

Repatriation, Settlement, “Left-behind,” and “Smuggling”: Racial Migrations in East Asia after World War II

蘭 信 三*
ARARAGI Shinzo

1. Introduction

In the summer of 1945, the Japanese Empire collapsed, and a new political order was came into being in East Asia. Communization of East Europe, as well as Asia after decolonization globally, expanded the Cold War system. In East Asia, from soon after the collapse of the Japanese Empire, conflicting relationships emerged between various groups over new governance in the area. Gradually, the tensed relationships reduced to rivalry relationships between one group with the U.S. backup and the other with communism. The area became one of the frontlines of the Cold War.

A rapid change in the political system in East Asia accompanied by social changes and civil wars brought various large scale human migrations in the area. The biggest of these was the “repatriation” of Japanese people residing in the colonies which was based on the policy of “exile” that was used to send back Germans in Eastern Europe. The repatriation policy resulted in large scale migration, with not only Japanese people as its target but also the “subjects of the former empire” who had migrated to Japan, the Japanese Empire, and its puppet kingdom of “Manchukuo.” Additionally, it even included a settlement policy of Koreans in “Manchukuo” by the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) and a repatriation policy for “Ryukyuan” from Okinawa that was also different from the one for the homeland Japanese.

Although the repatriation policies were influenced by the European policies, they were largely a mixture of CCP policy and the need to justify the control of Okinawa after the war. Additionally, there were some differences between ethnic groups in each area, and the policies were determined by political situations before and after the war, so enforcement of the policies was complicated.

Moreover, various human migrations were took place along with the repatriation in the disorder and disturbance caused by the war in East Asia. For instance, people from

Taiwan escaped or returned from “Manchukuo” to Taiwan, and the indigenous Ainu population of Karafuto repatriated to Hokkaido with the Japanese. In addition,, people migrated again, or “smuggled” into Japan again from South Korea, especially from Jeju Island as a result of the April 3 Uprising in 1948 and the breaking out of the Korean War in 1950. In East Asia, various human migrations along with repatriation and those similar to what we would see in the later period occurred.

This paper gives an account of the actual situation of human migration, especially repatriation right after World War II in East Asia and determining the factors behind it. The paper aims to reveal not only a regionally unique history of repatriation in post-war East Asia, but also highlight its relevance to global history tracing its connection to European history.

2. Confusion over a new order in East Asia

The Allied countries and the Communist forces had tense relationships over the governance of East Asia in the summer of 1945.

In the Korean peninsula, where the tensed relationships continue even until present times, North Korea was stabilized after Kim Il-sung, the leader of anti-Japan partisan, took governance under control with help from the Soviet military. However, South Korea, that was under the control of the US, remained unstable until Rhee Syngman took over administrative power with support from the US military after defeating the conservatives, supporters of the Communist Party, and supporters of democratization. The conservative attack on the civilians opposing the division of the Korean Peninsula and the US military seeking to stabilize and de-communize South Korean society resulted in the White Terror, the April 3 Uprising on Jeju Island, in which approximately 30,000 civilians were slaughtered. Subsequent to the sacrifice, the Korean Peninsula was divided with the Republic of Korea was established in August, and the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (DPRK) was established in September 1948.

Manchuria (Northeast China) was put under the control of the Soviet military. It was chaotic with the existing presence of the Chinese Nationalist Government (KMT), Chinese Communist Party (CCP), and several bandits. After the spring of 1946, when the Soviet military withdrew, the KMT and the CCP restarted the civil war. The Chinese

Communist Party unpredictably defeated the Chinese Nationalist Government, and the People's Republic of China was established on October 1, 1949, while the KMT withdrew to Taiwan.

The KMT took over Taiwan in October 1945, and it was expected that the political system would be stable since the nation became a part of becoming China again. However, the citizens were expecting democratization and influenced by the civil war in mainland China clashed with the conservative KMT. In the spring of 1947, KMT caused white terrorism in the form of the "February 28 Uprising" to suppress the Taiwanese and slaughtered more than 20,000 people. After losing the civil war, KMT retained control of Taiwan until 1987 amidst tense relationships with China.

In the summer of 1948, the Korean peninsula was divided into north and south Korea, and in the autumn of 1949, "Two Chinas" with CCM's China and KMT's Taiwan were established, which brought Cold War to East Asia with liberalism confronting communism. In June 1950, North Korea attacked South Korea going beyond the 38th parallel north, and the Korean War broke out. The United Nations Force, mainly the US army, supported South Korea and China joined the war on the side of North Korea, which resulted in a terrifying war that was suspended in 1953.

After the collapse of the Japanese Empire, present day borderlines and nation-states in East Asia were established in 1953, and thereafter confirmed by the Cold War. In the 21st century, 70 years after World War II, "Two Chinas" and "the divided Korea" are still major issues in East Asia.

3. Human migration after the collapse of the Japanese Empire

(1) Human migrations around/in the Japanese Empire before WWII

There were four kinds of human migration around the pre-war Japanese Empire: (a) from Japan to the American and Asian continent, (b) from the home islands to the colonies and the sphere of influence (overseas area), (c) from overseas areas to the home islands, and (d) between overseas areas.

In this paper, I mainly focus on aspects of (b) the employment of Japanese people in the colonies and (c) the migration and employment of Koreans coming into Osaka city, especially in the 1920s and 30s.

These are typical, contrasting cases of Japanese in colonies and colonials in Japan. The migration of the Japanese into the colonies was mainly upward mobility of colonial government officials and skilled workers within the social stratum. They enjoyed colonial privileges and modernization. Their children, as members of new middle-class modern families, had the privilege of attaining secondary and higher education in the colonies to succeed in their parents' social stratum.

On the other hand, migrants from Korea to Osaka were concentrated in Korean slums on the outer edge of urban areas, and they engaged in unstable and cheap “3K labor.” As the lowest-class laborers in the labor market in Osaka, they played the role of a safety valve in the business cycle. Many of their children did not attend school, and they constituted a reserve army that reproduced the lowest class of laborers. Many Korean children were tainted with the wartime regime as “youngsters” of the Japanese Empire.

In this situation, Korean community leaders and Korean students studying in Japan discussed improvements in the treatment and status of Korean laborers and voting rights in the Korean peninsula, which led to the origin of the democratization and nationalist movements after the liberation.

(2) Human migrations after the collapse of the Japanese Empire

The difference in the status of the Japanese in colonies and colonials in Japan drastically changed after Japan's defeat (the collapse of the Empire) in 1945. The position of the Japanese in the colonies was reversed because of the defeat, and they lost their jobs and houses to be repatriated to the Japanese home islands. They had no choice but to start from scratch in the home country burnt during the devastating war. Some could re-enter skilled jobs through connections, but most of them went through extreme poverty. However, their lives improved due to high economic growth.

On the other hand, Koreans in Osaka were “liberated” from Japanese colonialism and were encouraged to return. Nevertheless, those who had been in Japan for a while and had created a life base found it difficult to return to their motherland. In the meantime, the April 3 Uprising in 1948 and the Korean War that broke out in 1950, made them give up the thought of returning home. They ended up staying in Japan, while others were forced to “smuggle (密航)” into Japan. Their lives were supposed to improve due to the

liberation. While some managed to find a way back through the black market after the war and set up businesses afterwards, the situation did not improve for most of them. Rather, they had to face difficulties as they were deprived of their status as imperial subjects and denied civil rights.

The diasporas most strongly affected by the war in East Asia after the collapse of the Empire were people from the colonies who had migrated into the spheres of influence of the Empire such as the Japanese home islands and "Manchukuo." Repatriation of 3.5 million Japanese was remarkable, but deportation, return, and "remaining/left-behind" of as many as 4 million Koreans and people from Taiwan (former Taiwan nationals or Taiwanese), and the more diasporic "Ryukyans" and indigenous Ainu population of Karafuto from the Japanese home islands, overseas areas, and the former sphere of influence, was more complicated and serious.

The Korean settlement in northeast China deserves a special mention as a national minority, which was not permitted to Japanese people, and deportation (and return) to Korea allowed over 1.5 million Korean people to settle down, because they had lived in early time and some Koreans were the united front person against the Japanese Army. In contrast, there were around 600 thousand people who had already settled in addition to more than 2 million Koreans who had lived in the Japanese home islands.

Moreover, it was more complicated for Taiwanese who had lived in "Manchukuo" to repatriate to Taiwan, and a few remained in northeast China. The repatriation and settlement of "Ryukyans" was also distinguished from the Japanese home islanders.

Similarly,, in contrast to the repatriation and "remaining/left-behind" from and in "Manchukuo," the repatriation and "remaining/left-behind" in East Asia was diverse and difficult to deal with. The processes of settlement before the war, repatriation policies and incorporation after the war, "left-behind" was more complex, and settlement in East Asia were events that were deeply connected to the situation of the colonial rule by the Japanese Empire and reorganization of East Asia after the collapse of the Empire, that is the circumstances of state building in each area.

As many as 170 thousand, which is more than 10% of the 1.55 million Japanese in "Manchukuo," passed away because they were subjected to refugee-like status in the process of evacuation before the repatriation. Additionally, 15 thousand orphans and women were "left-behind" in China for a long time, even after the repatriation. Japanese

orphans and women who remained in China were forced to live “isolated” from their motherland, and they led a hard and difficult life because it was not easy to return to Japan even after the normalization of diplomatic relationships between Japan and China in 1972. They were only able to return to Japan after 1980, when both governments agreed to their return due to the globalization of the two countries. They faced several problems even after returning to Japan (Araragi 2009).

4. “Repatriation” of the Japanese from South Korea

The US implemented the repatriation policy of returning Japanese people from the former imperial sphere, as part of the post-war policies for East Asia. The US repatriation policy defined Japanese migrants in the imperial colonies and the spheres of influence such as Korea and Taiwan as settlers who were connected with the colonialism of the “Japanese Empire.” The lives of over 3.6 million people were overturned and they were forced to repatriate to the Japanese home islands (Wakatsuki 1991/1995).

In contrast to Western colonialism, such as that of Britain, the characteristic feature of colonial Japanese Empire was its extremely strong influence such as “soshi-kaimei” (forcing locals in the colonies to change their names to Japanese names) with the migration of many people from the suzerain country(宗主国). It resembled the German rule of Austria after annexation rather than British colonialism in Asian and African colonies. It was necessary to repatriate the Japanese from the colonies to weaken their influence. It was reasonable that the repatriation of the Japanese was based on the deportation of Germans from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, which was agreed upon by the Polish and Czech-Slovakian refugee governments in Britain and the British Prime Minister Churchill.

Repatriation from Taiwan, whose governance was taken over by the KMT, and the Pacific Islands, which was occupied by the US. army, took place smoothly. Repatriation from South Korea, which was also under the US administration, was also carried out smoothly. However, repatriation from “Manchukuo” and North Korea, which were occupied by the Soviet army, and Karafuto, which was occupied after the Soviet-Japan War, were delayed due to various problems.

The Koreans were excited to be liberated, but the power relationships reversed for

the Japanese. They acted in two different ways in the chaotic Korean society. Many of the short-term residents and the privileged who were often criticized informally repatriated through private fishing vessels, so-called "black ships" (Exodus-like escape to the motherland). On the other hand, many Japanese wanted to stay behind in Korea.

After the collapse of the Empire and the liberation of Korea, there was a need for an organization that could represent and protect the Japanese in Korea. A Japanese organization similar to a resident union was established before the annexation of Korea with the support of the Governor-General of Korea. Interestingly, it was called Assistance Association for the Home Islanders, not the Assistance Association for Japanese Residents. The Assistance Association for the Home Islanders was established in Keijo on August 25, and it kept close contact with the US Army Military Government, that took over the governance from the Governor-General of Korea. The association tried to issue "a bulletin" to provide correct information to the people, and ran a hospital for those who were injured after the defeat to minimize damage and confusion among the Japanese.

The association was in charge of providing support and repatriating Japanese not only living in South Korea but also those escaping from North Korea. The reason why it was named Naichijinn-sewaninkai (Assistance Association for the Home Islanders), and not Nihonjin-sewaninkai (Assistance Association for Japanese Residents) was to distinguish the Japanese and the Korean clearly. It is said that they considered the feelings of Koreans so that the Japanese could stay in Korea. The Assistance Association for the Home Islanders was established in Busan on 1st September, and it played a significant role in repatriation.

Remarkably, a lot of Japanese were eager to study the Korean language in post-war Korea. It was an attempt to prepare for survival in Korean society after the defeat. The history of Japanese migration to Korea goes back to 1876, much before the annexation. There were many powerful Japanese settlements back then, and some groups applied a law for residents' union in Korea. Jun Uchida (2011) illustrated in her essay "Brokers of Empire" that the long-distance nationalism among the Japanese in Korea led to the annexation of Korea. The Japanese had a history of over 70 years in Korea. There were many second and third generations Japanese who owned property and hoped to live in Korea just like when they lived as residents' unions even after the defeat.

Korean migration to Japan began after the annexation of Korea in 1910, and it

rapidly increased in the 1920s as Osaka became a global city. After 1939, under the total war regime, the migration increased drastically due to the “forced migrants.” The turning point came in 1935. Until then, there were more Japanese in Korea than Koreans in Japan. In 1945, it is estimated that there were more than two million Koreans in Japan, which was three times the number of Japanese in Korea (750 thousand). There is no doubt that the Japanese in Korea benefitted from the annexation, but it is also certain that they were proud of having lived in Korea for 70 years (many had arrived before the colonial rule since 1876), and wanted to remain continue staying even if they had to become settlers again.

Regardless of the Japanese hope to remain, the repatriation started on October 23, 1945, and it reached its peak the next year. The repatriation of the Japanese people was almost completely carried out within two years, except for a few people, such as women who had married Koreans (Japanese wives in Korea).

However, surprisingly, the US set “free will” of the Japanese at the base of the repatriation policy to respect their human rights. The policy respected their will to return or remain. The Japanese who had lived in South Korea for long were hopeful because of the US policy, but the Koreans did not let them exercise the will to remain as they wanted to completely exile the Japanese.

After the liberation, the Soviet Union and the US established military governments in North and South Korea, respectively. However, in South Korea the establishment of an independent government was chaotic as various powers and ideologies were mixed up. North Korea established a relatively stable government in February 1946 with Kim Il-sung taking charge, supported by the Soviet army. The US Army attempted to stabilize South Korea by demanding democratization and oppressing the forces that aimed to unite Korea. The US supported Ree Syngman, who had migrated to the US, and had integrated into the pro-American and anti-communism regime of the south. They partly utilized former institution of the Governor-General of Korea, to mobilize officials of Korea and “Manchukuo” and military personnel against the new post-war regime (the so-called pro-Japanese).

The US Army wanted to reduce confusion under the military government and therefore, decided to exile the Japanese, who were destabilizing the situation. Thus, the hope of the Japanese to remain did not come true. In “Manchukuo” and Taiwan, both the

KMT and CCP retained Japanese medical personnel and engineers (“ryuyo”) as labor, and in Siberia, the Japanese were “forced to work (‘yokuryu’).”

In southern Korea, few attempts were made for “ryuyo,” which was aimed to avoid the sharp deterioration in the efficacy of the administration and industry as well as medical standards. Under “ryuyo,” engineers and medical personnel stayed behind to train new personnel in the former colonies.

The South Korean demand of complete exile of the Japanese shows their strong hatred toward Japanese colonialism, which dominated most of the Korean territory. Additionally, it is said that Korean repatriates from Japan shared terrible accounts of abuse, discrimination, poor working environments, and started rumors of conflicts and fights between Japanese veterans and young Koreans in the home islands. This resulted in a stronger desire for the complete exile of the Japanese as an act of revenge. Moreover, the Korean people were deeply entrenched in colonialism so there was no need for transplantation of skills or help from government officials, and there was no civil war to create an urgent need for medical personnel as in “Manchukuo.”

Similar to the Japanese who unofficially repatriated using fishing vessels, it is said that one-third of Korean repatriates from Japan had also gone back using fishing vessels before the official repatriation policy was enacted. The unofficial repatriation by black ships led to people illegally going back and forth (smuggling) between Japan and Korea. This did not start after the war, it had been way of transportation between Japan and Korea for long.

5. Repatriation, settlement, remaining/“left-behind’ of Koreans in Japan

(1) Settlement of Koreans in “Manchukuo” and “Karafuto”

Deportation (exile) from the area under the KMT’s control: There were various circumstances and stories about the deportation and voluntary return of more than 4 million Koreans who had lived in “Manchukuo,” North China, and the Japanese home islands to the places of their origins (Korean peninsula).

Settlement under the CCP-settlement policy: The settlement or remaining of

Koreans in northeast China after the war (as a Korean minority in China) and in the Japanese home islands (as Zainichi Koreans) differ from each other vastly in terms of the citizenship and position as nationals in each country after the war.

Additionally, the “smuggling” to Japan after the April 3 Uprising in Jeju was marked with a complicated history, in which the return, re-return, remaining, and settlement of Koreans is the miniaturization of the reorganization of post-war East Asia.

Also, as described in detail in the study by Taisho Nakayama, “remaining/left-behind” of Korean people in Karafuto (or Sakhalin), as well as of the Japanese in “Manchukuo,” reveals the nature of human migration after the collapse of the Empire and how the Soviet Union dealt with the repatriation of the former subjects of the Empire.

Additionally, the return (or evacuation) of Taiwanese from “Manchukuo” could be judged as Chinese collaborators cooperating “Manchukuo,” and it was dangerous enough for them to be executed, which showed the most complicated relationships in the Japanese Empire. Moreover, even after the return to Taiwan, they were related to the February 28 Uprising in 1947, which was a compression of the contradiction of East Asia from the pre-war period to the post-war period.

(2) Repatriation, settlement, remaining or “left-behind” in Japan

What kind of policy was adopted for the Koreans who had resided in the Japanese home islands as subjects of the Empire? As a whole, the Japanese government decided to deport Korean migrants as part of the post-war process, and the deportation policy closely resembled the exile policy. However, once the occupation army began to be stationed, and the GHQ/SCAP had already decided on the occupation policy, the Japanese policy located Koreans as both liberated national minorities as well as alien enemies, and it was confusing because it was neither a protection policy nor an exile policy.

The draft of the constitution prepared by MacArthur insisted on respecting the basic human rights of the Koreans, and it had a protection policy for treating Koreans as a national minority. However, this policy was deleted from the Constitution of Japan. With the establishment of South Korea and DPRK after August 1948 in the Korean Peninsula, the beginning of the Cold War, and the Korean War breaking out in 1950, the GHQ/SCAP changed the policy to bring back the Japanese conservatives, who had been purged from public offices, and the policy started to incline toward the Japanese

government. The policy by the Japanese Communist Party insisted on the protection of Koreans as a national minority, and it was similar to the one by the CCP.

In the "registering return survey" of Koreans in 1946, more than 90% of the population of 610 thousand people hoped to go back to their country, while approximately 100 thousand people hoped to stay.

However, as mentioned earlier, South Korea was politically unstable after the war, which was symbolized by the April 3 Uprising in Jeju. It was economically suffering after emerging from the colonial economy, and Koreans who still had means in Osaka re-returned (smuggled) to Japan. The Koreans who had wanted to return from Japan started looking for ways to stay.

However, on April 28, 1952, the Alien Registration Act (1947) and the Peace Treaty came into force, and the Japanese government notified the Koreans that they had lost their nationality, similar to the exile policy.

The General Association of Korean Residents in Japan, being against the Japanese government and having a political attitude similar to North Korea, adopted a return home policy. Under these circumstances, the movement for the settlement of the Koreans in Japan (by becoming Zainichi Korean) advanced. This could be called a kind of "remaining/left-behind." The project to return to North Korea in 1959 sent out 90 thousand people. It was a meaningful event in which 15 % of the Koreans in Japan, mainly the young, returned the motherland to reconstruct North Korea, which they decided was their homeland.

6. Repatriation from Taiwan and the construction of "Ryukyo"

Repatriation of the Japanese from Taiwan was carried out at an early stage, and it is said that they experienced the least damage. In October 1945, the KMT took over the governance from the Governor-General of Taiwan, and repatriation began from February 23, 1946. Many Japanese repatriated within two months. There were a few instances of plunder, murder, or uprisings, but the repatriation was completed quickly. The colonial rule of Taiwan had lasted for 50 years, and some Japanese wanted to stay behind. Over 7,000 Japanese were retained as labor to maintain the social function of Taiwanese society after liberation. Most of them returned to Japan with their families during the second

repatriation that happened in 1947.

The repatriation of people from Okinawa in Taiwan was put under a different category. They were called “Ryukyo (琉僑)” and distinguished from the “Nikkyo (日僑),” which means Japanese residents, due to KMT’s intention to bring about a political change. The two groups were put under different repatriation policies, and the repatriation of people from Okinawa was delayed. The Ryukyu had a unique position in KMT’s strategy for East Asia and the world, and Taiwan also held a special place for people from Okinawa. In pre-war Okinawa, working in the Japanese home islands and abroad was common because the resources on the island were limited and there was little industrial investment. It was common to migrate overseas to Hawaii, mainland America, and Brazil, and work on the Japanese home islands. Migration abroad, to Asian countries such as the Philippines, and to other spheres of influence was common and as much as 25% of the population had migrated. In particular, migration to neighboring Taiwan was special for people in Okinawa because it was less risky and costed less. For people from Okinawa, being a houseboy or a house servant while obtaining an education to get a skilled work in Taiwan was a model career path. Getting skilled professional jobs as colonial government officials, teachers, police officers, nurses, and typists in Taiwan was a path to achieve social success for people from Okinawa. Since there was a semi-colonial situation under which Japanese home islanders occupied important posts in Okinawa, Taiwan was a place of opportunity, and Okinawans in Taiwan had rich human resources.

While they were waiting for repatriation, the Okinawan leaders made connections with American diplomats in Taiwan. It is important to point out that, in that process of constructing relationships, post-war Okinawan leaders in Taiwan built channels with Americans in Taiwan, and with the US Army in Okinawa, that played a huge role in the post-war occupation policy by the US. Naomi Noiri and I started a cooperative research based on a hypothesis that skilled professional workers, who can be called “*repatriated elites*,” played important roles in the post-war reconstruction of Okinawa.

Taiwan was colonized as early as 1895, and many Japanese in Taiwan were born in the colony. The second generations were called “Wansei,” and there were Taiwanese people called “Japanese language generation,” who attained secondary and higher education in Japan. The existence of these people combined with strong rule by KMT

after the war, created a unique situation between Japan and Taiwan in which shared cultural interactions took place between the "Wansei" and the younger Taiwanese generations after the democratization of Taiwan.

7. Factors determining repatriation in East Asia

(1) The resemblance with the exile in Europe and "issues of national minorities"

In Europe, various ethnicities were mixed when the age of nation states replaced the multi-ethnic empires such as the Ottoman Empire, the Austrian-Hungarian Empire, and the Russian Empire, and human migration became active to complement the lack of labor force created by industrialization. Newly independent nation states had a history of ethnic cleansing, population exchange, and exiling minorities and putting them under refugee status to avoid troubles such as ethnic conflicts among mixed national minorities.

The League of Nations established after World War I set protection of "national minorities" as one of the tasks to be worked upon by the post-war international society. This was an important task in the interwar period which worked on the principle of self-determination. In particular, the mass population exchange between Greece and Turkey after the Greco-Turkish War subsequent to World War I was one of the solution models since the exchange was carried out smoothly.

Although the protection of national minorities in Europe and the principle of self-determination aimed to protect the minorities in the nation states, the exile of Germans from Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union after World War II was carried out under different policies. This was because East European countries such as Poland and Czech-Slovakia along with the British Prime Minister Churchill, who supported these countries, made a policy to completely "exile Germans" from the area of their control based on the expansion policy of Nazi Germany to extend the sphere of influence under the name of the protection of overseas Germans, and activities by the overseas German to cooperate with the German army that acted on behalf of Nazi Germany.

As the result of the defeat of Germany in World War II, more than 12 million Germans were "exiled" from Poland, Czech-Slovakia, and the Soviet Union in accordance with the change of borderlines in Eastern Europe. The scale of this migration was much bigger than the repatriation in East Asia. Not only settlers who had newly migrated with

the expansion of the sphere of influence of Nazi Germany but also those who had a long history of settlement and had been localized in Eastern and Central Europe and Russia for a few centuries (since the 17th century) were also a target of the exile.

The exile of Germans from Eastern and Central Europe and the Soviet Union was similar to the repatriation of the Japanese from the former Empire, which must come across as surprising for people in East Asia. However, historically, the exile of Germans preceded the repatriation in East Asia. It was not the exile which was similar to the repatriation, but the other way around.

(2) Change in international opinion about the issue of minorities

After “the Lesson of Munich” in the interwar period, the European society changed its focus from the protection of the minorities to the integration of nation states and stabilization of the international society. Pursuing homogeneous nation-states and the cleansing and exile of national minorities became common. These policies were utilized by the US to implement repatriation policies in East Asia as one of the post-war strategies.

The opinion of the international society about the issue of minorities (or national minorities) changed at the Paris Peace Conference as Nazi Germany rose. There was less tolerance toward the issue of national minorities in European society, especially in Eastern and Central European society, because Nazi Germany disrupted the peace in the area under the ostensible reason of protecting German residents in Poland and annexed or put Poland and other East European countries under its sphere of influence. In the due course, Nazi Germany forced national minorities in Eastern and Central Europe to move, causing the Holocaust under which a mass slaughter of Jews took place. As a result, it is said that even during World War II, the Polish and Czech refugee governments and the British started considering “policies to exile Germans” in London. The US also took this discussion in Europe into consideration and started to think about repatriation policies for overseas Japanese a few years before the end of the war.

Such a change in international opinions, from “protection” of the minorities to “exiling” of Germans, was a drastic shift. The US made a policy to exile overseas Japanese, who were a destabilizing factor in international and internal politics, and the KMT also made a similar policy to exile Koreans. On the other hand, the CCP created a national minority policy that allowed the settlement and autonomy of Koreans in the former “Manchukuo” region, under the influence of Five Races under One Union of Sun

Yat-sen and minority policies of the Soviet Communist party.

These two principles determined the repatriation policy in East Asia after World War II. The Japanese Communist Party followed the Chinese Communist Party and supported the settlement of Koreans.

The history of forceful human (ethnic) migration dates back to the issue of national minorities, such as population exchange, forceful migration, and ethnic cleansing in Europe from the late 19th to the first half of the 20th century. For European society, which transitioned from multi-ethnic empires such as the Habsburg Monarchy and Ottoman Empire to nation states, the borderlines of nation states and residential areas of national minorities overlapped, especially in Eastern and Central Europe. As a result, national minorities turned out to be troublesome at the time of wars and conflicts, and sometimes became the cause of wars and conflicts. They then became refugees who were exiled to their residential area (motherland) as one of the solutions, and population exchange, ethnic cleansing, and forceful ethnic migration were also carried out. A typical example is the population exchange between Greece and Turkey at the time of the Greco-Turkish War after World War I.

The German exile policy, based on the population exchange between Greece and Turkey, was discussed between Britain and East European countries. This was followed by the repatriation policy in post-war East Asia under the US occupation policy.

(3) Factors determining repatriation in East Asia

As such, repatriation, "remaining/left-behind," and settlement in East Asia happened in complicated and diverse ways, due to the pre-war imperial rule and the post-war reorganization of East Asia intertwining, and the anticipation of the Cold War regime in East Asia. At the same time, these human migrations are viewed differently depending on whether they are seen from the Japanese perspective or East Asian perspective, which is symbolized in if it is called deportation or repatriation. The perspective determines whether the migrations are called settlement or remaining, or whether they are termed as "smuggling" or re-return.

Looking back on the history of East Asia after the war, we can say there were two types of policies. One was the policy to exile Germans, and the other was the policies based on the norm of "protection of the minorities" as agreed at the Paris Peace

Conference. So, the deportation (repatriation) policy of overseas Japanese people by the US, China, and Koreans treated Japanese settlers similar to the Germans under the exile policy, but the settlement policy of CCP for Koreans in “Manchukuo” was based on the norm of “the protection of the minorities.”

Thus, in post-war East Asia, the exile and the protection policy were separate for settlers and national minorities. Interestingly, the policy implemented by the CCP for Koreans in North China was in the context of the exile policy of the settlers. The policies for Koreans in different parts of China was different depending on the administration. The CCP implemented the protection policy, valuing the commitment of Korean communists who fought in the anti-“Manchukuo” and anti-Japanese battle, but the KMT adopted the exile policy similar to that used for Japanese settlers as some troublesome Koreans acted as vanguards and brokers of the Japanese Empire.

8. Conclusion

In summary, there are two approaches to repatriation policies in East Asia. One was the perspective of seeing the target people as settlers to be exiled, and the other was the perspective of seeing them as national minorities to be protected. The Japanese were seen as settlers and were removed and exiled from the spheres of influence. However, the classification of Japanese as settlers and the former subjects of the Empire as national minorities was not as simple when it came to the execution of the policies. As mentioned earlier, among the people from the colonies who had migrated to the sphere of Empire, in addition to the axis between settlers and the national minorities, there was another one between collaborators of the Japanese Empire and the colonial resistance. The judgement of the repatriation policy differed depending on the two axes. Moreover, depending on the political position in the conflicts around post-war governance and the chaos during the Cold War, some people were forced to move again, which was accompanied by the repatriation policy. Symbolized by the February 28 Uprising in Taiwan and April 3 Uprising in Jeju, there was an axis between democratization and taking sides with the conservatives against anti-communism. These three axes determined the post-war repatriation policies in East Asia and the subsequent human migration.

付記

本論文は、2019年2月19日、ケンブリッジ大学東アジア中東学部の Barak Kushner 教授を中心とするプロジェクト（ERC project: The Dissolution of the Japanese Empire and the Struggle for Legitimacy in Postwar East Asia）における招待講演の草稿に加筆修正したものである。2年以上も前の草稿だが、本格的に練りあげたものであり、Kushner 教授からもしかるべきジャーナルで掲載すべきとのアドバイスを受けていた。本年、大和大学『社会学部 研究紀要』第1号が刊行されることになったので、ここに寄稿することにした。

References

- Araragi Shinzō, *"Manshū imin" no rekishi shakaigaku* (Kōrosha, 1994).
- Araragi Shinzō, "Chūgoku 'zanryū' nihonjin no kioku no katari: katari no henka to 'katari no jiba' o megutte," in *Manshū: kioku to rekishi*, ed. Yamamoto Yūzō (Kyoto: Kyōto Daigaku Gakujutsu Shuppankai, 2007).
- Araragi Shinzō, "Josetsu 1," in *Teikoku igo no hito no idō: postcolonialism to globalism no kōsakuten*, ed. Araragi Shinzō (Bensei Shuppan, 2013).
- Asano and Yan, *Ikoku no fubo: chūgoku zanryū koji o sodateta yōfubo no gunzō* (Iwanami shoten, 2006).
- Fukumoto Taku, "'Mikkō' ni miru zainichi chōsenjin no posuto-shokuminchisei," in *Teikoku hōkai to hito no saidō: hikiage, sōkan, soshite zanryū*, ed. Araragi Shinzō (Bensei Shuppan, 2011).
- Iijima Mariko, "Twice Migration of Japanese Immigrants to Hawai'i: Processes, Motives and Continuity of Domestic and International Migrations," *Journal of American & Canadian Studies*, Issue 28 (2010).
- Imaizumi Yumiko, "Nan'yō shotō hikiagesha no dantai keisei to sono katsudō: nihon no haisen chokugo o chūshin toshite," *Shiryō henshūshitsu kiyō*, No 30 (2005).
- John Lie, *Multiethnic Japan* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009).
- Katō Kiyofumi, *"Dainihon teikoku" hōkai: higashi ajia no 1945 nen* (Chūō kōronsha, 2009).
- Katō Yōko, "Haisha no kikan: chūgoku kara no fukuin/hikiage mondai no tenkai," *Kokusai seiji*, Issue 109 (1995).
- Kim Jeong-won, "Zainichi chōsenjin no sengo to watashi," in Araragi, *Teikoku igo*.
- Lori Watt, *When Empire Comes Home: Repatriation and Reintegration in Postwar Japan* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center, 2009).
- Nakano Yoshio and Arasaki Moriteru, *Okinawa sengoshi* (Iwanami shoten, 1976).
- Oguma Eiji, *Tan'itsu minzoku shinwa no kigen: "Nihonjin" no jigazō no keifu* (Shin'yōsha, 1995).
- Okabe Makio, *Umi o watatta nihonjin* (Yamakawa shuppansha, 2002).
- Song Youn-ok, "Nihongun 'ianfu'," in *Hito no idō jiten: nihon kara ajia e, ajia kara nihon e*, ed. Yoshiwara Kazuo et al. (Maruzen shuppan, 2013).
- Sugihara Tōru, *Chūgokujin kyōsei renkō* (Iwanami shoten, 2002).
- Sunil S. Amrith, *Migration and Diaspora in Modern Asia* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011).
- Tamura Masato, "Karafuto ainu no 'hikiage'," in Araragi, *Nihon teikoku o meguru*.
- Tessa Morris-Suzuki, *Exodus to North Korea: Shadows from Japan's Cold War* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006).
- The Study Group for Research into the History of Migration into Manchuria, ed., *Nihon teikokushugi ka no manshū imin* (Ryūkei Shosha, 1976).
- Tomomura Masaru, "Posuto shokuminchishugi to zainichi chōsenjin," in *Imin kenkyū to tabunka kyōsei*, ed. The Japanese Association for Migration Studies (Ochanomizu shobō, 2011).
- Tomomura Masaru, *Chōsenjin kyōsei renkō* (Iwanami shoten, 2012).
- Wakatsuki Yasuo, *Sengo hikiage no kiroku* (Jiji tsūshinsha, 1995).