population growth of the nation on the other hand.

<sup>7</sup> Arai, "Shokumin to Kyōiku," 84. By the term "total war," this book refers to the Asia-Pacific War that began with the Marco Polo Bridge Incident on July 7, 1937, and ended with Japan's surrender on August 15, 1945.

4 Introduction

As two sides of the same coin, these seemingly contradictory ideas worked together in the logic of Malthusian expansionism. It rationalizes migration-driven expansion, which I call “Malthusian expansion,” as both a solution to domestic social tensions supposedly caused by overpopulation and a means to leave the much-needed room and resources in the homeland so that the total population of the nation could continue to increase. In other words, Malthusian expansionism is centered on the *claim* of overpopulation, not the actual *fear* of it, and by the desire for population growth, not the actual *anxiety* over it.

On the one hand, Malthusian expansionism echoed the logic of classic Malthusianism in believing that the production of a plot of earth was limited and could feed only a certain number of people. As early as 1869, three years before the newly formed Meiji government carried out the first nationwide population survey, it pointed to the condition of overpopulation (*jinkō kajō*) as the cause of regional poverty in the archipelago. As a remedy, the government concluded, surplus people in Japan proper should be relocated to the empire’s underpopulated peripheries.<sup>8</sup> From that point forward, different generations of Japanese policymakers and opinion leaders continued to claim overpopulation as the ultimate reason for whatever social tensions of the day were plaguing the archipelago. They also embraced emigration, first to Hokkaido and then to different parts of the Pacific Rim, as not only the best way to alleviate the pressure of overpopulation but also an effective strategy to expand the power and territory of the empire.

On the other hand, unlike Malthus’s original theory that held that population growth should be checked,<sup>9</sup> Malthusian expansionism celebrated the increase of population. The call for population growth emerged as Meiji Japan entered the world of modern nations in the nineteenth century, when the educated Japanese began to value manpower as an essential strength of the nation and a vital component of the capitalist economy. The size of population and the speed of a nation’s demographic growth, as Japanese leaders observed, served as key indicators of a nation’s position in the global hierarchy defined by modern imperialism. Accordingly, the emigration of the surplus people overseas would free up space and resources in the crowded archipelago to allow the Japanese population to continue its growth.

This study examines overpopulation as a political claim, not as a reflection of reality. Japan did experience periods of rapid population growth once it began the process of modernization, and it has historically been known as a densely populated nation/empire.<sup>10</sup> However, the word “overpopulation” should never

<sup>8</sup> Yoshida Hideo, *Nihon Jinkō Ron no Shiteki Kenkyū* (Tokyo: Kawade Shobō, 1944), 250–252.

<sup>9</sup> Thomas Malthus, *An Essay on the Principle of Population* (London: J. Johnson, 1789), 6, 28.

<sup>10</sup> For example, world-renowned sociologist Warren Thompson in 1929 listed the Japanese empire, together with China, India, and Central Europe, as the world’s “danger spots” due to their extremely high population densities. Thompson warned that if the population pressures in

be taken as given when discussing the contexts of emigration and expansion because the very definition of “overpopulation,” as this study has shown, has always been subject to manipulation. Like elsewhere in the world, the claim of overpopulation was associated with a variety of arguments and social campaigns in modern Japan. As Japanese economist and demographer Nagai Tōru observed at the end of the 1920s, the issue of overpopulation served as an excuse for different interest groups to advance their own agendas. Those who called for birth control were in fact working toward the liberation of proletarians and women; those who focused on the issue of food shortage might have cared more about political security than overpopulation per se; and in the same vein, migration promoters’ ultimate goal was the expansion of the Japanese empire itself.<sup>11</sup> By the concept of Malthusian expansionism, this book aims to explain how the claims of overpopulation were specifically invented and used to legitimize migration-driven expansion.

To this end, I focus on the ideas and activities of the Japanese migration promoters, men and women like Nagata Shigeshi, whom I call “Malthusian expansionists.” In other words, this is a study of the migration promoters, not the individual migrants who left the archipelago and settled across seas. Malthusian expansionists were different generations of Japanese thinkers and doers, who viewed migration as an essential means of expansion. Their diverse backgrounds shaped their agendas for emigration in different ways—those inside the policymaking circles envisioned that emigration would expand the empire’s territories and political sphere of influence, business elites saw emigration as a vital step to boost Japan’s international trade, intellectuals believed that migration would propel the Japanese to rise through the global racial hierarchy, social activists and bureaucrats used emigration to realize their plans to reform the domestic society, owners and employees of migration organizations and companies hoped for the growth of their wealth and networks, and journalists aimed to expand readership and influences.

However, as advocates of Malthusian expansionism, they claimed in unison that the archipelago, in part or as a whole, was overcrowded even though it was essential that the Japanese population continue its growth. They thus agreed with each other that emigration was both an ideal solution to the problem of overpopulation at home and a critical means of expansion abroad. In different historical contexts and in their own ways, they took on the primary responsibility to plan, promote, and organize Japan’s migration-driven expansion. Many not only extolled the merits of emigration through articles and speeches

these regions were not correctly dealt with, they might lead to international wars. Warren S. Thompson, *Danger Spots in World Population* (New York: Knopf, 1929), 18–48, 113–114.

<sup>11</sup> Nagai Tōru, *Nihon Jinkō Ron* (Tokyo: Ganshōdō, 1929), 3.

6 Introduction

but also actively participated in migration campaigns by making policies and plans, investigating possibilities, or recruiting migrants.

To be sure, Malthusian expansionism was not the only design of empire in modern Japan. The ideas that the empire needed more population instead of less were constantly challenged by different forces from within and without. Kōtoku Shūsui, a pioneer of Japan's socialist movement, made one of the earliest and most powerful critiques of Malthusian expansionism at the turn of the twentieth century. The argument that overpopulation necessitated emigration, he pointed out, was merely rhetoric for imperial expansion because the true reason behind the rise of poverty was not population growth but the increasingly imbalanced distribution of wealth.<sup>12</sup> From the late 1910s to the early 1930s, leaders of socialist and feminist movements in Japan were vocal in their push for contraception and birth control. Their birth control and eugenics campaigns were both inspired and empowered by contemporary international Neo-Malthusian and eugenic movements.<sup>13</sup> Similarly, not every Japanese empire builder favored emigration as a practical solution to Japan's social problems and a productive means of expansion. As the tide of anti-Japanese sentiment began to rise in the United States, liberal thinkers like Ishibashi Tanzan argued that Japan should acquire wealth and power through trade instead of emigration. Ishibashi urged Tokyo to relocate all Japanese migrants in the United States back into the archipelago in order to avoid diplomatic conflicts.<sup>14</sup> As a whole, though Malthusian expansionists at times worked with other interest groups such as merchants, labor union leaders, and women's rights advocates, they were also constantly vying for leadership and influence.

Not all types of emigration fit into the ideal scenario of expansion imagined by Japanese Malthusian expansionists either. Few of them saw the Korean Peninsula and Taiwan, two major colonies of the empire, which had two of the largest Japanese overseas communities by the end of World War II, as vital parts in their maps of expansion. Due to the high population densities of the native residents and the low living standards of the local farmers, the Japanese agricultural migration, favored by the Malthusian expansionists, had seldom succeeded there. Due to similar reasons, Okinawa, a colony turned prefecture of the empire, was rarely mentioned in the discussions of the Japanese Malthusian expansionists. The rich histories of Japanese migration in the Korean Peninsula, Taiwan, and Okinawa, therefore, do not feature prominently in this book.

<sup>12</sup> Kōtoku Shūsui, *Teikoku Shugi* (Tokyo: Iwanami Bunko, 1901), 106–108, 112.

<sup>13</sup> Fujime Yuki, *Sei no Rekishigaku: Kōshō Seido, Dataizai Taisei kara Baishun Bōshihō, Yūsei Hogohō Taisei e* (Tokyo: Fuji Shuppan, 1997), 245–281.

<sup>14</sup> Oguma Eiji, *Nihonjin no Kyōkai: Okinawa Ainu Taiwan Chōsen Shokuminchi Shihai kara Fukki Undō made* (Tokyo: Shinyōsha, 1999), 232–235.

Instead, I focus on the histories of Japanese migration in Hokkaido, California, Texas, Brazil, and Manchuria, where Japanese settlement was crucial for the evolution of Japanese Malthusian expansionism. Similarly, in the visions of Japanese Malthusian expansionists, not every ethnic group in the empire was qualified for emigration. Though having substantial differences among themselves, colonial subjects in the Korean Peninsula and Taiwan as well as outcast groups were generally excluded from the pool of ideal subjects of emigration.<sup>15</sup> Although Okinawa had one of the greatest numbers of emigrants among all Japanese prefectures, Malthusian expansionists did not consider Okinawans as ideal migrants either.<sup>16</sup>

### Malthusian Expansionism as a Logic of Settler Colonialism

By moving beyond geographical and sovereign boundaries, this study brings new ways to understand settler colonialism in the histories of modern Japan and the modern world. At a concrete level, it analyzes the links, flows, and inter-sections between Japanese migration within the imperial territory in Asia and that outside of the imperial territories in Hawai'i and North and South America and the continuities between Japanese overseas migration during and after the time of the empire. The connections between Japanese colonial migration in Asia and Japanese migration across the Pacific Ocean also present an intellectual necessity to conceptualize the overlaps between migration and colonial expansion. Thus, at a more theoretical level, by recognizing certain types of migration into the territories of other sovereign states as expansion, this study reconfigures the scope, logic, and significance of settler colonialism in world history.

<sup>15</sup> Although these marginalized groups are generally absent in the Japanese Malthusian expansionists' proposals, their stories as emigrants have been well documented. Noah McCormack, "Buraku Emigration in the Meiji Era – Other Ways to Become 'Japanese,'" *East Asian History*, no. 23 (June 2002): 87–108; Andrea Geiger, *Subverting Exclusion: Transpacific Encounters with Race, Caste, and Borders, 1885–1928* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011), 36–71; Ronald Takaki, *Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 270–286.

<sup>16</sup> Malthusian expansionists' discrimination against Okinawan migrants was exemplified by Tokyo's ban on Okinawan migration to Brazil from 1912 to 1917. The imperial government justified the decision by labeling the Okinawans as inferior to the Japanese and attributing the rise of anti-Japanese sentiment in South America to the Okinawan migrants' "inappropriate" behavior there. Yabiku Mōsei, *Burajiru Okinawa Iminshi* (São Paulo: Zaibu Okinawa Kenjinkai, 1987), 48–52. In 1942, Japanese colonial thinker Yanaihara Tadao, too, complained that the inferior Okinawan migrants had damaged the Japanese settlers' civilized image in the South Seas. Yanaihara Tadao, "Nanpō Rōdō Seisaku no Kichō," *Shakai Seisaku Jihō*, no. 260 (1942): 156–157, cited from Tomiyama Ichirō, "Colonialism and the Sciences of the Tropical Zone: The Academic Analysis of Difference in 'the Island Peoples,'" *Positions: Asia Critique* 3, no. 2 (1995): 385–386.

8 Introduction

Until recently, the experience of Japanese overseas migration has been divided into two contrasting narratives: a story of settler colonialism inside of the empire's sphere of influence in Asia on the one hand and a story of Japanese migrants' bitter struggles against white racism and immigration exclusion in other areas across the Pacific on the other. Recognizing the divergence between emigration (*imin*) and colonial migration/expansion (*shokumin*) remains absolutely necessary for us to grasp the different dimensions in the experience of the Japanese overseas. However, recent scholarship has moved our understanding of Japanese colonialism and expansionism beyond geographical and temporal boundaries of the Japanese empire.<sup>17</sup> As a result, the concepts of emigration and colonial expansion, together with the two separated narratives they represent respectively, are no longer sufficient because they cannot explain the continuities and connections between various waves of Japanese emigration on both sides of the Pacific Ocean from the beginning of the empire to the decades after its fall.

By not taking the conceptual division between migration and colonial expansion as given, this study illustrates the ideological and institutional continuities centered around the overpopulation discourse that persisted through different periods of Japanese emigration. The history of Japan's Malthusian expansion transcended both the space and time of the Japanese colonial empire. I trace the origins of Japan's Malthusian expansion to the beginning of Meiji era. I demonstrate how the migration of declassed samurai (*shizoku*) to Hokkaido during early Meiji, an episode commonly omitted from the history of Japanese colonial expansion, was a precursor to the ideas and practices of Japanese migration to North America and other parts of the Pacific Rim in later years. Likewise, Japanese migration to the United States that began in the last two decades of the nineteenth century also provided crucial languages and resources for Japanese expansion in South America and Northeast Asia from the early twentieth century to the end of World War II. I also extend the analysis into the postwar era and consider Japanese migration to South America in the 1950s and 1960s as the final episode in the history of Japan's Malthusian expansion: though no longer performed by a militant and expanding empire, the postwar migration was still legitimized by the same discourse of overpopulation while driven by the same institutions and networks that were

<sup>17</sup> The representative studies in recent years include, but are not limited to, Young, *Japan's Total Empire*, 312–318; Sandra Wilson, “The New Paradise: Japanese Emigration to Manchuria in the 1930s and 1940s,” *International History Review* 17, no. 2 (May 1995): 251–253; Eiichiro Azuma, “‘Pioneers of Overseas Japanese Development’: Japanese American History and the Making of Expansionist Orthodoxy in Imperial Japan,” *Journal of Asian Studies* 64, no. 4 (November 2008): 1187–1226; Takashi Fujitani, *Race for Empire: Koreans as Japanese and Japanese as Americans* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011); Geiger, *Subverting Exclusion*; Jordan Sand, “Reconfiguring Pacific History: Reflections from the Pacific Empires Working Group,” *Amerasia Journal* 42, no. 3 (2016): 1–5.

established during Japanese migration to South America and Manchuria before 1945.

That settler colonialism as a concept to describe the settler-centered colonial expansion and rule is different from military- or trade-centered colonialism has been widely accepted by scholars in recent decades. Yet researchers have utilized varied definitions of the term depending on the historical and political contexts of their subjects. The existing literature has offered at least three different definitions. First, in Anglophone colonial history, scholars use “settler colonialism” to describe the settling in colonies by colonizers and the establishment of states and societies of their own by usurping native land instead of exploiting native labor. The elimination of native peoples and their cultures and the perpetuation of settler states in the Anglophone history have led Patrick Wolfe to conclude that settler colonial invasion “is structure, not an event.”<sup>18</sup> Second, careful examinations of twentieth-century colonialism around the globe have extended our understanding of settler colonialism beyond the Anglophone model. Unlike the expansion of the Anglo world in the previous centuries, settler colonialism in the twentieth century was marked by the instability of settler communities. Whether in the Korean Peninsula, Abyssinia, or Kenya, colonial settlers from Japan, Italy, and Britain alike had to constantly negotiate their political and social space with more numerous indigenous populations. Their stories often ended with repatriation, not permanent stay. Accordingly, Caroline Elkins and Susan Pedersen have defined twentieth-century settler colonialism as a structure of colonial privileges based on the negotiation between four political groups: the settlers, the imperial metropole, the colonial administration, and the indigenous people.<sup>19</sup> Third, recent studies have started to extend the definition of settler colonialism beyond formal colonial sovereignty and power relations by exploring the overlaps and similarities between the experience of colonial settlers and that of migrants. Looking from indigenous perspectives, colonial histories of Hawai‘i, Southeast Asia, and Taiwan, in their own ways, have all offered plenty of evidence of how immigrants ended up fostering the existing settler colonial structures.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Lorenzo Veracini, “‘Settler Colonialism’: Career of a Concept,” *Journal of Imperial and Commonwealth History* 41, no. 2 (2013): 313; Patrick Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology: The Politics and Poetics of an Ethnographic Event* (London: Cassell, 1999), 2.

<sup>19</sup> Caroline Elkins and Susan Pedersen, eds., *Settler Colonialism in the Twentieth Century: Projects, Practices, and Legacies* (London: Routledge, 2005), 3–4. Jun Uchida further defines the Japanese settlers in colonial Korea as “brokers of empire” based on ambivalent and constantly shifting relations they had with different forces in the Korean Peninsula and Tokyo. Jun Uchida, *Brokers of Empire: Japanese Settler Colonialism in Korea, 1876–1945* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011), 5–8.

<sup>20</sup> Candace Fujikane, “Introduction: Asian Settler Colonialism in the U.S. Colony of Hawai‘i,” in *Asian Settler Colonialism: From Local Governance to the Habits of Everyday Life in Hawai‘i*, ed. Candace Fujikane and Jonathan Y. Okamura (Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i Press, 2008),

Recognizing the overlaps between the experiences of settlers and migrants is the starting point of this research. I use the term “settler colonialism” by its most extended meaning, close to the third definition. However, different from all the approaches above, this book sheds new light on settler colonialism through the lens of migration itself. The migration of settlers is an essential component of settler colonial experience but has often been neglected. The migration-centered approach requires us to examine settler colonialism from both the sending end and the receiving end of settler migration. Existing literature of settler colonialism has provided rich insights from the receiving end. Scholars have explained in depth how a settler state is established and how the power structure of a settler colonial society is maintained.<sup>21</sup>

This book examines the ideas and practices of settler colonialism at both ends of settler migration, highlighting the interactions between the social and political changes in the home country and those in the host societies. It seeks to explain how the emigration of settlers was reasoned in the home country, why settlers demanded land more than anything else, and how settlers’ appropriation of the land owned by others was justified in both settler communities and the home country. I argue that Malthusian expansionism, which celebrates population growth and, in the meantime, demands extra land abroad to alleviate population pressure at home, lies at the center of the logic of settler colonialism in the modern era.

The migration-centered approach also allows me to examine the ideas and practices of settler colonialism beyond conventional boundaries. Though existing indigenous critiques have successfully problematized the very definitions of “settlers” and “migrants,” they are almost exclusively anchored in the host societies. I challenge the conceptual division between migration and settler colonialism from both ends of settler migration. Through the prism of Malthusian expansionism, this book shows that Japanese migration campaigns to the Americas and Hawai‘i, territories of other sovereign states, were not only closely connected with the empire’s expansion in Asia but also propelled by settler colonial ambitions in Japan’s home archipelago.

3; Dean Itsuji Saranillio, “Why Asian Settler Colonialism Matters: A Thought Piece on Critiques, Debates, and Indigenous Difference,” *Settler Colonial Studies* 3, nos. 3–4 (2013): 287; Shu-mei Shih, “Theory, Asia and the Sinophone,” *Postcolonial Studies* 13, no. 4 (2010): 478; Katsuya Hirano, Lorenzo Veracini, and Toulouse-Antonin Roy, “Vanishing Natives and Taiwan’s Settler-Colonial Unconsciousness,” *Critical Asian Studies* 50, no. 2 (2018): 196–218.

<sup>21</sup> Patrick Wolfe, “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native,” *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, no. 4 (December 2006): 387–409; Wolfe, *Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology*; James Belich, *Replenishing the Earth: The Settler Revolution and the Rise of the Anglo-World, 1783–1939* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); Lorenzo Veracini, *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); Lorenzo Veracini, *The Settler Colonial Present* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015).