
Kyoto University
Economic Review

MEMOIRS OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS
IN
THE IMPERIAL UNIVERSITY OF KYOTO

VOLUME II 1927

PUBLISHED BY THE DEPARTMENT
OF ECONOMICS IN
THE IMPERIAL UNIVERSITY OF KYOTO

THE PRINCIPLES OF EMIGRATION POLICY

Few questions are more important, in connection with the problem of the population of a country, than those about immigration, emigration, or colonisation. It is the one question which becomes an issue in all countries and at all times and challenges the thoughtful attention of scholars and statesmen. And yet, no other question seems to be less adequately understood by the general public, despite the fact that it is discussed very widely. The question may be discussed from two entirely different points of view, even when it is taken up in connection with the solution of the population problem. It may be discussed, on the one hand, by those who would invite immigrants into their country in order to increase their population thereby to develop their natural resources. The question may be discussed, on the other hand, by those who hold a directly contrary opinion by those who would send part of the population to foreign countries because of over-population; Italy and our own country may be cited as examples. Thus, the same problem may be discussed by immigrant and emigrant countries having different objectives, purposes, and arriving at different conclusions. For this reason, the most vital problem in immigration is to harmonise, as far as possible, these two points of view so that the object of the shifting of people may be reached with a maximum satisfaction to all concerned.

In studying the overseas development of a nation, it is imperative that distinction should be made between colonisation and emigration, although such distinction is usually neglected by laymen. But for the scholars who would investigate the essential nature of the overseas development

of a country, the distinction in question is paramount. When the nationals of a country go to a territory which is under the sovereignty of their own country, they are called colonists; when they go to a country which is under the sovereignty of another country, they are known as emigrants to that country. Thus, the distinction is due, not to the essential nature of the country to which they belong, but to the political relations of their own country with the country to which they have migrated. This distinction becomes clear when one considers the colonial history of nations. I have endeavored to make this clear in my numerous writings especially in my book "A Study in Colonial Policies". I shall not, therefore, repeat my argument here. I shall only point to the fact that this distinction is often neglected by ordinary people. The main object of the present article is to discuss what I deem the principles of emigration policies—the principles concerning the movement of people from one sovereign state into another.

Of the numerous circumstances, causes and motives underlying the emigration of peoples in the history of mankind, the following are the more important ones:

(1). The desire to overcome their dissatisfaction and discontent at the political and social systems of their own country.

(2). Religious oppression, or their desire to enjoy freedom of religious convictions.

(3). The desire of a people in a comparatively inferior condition to advance their economic status.

In the early part of modern times, the first and second causes were predominant to the exclusion of the third, which, however, has become all important in more recent years. When the number of the population of a country is small compared with the area of the land, or when the wealth of a country is ample to support its people, there is very little reason for an overseas development of such a people; and their migration is due to their discontent with their group life, especially in its political, social or religious phases.

Such migration has not ceased even in an age when economic reasons have become predominant, as at the present. Examples may be cited of the people of Alsace-Lorraine and the Koreans. The former went over to the American Continent because of their discontent with the German rule which was extended over to Alsace-Lorraine as a result of the Franco-Prussian war; some of the latter people migrated to Manchuria and Mongolia rather than remain in Korea after it was annexed to the Japanese Empire. Those Communists, Nihilists and Anarchists who depart for foreign countries to seek a shelter belong to the first category, while the emigration of the Puritans to America and that of the Jews in Russia before the Russian revolution belong to the second category. The number of those falling under the first and second categories is far smaller than of those who seek a new land because of economic reasons. Nor are the effects of the migration of the former upon both the immigrant and emigrant countries so great as those of economic immigration, inasmuch as their main object is to free themselves from the yoke of the political, social or religious perplexities of their native land, their presence in the new land causes no unrest to the people with whom they come into contact. True, Communists, Nihilists and Anarchists are regarded with much apprehension by the people of the immigrant country, but their entry is being strictly circumscribed; nor is their number sufficiently great to disturb the general peace of the country they enter.

On the other hand, the number of those who migrate to foreign countries because of economic reasons is predominant at present and their effects upon both the emigrant and immigrant countries are very great. The following are the more important effects upon the emigrant country:

- (1). Social effects (in case the number of emigrants is sufficiently great):
 - (a). Assist in the regulating of an over-population.
 - (b). Consequently prevent the lowering of the standard of living of the people.

(c). Lessen the necessity of charity and other relief enterprises.

(d). Lessen the number of crimes.

(e). Prevent the demoralising tendency of an increase in population.

(2). Industrial and economic effects :

(a). Do away with a cut-throat competition in the labour market.

(b). Maintain the wage and othe conditions of labour.

(c). Soften the difficulty of the unemployment problem.

(d). Create a new economic relation between the emigrant and immigrant countries.

(e). Open up a new opportunity for either a direct or indirect convenience in the trade or finance of the country.

(3). Political and religious effects :

(a). Afford an outlet for those entertaining discontent with the politics or the religion of the country.

(b). Thereby forestall political or religious contentions.

It must be noted, however, that emigration is not without losses to the country. The immigrants who are welcomed by an immigrant country are those who have strong bodies and able to endure hard labour, possess proper intelligence and character, able to dwell in harmony with the people of their new home, and regard the new land as a place of security for them and a final rest. But it is precisely such persons that are most useful to their own native land. It cannot be overemphasised that the industrial prosperity or decline of a country depends upon such citizens. Their departure for a foreign country, therefore, means a double loss to the emigrant country. On the one hand, a great expenditure has been made in order to bring up and educate those persons until they have become useful citizens, and their country will lose the money which has been spent in their subsistence and education. On the other hand, the industry of the country which ought to be developed by these people will remain rudimentary. The immigrant country, on the contrary, is enabled to import those useful

people without spending a penny for their early subsistence and education. Therefore, there are those who believe it is unwise for a state to encourage such persons to emigrate to foreign countries. Such an argument was put forth in Germany in and after the middle of the last century, when there was much fever of emigration. Some calculated the amount of money Germany spent in bringing up and educating an emigrant up to his adult age, in order to show what enormous sums Germany was losing through the emigration of her nationals.

Although such an argument contains some measure of truth, the fact remains that in a country which is overpopulated or whose wealth is not sufficient to support its inhabitants, all useful citizens cannot expect to develop their individual capacities, due to the extreme difficulty of securing food and employment. If they are to develop their efficiency, they must seek a place where they can choose their proper occupations freely, and have elbow-room in which to develop. Thus, the necessity arises for emigration. Emigration indeed transports useful citizens to a foreign land and emigrant countries thereby lose an enormous amount of money. But for the countries which cannot allow all of their inhabitants to live suitably within their boundaries, emigration of some of their inhabitants will prove beneficial to the countries themselves. The apparent loss by no means is unredeemable.

I have so far considered the effects of emigration upon the emigrant country. But the effects upon the immigrant country are even greater. This is why immigration questions are regarded as more important by the immigrant country than by the emigrant country. For this reason a country which sends forth emigrants must consider the effects of emigration upon the country to which they are sent, so that the desires of the latter may be respected as far as possible. Here the distinction between emigration and colonisation becomes apparent. Whereas, the kind of colonists can be determined by the mother country inasmuch as they are

sent to the place which is under her own sovereignty, in the case of emigration, the immigrant country decides as to who shall be admitted into it as possible citizens. However, the immigrant country must observe certain things in deciding the question of selecting immigrants. International comity and friendship must be scrupulously regarded in all international relations. An immigrant country must extend an equal privilege to the nationals of all countries which are of the same class. Such treatment is imperative from the standpoint of international righteousness. It is apparent then that the United States does not understand international comity, disregards international friendship and forgets international righteousness, when she refuses, as she does in reality, to apply the same quota of immigration to our nationals as to those of Europe; her act is utterly unjustifiable.

Since emigrants are sent to another sovereign state which imposes its own peculiar conditions for their entry, the emigrant country must closely study the nature of the desires and conditions of the immigrant country, and select only those emigrants who are most desirable to the latter country. Unless this be done, it is apparent that the object of emigration cannot be attained. And, although the desires and circumstances of all countries are not the same, and therefore it is impossible to make preparations to meet them, all immigrant countries must consider the following facts in connection with immigration:

(1). Some of the more important social facts:

(a). The fact that the new arrivals are not inferior to the natives in points of physical power, intelligence, and experience or skill in labour.

(b). That they are not inferior in respect of their standard of living and character.

(c). That they are willing to reside in the new abode permanently, to cast away all their race prejudice or time-worn sentiments, and to assimilate and cooperate with the natives.

(d). That they need not the assistance of charity enterprises or relief organisations, and are free from habitual crimes and mental diseases.

(2). Some of the more important industrial and economic matters :

(a). Since a great increase in the number of unskilled or low-class workers gives rise to a serious unemployment problem and thereby causes confusion in the labour market, it is imperative that proper restriction should be placed upon the inflow of such class in proportion to the degree of the wealth to be developed by their labour.

(b). Proper precautions must also be taken against the inflow of even skilled labourers whose presence in the country may cause the lowering of wages and other conditions of labour.

(c). Immigrants should cooperate as far as possible with the labour organisations of the immigrant country and should never act in such a way as might provoke the unions.

(d). Immigrants should use the money saved in the new country in the same country, instead of sending it back to the home country. (We often find that the economic value of emigrants is estimated in reference to the amount of money sent home. But such a policy is opposed by the people of an immigrant country who think the country's wealth is thereby carried out of it. This was one of the reasons for opposing a certain class of immigrants in the United States. Viewed from the standpoint of an immigrant country, it constitutes a proper ground for voicing opposition to the coming of those who would practice the method).

(3). Some of the more important political matters :

(a). It is necessary that immigrants should have a proper knowledge of the nature of the state and of the government of the country which they enter. Unless they have this, they may occasion various serious political problems. According to American experience, the political corruption and demoralization in that country are due to the lack of political consciousness on the part of new arrivals. Immigrants

usually have less intense love for the land they have adopted than the natives and their lack of political consciousness is due to their indifference regarding the political affairs of their adopted country.

(b). It is also imperative that immigrants should not be those who advocate Communism, Nihilism, Anarchism and other radical doctrines.

The country wishing to send emigrants to another sovereign country must carefully consider those facts which are regarded as important by the people of an immigrant country; unless this be done effectively its emigration policy will not prove successful.

I have set forth the principles governing emigration under prevailing international relations. Although any better principles do not seem possible in the light of past experience and existing international relations, they by any means constitute the ultimate ideals in emigration. As in any other case, there is a vast gap between ideal and reality in the problems of emigration. What I have so far set forth are those principles which are practicable under the existing international relations, because I am convinced that an impractical policy, however idealistic it may be, has very little real value.

If the nations of the world truly embrace love for humanity, sweep away their race prejudices and false ideas of racial superiority, and put into effect what the people of the West preach, namely, universal brotherhood, the solution of such problems as surplus population and emigration will be effected even under the prevailing state of affairs instead of at the distant future. Nations should be determined to recognise frankly the following truth:

The whole world should be used for all; while each group of mankind inhabits some fixed territory, it has a right to migrate to wherever it pleases. Just as God lets the sun shine and rain fall equally upon the rich as well as upon the poor, the whole world has been created by God for the benefit of all mankind, and not for the exclusive possession

of a part of humanity. In other words, the whole world should be opened up for the use of mankind as a whole. If a group of men should put up an exclusive fence around some district, prevent others from entering it, and aim to develop its natural resources neither by itself nor through others' labor, that group is truly committing a crime against the will of providence.

The United States prevents others, on the pretext of the conservation of natural resources, from entering her vast exclusive territory, and thereby is proving that her glorifications of humanism and universal brotherhood are but shams. Not content with her vast territory, she has extended the boundary line over to Hawaii, the Philippines, and the South Sea islands; and in the name of Pan-Americanism she is even extending her hand to Central and South America. Her action certainly is in direct disregard of the will of providence.

The British also have colonies and territories in Africa, the South Seas and the furthest corners of the world, the total area being so vast that they themselves are not able to develop them. They take much pride in possessing such a vast territory. France, too, is guilty of similar covetousness. Although she is worrying over a too small population, she prevents others from entering her colonial possessions in Africa and Indo-China so that it seems that it seems that she has placed fences around her possessions in order to prevent the development of their natural resources; and is totally indifferent to the necessities of over-populated countries to carry on their overseas development; not only that but she is even attempting to place an obstacle in the way of such development. Her action is perfectly unpardonable from the standpoint of the ideal humanity which she preaches.

At present it is impossible to make any alteration as regards the sovereign rights of individual states; various considerations, the dignity of a state in particular, are too powerful for the realisation of such a plain. However, the development of the natural resources of territories, especially

colonies, should be opened to all; such an open policy is not in conflict with the sovereignty or dignity of states. By allowing others to participate in the development of her own colonies a state can hope to make material use of such colonies. But exactly an opposite tendency is being manifested by nations to-day; such policies of White Australia, White Africa, Pan Bricism, and Pan Americanism have narrowed the entrances to the selfish boundary lines and heightened the walls. It is indeed a matter of congratulation that a proposal has been made for the convocation of an international conference for the purpose of solving the question of over-population; by it is clear that unless the nations of the world awaken to the fact just pointed out, it will be impossible to find a key to the solution of the problem.

If nations shut their eyes to their selfish attitude and continue to preach the brotherhood of Man, their words will be wasted, and the time will come when they will bow before the simple truth that "the whole world should be opened up for the use of mankind as a whole." If we are to be faithful to truth, we must hasten the coming of that day. Until that time comes, the principles I have endeavored to set forth in the present article must dictate the policy of the emigration.

MIONO YAMAMOTO
