

NODE

NEW AND OLD
DIVERSITIES
EXCHANGE

UK | JAPAN

Migration to and from Japan and Great Britain to 1945

Hidetaka Hirota, Nando Sigona and Nobuko
Nagai

IRIS WORKING PAPER SERIES, No. 33/2019

IRiS Working Paper Series

The Institute for Research into Superdiversity (IRiS) Working Paper Series is intended to aid the rapid distribution of work in progress, research findings and special lectures by researchers and associates of the Institute. Papers aim to stimulate discussion among scholars, policymakers and practitioners and will address a range of topics including issues surrounding population dynamics, security, cohesion and integration, identity, global networks, rights and citizenship, diasporic and transnational activities, service delivery, wellbeing, social exclusion and the opportunities which superdiverse societies offer to support economic recovery.

The IRiS WP Series is edited by Professor Nando Sigona and Dr Aleksandra Kazlowska at the Institute for Research into Superdiversity, University of Birmingham. We welcome proposals for Working Papers from researchers, policymakers and practitioners; for queries and proposals, please contact: n.sigona@bham.ac.uk. All papers are peer-reviewed before publication.

The opinions expressed in the papers are solely those of the author/s. They should not be attributed to the project funders or the Institute for Research into Superdiversity, the School of Social Policy or the University of Birmingham.



Institute for Research into Superdiversity
University of Birmingham
Edgbaston
B15 2TT
Birmingham UK
www.birmingham.ac.uk/iris

Migration to and from Japan and Great Britain to 1945

Hidetaka Hirota, Nando Sigona and Nobuko Nagai

Keywords

Empire; migration; globalisation; colonialism; Japan; UK

Citation

Hirota, H., Sigona, N., Nagai, N. (2019) 'Migration to and from Japan and Great Britain to 1945', *IRiS Working Paper Series*, No. 33/2019. Birmingham: Institute for Research into Superdiversity

Acknowledgements

This Working Paper is produced as part of the *NODE UK/Japan* initiative, a collaboration between the Institute for Research into Superdiversity (IRIS) at the University of Birmingham and the Institute of Asian Migrations (IAM) at Waseda University. NODE UK|Japan is generously supported by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) and the Japan Foundation.



Contents

Acknowledgements	3
Introduction	5
Mobility	6
When the 'closed country' opened up: Japan after the Meiji Restoration	6
Mobility within the British Empire	8
Settlement: Legal Conditions and Social Milieu	9
Japan	9
Settling in the British Isles	11
Conclusions and Questions	13

Introduction

Patterns of migration to and from Japan and the United Kingdom up to the end of World War II were largely shaped by the economic, political, and legal effects of colonialism, imperial expansion and retraction, and geopolitical adjustments and frictions linked to them. Often, but not exclusively, they occurred within the territorial boundaries of the empire and would in current parlance fall under the internal migration rubric. The expansion of the Japanese Empire in East Asia brought about the immigration of Koreans into mainland Japan, while stimulating the emigration of the Japanese to the empire's overseas territories as settlers and colonial officials. Similarly, British colonial wars and the administration of colonies and the slave trade brought about the mobility of colonial subjects within the vast territory controlled by the British crown, the forced movements of millions of Africans across the Atlantic and the emigration of Britons as settlers, military personnel, administrators and merchants.

The impoverishment of the rural population of Japan as result of the Meiji Restoration provoked the trans-Pacific migration of Japanese labourers. Migrants first headed for Hawaii to work on sugar plantations. But, as the United States pursued its colonialism and annexed Hawaii at the turn of the twentieth century, North America emerged as the major destination for Japanese migrants, many of whom first landed in Hawaii and continued their journey to the mainland United States. As the US government tightened the restriction of immigration from Asia, the direction of Japanese migration shifted to South American countries, such as Brazil and Peru.

While the nineteenth century saw growing waves of Asian migration to the Americas, also from the British islands, 7.5 million Britons (including Irish) moved to the United States and Canada. Later in life, some returned to Britain, particularly Scottish emigrants¹.

In Britain the war efforts led to a major restructuring of mobility not only due to the extensive involvement of colonial subjects in multiple war fronts with huge sacrifice of lives, but also due to the redrawing of borders, the forced movements of populations within the Empire and the scarcity of workforce available in Britain due to military conscription. Following the end of the war, the decolonization process further transformed the movement of people within the territory of the by then shrinking Empire.

The combination of empire-building and migration is complex and escapes simple analysis. However, according to Patrick Manning², it 'set the scene for the divisions and conflicts of the twentieth century' and in the process contributed to creating the geopolitical categories of East, West, North and South.

Imperial geopolitics shaped migration patterns and movements also during the decades of decolonisation and informed the transnational networks and cross-cultural borrowings 'that sustained the forces of anti-colonial nationalism, insurgency, and popular protest'³.

¹ Michael H. Fisher (2014) *Migration: A world history*, Oxford: OUP.

² Patrick Manning (2005) *Migration in the world history*. Routledge, 154.

³ Martin Thomas and Andrew Thompson (2014) 'Empire and Globalisation: from 'High Imperialism' to Decolonisation', *The International History Review*, 36 (1): 142.

Mobility

When the 'closed country' opened up: Japan after the Meiji Restoration

Migration to and from Japan was long restricted under the “closed country” (*sakoku*) edicts placed by the Tokugawa government during the 1630s. After the political revolution in 1868 known as the Meiji Restoration, the new government promoted overseas colonial expansion through territorial acquisition as part of the policy for modernizing the nation. This colonialist pursuit stimulated mass migration to and from Japan. After Japan acquired the right to colonize Taiwan as a result of the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-1895, for example, a large number of Japanese civilians and military men migrated to Taiwan. By 1932, about a million Japanese lived in the empire’s overseas colonies, including Taiwan, Karafuto, and Korea, and about 820,000 Japanese lived in the quasi-colony of Manchukuo in 1940.⁴

Japanese colonialism also provoked the migration of non-Japanese into Japan, especially after the annexation of Korea in 1910. Japanese colonial rule brought about the extensive impoverishment of the Korean population through heavy rents for land use, the diminishment of non-agricultural employment opportunities, and the heavy imposition of exports. While the increasingly gloomy economic prospects pressured Koreans, the very colonialism that created the situation allowed them to migrate to Japan as subjects of the Japanese Empire. On the Japanese side, the demand for Korean labour in the country’ shipbuilding, iron and steel, and mining industries expanded shortly after the annexation as Japan entered into World War I.⁵

Domestic impoverishment, freedom of movement within the empire, and labour demand in Japan resulted in the migration of a growing number of Koreans to Japan. The development of the system of labour recruitment in Korea that provided labour force to Japanese firms facilitated this process. In 1911, there were only about 2,500 Koreans living in Japan. By 1938, however, approximately 800,000 Koreans resided in the country, accounting for over one percent of the population. The majority of these migrants were labourers, while students made up a growing minority. In 1928, for example, manual labourers accounted for over 70 percent of Korean residents in Japan. Initially men were disproportionately represented in Korean migrants. As the migrants settled in Japan as long-term residents rather than short-time sojourners and established households, however, Korean women increasingly migrated to Japan for about 40 percent of the Korean population in Japan by 1937. During the Asia-Pacific War, Korean migrants included those who were forcibly conscripted to labour in Japan through coercion. At the end of the Japanese Empire in 1945, the number of Korean residents in Japan reached about 2.1 million. Besides Koreans, a total of 60,000 Chinese labourers were brought from China and Taiwan to Japan during the war.⁶

⁴ Lori Watt, *When Empire Comes Home: Repatriation and Reintegration in Postwar Japan* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009), 20-34; Tessa Morris-Suzuki, “Migrants, Subjects, Citizens: Comparative Perspectives on Nationality in the Prewar Japanese Empire,” *Asia-Pacific Journal: Japan Focus* 6, no. 8 (August 2008): 2.

⁵ Michael Weiner, *Race and Migration in Imperial Japan* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 45-63, 66, 126, 146-148.

⁶ Morris-Suzuki, “Migrants, Subjects, Citizens,” 2-3; Tessa Morris-Suzuki, *Borderline Japan: Foreigners and Frontier Controls in the Postwar Era* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010); 37-41.

While non-Japanese people immigrated to Japan, emigration of the Japanese to independent states in the Pacific and the Western Hemisphere, especially the United States, became an established trend in the late nineteenth century.

After the Meiji Restoration, the Japanese government's policy for promoting the rapid modernization and industrialization of the nation with high taxes brought about serious economic distress among the rural population of Japan, especially its southwestern prefectures, such as Kumamoto, Hiroshima, and Yamaguchi. As prospects for farmers seemed bleak, those in the southwestern prefectures found overseas emigration an attractive way to escape rural poverty and hopefully accumulate new fortunes. Beginning in 1884, Japanese people migrated to the Kingdom of Hawaii as contract labourers under the agreement between the Japanese and Hawaiian governments, with the passages paid for by the Hawaiian government and the pledge to work on sugar plantations in Hawaii for three years. In the next decade, about 30,000 Japanese migrated to Hawaii.

During the 1890s, however, driven by the rumours and news of high wages, Japanese migrants increasingly headed for North America, especially the United States, although Hawaii remained the major destination for the Japanese. Many went to the Canadian province of British Columbia, but these migrants often continued their journey to the United States shortly after landing in Canadian ports, such as Victoria and Vancouver. Some Japanese managed to cross the Pacific as free labourers with their own savings or by borrowing money from relatives or friends, but many others migrated as contract workers through Japanese private emigration companies which made profit by recruiting migrant labourers, arranging their transportation, and providing them to farming, mining, or construction firms in North America needing cheap foreign labour. As the United States annexed Hawaii in 1898, many Japanese migrated to the islands with the intention of eventually migrating to the mainland United States. In this sense, US colonialism facilitated Japanese migration to the United States. At the turn of the twentieth century, Japanese migration was overwhelming male. Over the course of the first half of the century, however, a growing number of women migrated, often as 'picture brides,' accounting for over 40 percent of the Japanese population in the United States by 1940.⁷

Japanese migration to the United States coincided with the largest wave of European migration to the nation up to that point. As a result, Japanese migration remained proportionally small compared to the inflow from Europe. Even in 1907, which marked the heaviest year of immigration from Japan, the Japanese accounted for only 2.4 percent of all immigrants admitted to the United States. The proportion of the Japanese in the total US population was less than 0.1 percent.⁸

As the US government tightened restrictions on immigration and anti-Japanese sentiment in North America intensified in the early twentieth century, the direction of Japanese emigration shifted from North America to South American countries such as Brazil and Peru, where Japanese immigration was encouraged to fill the shortage of plantation labour. Brazil ended up becoming the second most popular destination next to Hawaii (230,000) for Japanese emigrants before the Asia-Pacific War. More

⁷ Yuji Ichioka, *The Issei: The World of the First Generation Japanese Immigrants, 1885-1924* (New York: Free Press, 1988), 40-56; Roger Daniels, *Asian America: Chinese and Japanese in the United States since 1850* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1988), 100-154; Ronald Takaki, *Strangers from a Different Shore: A History of Asian Americans*, Updated and Revised Edition (New York: Back Bay Books, 1998), 43-46; Sucheng Chan, *Asian Americans: An Interpretive History* (Boston: Twayne, 1991), 8-12; Eiichiro Azuma, *Between Two Empires: Race, History, and Transnationalism in Japanese America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 17-31.

⁸ Daniels, *Asian America*, 115.

Japanese went to Brazil (190,000) than the United States (107,000). Between the 1860s and 1941, approximately one million Japanese emigrated to the countries which were not Japanese territories.

Mobility within the British Empire

Historically, empires profoundly altered the way in which those who inhabited the lands over which these powers ruled envisioned their societies, gauged political possibilities, and marked out trade routes⁹. Bound and free British emigrants settled on every available continent under the auspices of the British Crown. Moving subordinated religious, social and ethno-cultural groups within the territory of the Empire had long been used by the British rulers as a strategy for undermining national and regional identities, and fragment and weaken resistance to the British rule.

In the eighteenth and part of nineteenth centuries English slave traders were among the most active in West Africa and together with other European slave traders (particularly Portuguese and Spanish) forced millions of enslaved people to emigrate from this region to the Americas. The so-called *Middle Passage* was the middle leg of a triangular trade route that started in Britain – with London, Bristol and Liverpool as the main hubs for slave merchants. The first section (the *Outward Passage*) was from Europe to Africa and involved the transportation of goods to use in exchange for slaves. Then came the *Middle Passage*, and the *Return Passage* was the final journey from the Americas to Europe. Slave merchants made large profits by carrying as many slaves as possible across the Atlantic to sell at auction.

Places like Bunce Island a few miles upriver from Freetown in Sierra Leone became the outposts of the slave trade. Around forty of such places, often located on small and strategically positioned islands, were built and fortified along the West Africa coast between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. For historian David Olusoga, ‘it was a proto-industrial production line, along which captive Africans were bought and sold, sorted, processed, warehoused and literally branded.’¹⁰ It was run by British companies, built and furnished with bricks and other material that came from Britain on British ships, and managed by men born in the British Isles. The profit from the trades largely travelled back to investors based in England.

Packed slave ships, on average each slave was allocated less than a square meter, usually took between six and eleven weeks to complete the voyage. Until the beginning of the nineteenth century, they sailed under the protection of the Royal Navy. The conditions on board were so extreme that many enslaved Africans didn’t survive the crossing.

The abolitionist movement in Britain gained momentum towards the end of the eighteenth centuries. At the time, following the American Revolution, many freed or escaped slaves moved to London. One of them was Olaudah Equiano, who became a public speaker and author and was later appointed by the British government on the committee that coordinated the emigration of more than 400 former African slaves to start the colony of Sierra Leone in West Africa.

In the centuries prior to 1914, common law defined ‘British subjects’ by reference to their allegiance to the Crown. If a person was born in the Crown’s ‘dominions and allegiance’ then the person was born a British subject. In common law, the ‘dominions’ referred to all the territories of the British Empire

⁹ F. Cooper and J. Burbank, *Empires in World History: Power and the Politics of Difference* (Princeton, 2009)

¹⁰ David Olusoga (2016) *Black and British: A forgotten history*, Macmillan, 2.

save for certain protected places. All British subjects across the Empire had the same status. They could also then, at least in law and in theory, freely move from one part of the Empire to another.

When the common law concept of a British subject was first codified, in the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act 1914, the language and basis of subject status was explicitly preserved.

Few British subjects chose to make use of their hypothetical rights at that time. Even the authorities in the United Kingdom seem not to have understood the legal situation because there are examples of attempts to forestall and prevent movement into the UK by some colonial British subjects.¹¹

Settlement: Legal Conditions and Social Milieu

Japan

As labourers, both Korean migrants in Japan and Japanese migrants in the United States started out in the bottom of the economic ladder. Both groups also met various kinds of hardship and discrimination, but in different ways. Koreans' experiences were shaped by their subordinate status as subjects of the Japanese Empire, whereas the Japanese in the United States became targets of racism and nativism as non-white foreigners.

Korean labourers were among the most vulnerable—most exploited and least protected—group in the working-class population in Japan. At factories and mines, considered disposable labour by employers, Koreans were assigned hazardous jobs with few safety measures and long working hours. Not surprisingly, Koreans tended to receive lower wages than the Japanese. In 1930, for example, the average wage of Japanese workers in the glass-making industry was 2.14 yen per day, whereas the Korean counterpart was just 1.22 yen per day. The migratory nature of their employment prevented Korean workers from forming effective unions. The Japanese government's consistent watch out for potentially subversive activities of the empire's subjects, and their alienation from Japanese trade unions, enhanced the vulnerability of Korean migrants in Japan.¹²

Economic marginalization was closely associated with anti-Korean bigotry and discrimination. The Japanese stereotyped Koreans as naturally suited for dirty, exhausting manual work which furthered their exploitation, while the alleged laziness of Koreans provoked Japanese hostility to them. Excluded from the normal housing market, Koreans often had to reside in overcrowded boarding houses with poor ventilation and sewage facilities, or even worse, in temporary shelters built on industrial wasteland. The undesirable living conditions of Korean residents also created the image that they were moral and public health threats.¹³

Within the Japanese Empire, colonial subjects were legally considered 'Japanese,' but this hardly meant that Koreans possessed the same rights as the colonizers. While the nationality law created some legal unity between colonizers and the colonized, the family registration (*koseki*) system of the Japanese Empire drew important distinctions. All people in the empire were entered into a family register, which recorded each person's birth and death information, marital status, and residence. Each of Japan's overseas colonies had its own family registration system. Koreans and Japanese, in

¹¹ <https://www.runnymedetrust.org/blog/british-citizenship-and-the-windrush-generation>

¹² Weiner, *Race and Migration in Imperial Japan*, 59-63, 115.

¹³ Weiner, *Race and Migration in Imperial Japan*, 140-145.

other words, were recorded in different registration systems, possessing different legal statuses. This arrangement created a kind of secondary membership for colonial subjects within the broader framework of Japanese nationality, allowing local Japanese authorities to treat their subjects and the Japanese differently in ways that discriminated against the former.¹⁴

Japanese migrants in North America encountered hardship that largely stemmed from their non-white racial status. In both Canada and the United States, the arrival of Japanese labourers and their settlement provoked antagonism from white residents, who feared that Japanese labourers would lower the wage standards in the local job market and even steal employment from whites by working for starvation wages. Anti-Asian stereotypes that they were inferior, docile, and treacherous, as well as that Japanese men were sexual threats to white women, reinforced anti-Japanese sentiment. Anti-Japanese sentiment sometimes escalated to physical violence against. In 1907, the Japanese became the targets of anti-Asian riots in San Francisco and Vancouver.¹⁵

The precarious position of the Japanese in the United States in part arose from their legal status. The US naturalization law limited the privilege to become citizens to whites and blacks, making Asians permanent aliens. (Native-born children of Asian immigrants were US citizens under the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution.) In California, the Alien Land Law of 1913 prohibited the ownership of agricultural land by non-naturalizable immigrants, a measure practically targeted against the Japanese.¹⁶

Anti-Japanese sentiment crystallized into advocacy for the restriction of Japanese immigration. By the time the Japanese arrived in America in great numbers, the US federal government had suspended the immigration of Chinese labourers. Opponents of Japanese immigration called for the extension of the policy to the Japanese. In Canada, the British Columbia government attempted to restrict Japanese immigration through provincial legislation.

These legislative attempts, however, had to take into account also the raising military and political power of Japan in the Pacific. The US government hesitated to offend Japan by passing immigration legislation expressly targeted against the Japanese. In Canada, the anti-Japanese provincial laws were invalidated because they conflicted with the British Empire's policy for maintaining friendly relationships with Japan as an ally. Nevertheless, both US and Canadian governments were able to reach so-called gentlemen's agreements in 1907 and 1908 with the Japanese government, under which the Japanese government voluntarily stopped issuing passports to labourers so that they could not migrate to North America. On the Japanese side, the gentlemen's agreements were part of the imperial government's diplomatic agenda to raise Japan's international prestige by mitigating hostility to 'uncivilized' Japanese labourers in North America.

Although not categorically excluding the Japanese, the US government further pursued the restriction of Japanese immigration with general immigration legislation that prohibited the landing in the US of undesirable groups of foreigners, such as paupers and contract labourers. Ultimately, Japanese immigration to the United States was virtually suspended with the Johnson-Reed Act of 1924, which

¹⁴ Tessa Morris-Suzuki, *Borderline Japan: Foreigners and Frontier Controls in the Postwar-Era* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 41-45; Morris-Suzuki, "Migrants, Subjects, Citizens," 6.

¹⁵ Erika Lee, *The Making of Asian America: A History* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2015), 109-136.

¹⁶ Daniels, *Asian America*, 138-144.

prohibited the entry of people ineligible for naturalization, namely Asians. The policy was not lifted until the 1950s.¹⁷

Settling in the British Isles

Aside from the liberated slaves who managed to reach Britain at the time of the abolitionist movement and in the decades in which the British Empire came to become the main champion of the anti-slavery crusade, Britain also received refugees from mainland Europe. Discussed herein are the two old and large exile groups, the Huguenots and the Jews.

The Huguenots are French Protestants who fled persecution from the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries. During 1680 to 1710, when French authority intensified religious discrimination, approximately 200,000 Huguenots fled the country, which is known as one of the largest mass migrations in Modern Europe¹⁸; it is assumed that Britain received around 40,000 of them, mainly settling in London but subsequently also in other cities across southern England.¹⁹ The proclamation of Charles II in 1680 stating that Britain would accept Huguenot refugees, and, together with the country's linguistic and economic traits, attracted a large number of Huguenots.

These Huguenots brought a range of skills. One of the most prominent was textile manufacturing, notably silk production. Some Huguenots took up other occupations such as goldsmiths, clockmakers, tailors and furniture-makers. Their professions and commitment contributed to development of British industry as well as its economy, leading to Huguenots being called 'profitable strangers'.²⁰

However, the Huguenots were also viewed negatively. The Protestant Church of England was indeed cautious about the possibility that Huguenots' might establish Calvinism in Britain.²¹ Whilst the Huguenots stood out as a distinct migrant group who would preserve own language, attire, culture, occupation and religion, since the middle of the eighteenth century, such dynamics became weaker. Descendants of the Huguenot migrants were gradually assimilated into British society through linguistic and religious shifts, while maintaining their cultural identity to a certain degree.²²

Jewish migrants also moved to Britain at various points in history, particularly since the seventeenth century when the Jews were readmitted for settlement and were able to migrate to the country for the first time in 360 years since their expulsion in 1290. The readmission resulted from cries for

¹⁷ On the development of immigration control in the United States and Canada, see Patricia E. Roy, *A White Man's Province: British Columbia Politicians and Chinese and Japanese Immigrants, 1858-1914* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1989); Roger Daniels, *Guarding the Gold Door: American Immigration Policy and Immigrants since 1882* (New York: Hill and Wang, 2004).

¹⁸ Van Ruymbeke, B. 'Minority Survival: The Huguenot Paradigm in France and the Diaspora', in Van Ruymbeke, R. and Sparks, R. J. *Memory and Identity: The Huguenots in France and the Atlantic Diaspora* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2003), 1-25.

¹⁹ Gwynn, R. *Huguenot Heritage: the History and Contribution of the Huguenots in Britain* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985), 24.

²⁰ Kershen, A. J. *Strangers, Aliens and Asians: Huguenots, Jews and Bangladeshis in Spitalfields 1660-2000* (London: Routledge, 2005), 28.

²¹ Ibid.

²² Parker, G. 'Huguenot Identity in Post-Medieval London', *Assemblage* 10 (2009), 7-15; Lachenicht, S. 'Huguenot Immigrants and the Formation of National Identities, 1548-1787', *The Historical Journal*, 50:2 (2007), 309-331.

religious tolerance as well as the economic need for Jewish presence in Britain.²³ The Jewish population slowly yet steadily expanded, firstly primarily in London but also in some cities and towns in the north of England. They nonetheless suffered also from episodes of violent antagonism against foreigners. While some of them started to gain political and economic prominence in society, exclusion of the Jews had continued in constitutional, legal, social, economic and religious terms.

Being forbidden to run retail shops, they were committed to trade and wholesale, which hugely benefited the British economy.²⁴ Gradually the Jews became acknowledged as a crucial part of British society, especially in economy, finance and politics, leading up to the emancipation in 1858, when the Jews gained the equal status as other British.

The Jewish community in Britain again grew drastically after those from Russian Poland (the Tsar's empire) started to exile from persecution. By the end of the nineteenth century, it is estimated that around 60,000 Jewish people were settled in Britain, and, by 1914, the number jumped to 300,000, including those who had been born in Britain. London had hosted more than half of the Jewish population, with a concentration in East End.²⁵

The influx of the Jews as a result increased the social anxiety within the national population as well as within the middle class Anglo-Jewish migrant group who had already been well established and assimilated into the larger society. The 'newcomer' East European Jewish migrants, who maintained strong cultural and religious traditions, ignited the anti-Semitic atmosphere that regarded them as outsiders who jeopardised domestic employment and housing opportunities.

As such, the demand for immigration control was provoked in the late 1880s, and led to the enactment of the 1905 Aliens Act, which shifted the course of immigration legislation of Great Britain inasmuch as immigration became a national political issue.²⁶ Contrary to the traditional laissez-faire approach, the Act defined those who were non-British subjects as aliens and further imposed controls upon 'undesirable immigrants,' inexplicitly aiming at Jews from East Europe. It precluded those who could not show they were self-sustaining from entering or settling in the country and stated that aliens could be expelled from Britain under certain conditions without trial or appeal.

Based on the 1905 Act, the government's border control was strengthened amid the tumult of the First World War, represented by legislations in 1914 and 1919, which targeted the Austrians, Germans, and Russian Jews. The 1914 Aliens Restriction Act authorized the government to prohibit, deport, and restrict pace of residence and travelling of aliens in the name of national security. However, the government continued and extended emergency powers even after the war; the 1919 Aliens Restriction (Amendment) Act repealed the 1905 Act and added some property and employment restrictions for aliens. Under the Act, the 1920 Aliens Order required aliens to register their residence and obtain a work permit from the Ministry of Labour.

Another notable piece of legislation was the 1914 British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act. Although the concept of British citizenship concerning British subjects from overseas territories had not been

²³ Roth C. *A History of the Jews in England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1964); Pollins H. *Economic History of the Jews in England* (London: Associated University Presses, 1982).

²⁴ Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*; Pollins, *Economic History of the Jews in England*.

²⁵ Solomos, J., *Race and Racism in Contemporary Britain* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Education, 1989), 32; Gartner, L. P., *The Jewish Immigrant in England 1870-1914* (London: Simon Publications, 1973), 30; Holmes, C., *John Bull's Island: Immigration and British Society, 1871-1971* (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1988), 26.

²⁶ Garrard, J. A., *The English and Immigration 1880-1910* (London: Oxford University Press, 1971).

completely articulated until 1981, the Act was an attempt to uniform nationality provision across the British Empire to establish a ‘common citizenship code’.²⁷ The Act, retaining *jus soli* (right of the soil) system, deemed those who were born within the territory as ‘natural-born British subjects’ and therefore provided them with unrestricted rights to enter.

The Jewish population within Britain was further stratified when largely middle class Jewish refugees escaping from the Nazis arrived at the country in the 1930s. Despite an enormous number of Jewish refugees escaping from the Nazi anti-Semitism, both public and official response to them was reluctant, and only few Jews managed to enter Britain. By 1945, it is estimated about 220,000 Jews resided in Britain.

Moreover, the first half of the twentieth century had also seen a series of legislations against other migrant groups, mainly seamen and stokers from a wide range of regions including the Caribbean, West Africa, India, China and the Middle East. They had already established communities in port cities, notably, Cardiff, Liverpool and London by the end of the nineteenth century.

After WWI, anti-immigrant sentiments, particularly targeted at non-white migrant communities, were further exacerbated by the ailing economy and intensified competition on job and housing markets²⁸.

Under the 1920 Aliens Order, although those seamen were predominantly British subjects, they were treated as aliens only because of the colour of their skin and were urged to show a proof of being British subjects, which not many of them possessed at that time. Furthermore, the 1925 Special Restrictions (Coloured Alien Seamen) Order, developed from the 1920 Order, and resulted in around 7,500 non-white seamen registered with the police. Black seamen who were British subjects were also forced by authorities to register as aliens, exposing them to the risk of being deported. National immigration control, since its shift from a *laissez-fair* approach in the beginning of the twentieth century, has tended to target particular migrant groups from time to time.

Conclusions and Questions

Migration to and from Japan to 1945—including the patterns of migration and the legal status of the migrants—was shaped by colonialism and imperial politics. A few suggestions on future research on the history of migration to and from Japan can be made. First, migration within the Japanese Empire and migration beyond the limit of the empire tend to be studied separately. Future research should make more efforts toward an integrated analysis of colonization, movement within the empire, and migration beyond the boundary of the empire. Second, social and legal comparison of the experiences of migrants who were colonial subjects, such as Koreans in the Japanese Empire and Indians in the British Empire, should be encouraged. Third, more attention should be paid to how the framework of empire shaped Japanese migrants’ experiences even after they migrated beyond the limits of the Japanese Empire, a line of inquiry suggested by historian Eiichiro Azuma, who examined how Japanese

²⁷ Layton-Henry, Z., ‘Patterns of privilege: citizenship rights in Britain’, in Kondo, A. (ed.) *Citizenship in a Global World: Comparing Citizenship Rights for Aliens* (Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001), 116-135.

²⁸ Holmes, *John Bull’s Island: Immigration and British Society, 1871-1971*; Solomos, *Race and Racism in Contemporary Britain*; Spencer, I. R. G., *British Immigration Policy since 1939: The Making of Multi-racial Britain* (London: Routledge, 1997); Visram, R., Ayahs, *Lascars and Princes: The Story of Indians in Britain 1700-1947* (Oxfordshire: Routledge, 2015).

migrants lived in a transnational space between the Japanese and US empires, even if they physically resided in the United States.

The UK perspective on migration history also raises some points. First, although a number of religious migrant groups had settled in the UK, research should not regard them as homogeneous but take into account their internal diversity and other attributes. Second, there should be more comprehensive studies on these migrants, including colonial subjects, that explore whether there were any interactions among different migrant groups that led to a formation of general identity as migrants along with the ideological expectation of colonialism. Finally, it is important to examine from the comparative perspective the process through which the historical flow of colonialism in the UK has shifted and possibly influenced other empire states such as Japan. Studying migration to and from Japan and Great Britain can be a significant step to advancing these lines of research and developing a better understanding the complex picture of migration and diversity.