Sakata, Minako. "Japan in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries." *A Global History of Convicts and Penal Colonies*. Ed. Clare Anderson. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018. 307–336. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781350000704.ch-011>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 12:38 UTC.

Copyright © Clare Anderson and Contributors 2018. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

Japan in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries

Minako Sakata

Introduction

Hokkaido, the northernmost of Japan's four main islands today, was the first new territory that Japan incorporated in the late nineteenth century. Before 1855, the island was divided into two portions. The southern half of Oshima peninsula was the Matsumae domain, the northernmost part of early modern Japan. The Japanese called the rest of the island Ezochi – literally the land of the barbarian. The Ainu are the indigenous people of the island, and the Japanese maintained trade relations with them for hundreds of years. Rituals called *omemie* and *omusha* were held between Japanese political representatives and Ainu chiefs and were accompanied by the exchange of gifts. To the Japanese, these ceremonies signified the Ainu's obedience to Japanese power. As a result, the Japanese held a strong belief that Japan ruled Ezochi by keeping the Ainu chiefs under their control.¹

Under a national seclusion policy implemented since the 1630s, the Tokugawa Shogunate had imposed severe restrictions on trade and communication with foreign ships. Only four gateways were opened in Japan and each was designated for trade with specific countries: Nagasaki for Dutch and Chinese private traders; Tsushima for Korea; Satsuma for the Ryukyu Kingdom (present-day Okinawa prefecture); and Matsumae for the Ainu (Map 11.1).² Ezochi was designated as a foreign land that the Japanese were not allowed to visit freely. However, from the first half of the eighteenth century, Japanese merchants who made contracts with the Matsumae domain were allowed to manage fishery grounds in Ezochi.³ They sent managers and workers from Japan and hired the Ainu as a labour force. The Japanese workers stayed in Ezochi only during the fishing season, and so Ezochi remained largely unknown to the Japanese even in the mid-nineteenth century.

Since the late eighteenth century, when Russian ships first approached the Ezo Islands (Ezochi, the Kuril Islands and Sakhalin), they had become sites of the Tokugawa Shogunate's concern, both for economic and national security policy. The Shogunate developed a plan to incorporate Ezochi into formal Japanese territory. However, this was soon abandoned. Although the Shogunate stationed garrisons along the coast, it chose to maintain or strengthen relations with Ainu chiefs instead of trying to annex

Map 11.1 Japan and the surrounding areas

the island. Nevertheless, from the eighteenth century, some Japanese politicians and intellectuals, held the ideological position that Ezochi was already Japanese territory. However, in a substantive sense, it was not. Thus the Tokugawa Shogunate (1603–1868)

and the Meiji Restoration government (1868–1912) made efforts to transform Ezochi, which was still Ainu land, into the Japanese territory of Hokkaido. The context was a desire to claim that the island was Japanese territory when faced with Russian colonization in north-east Asia.

In Japanese historical scholarship on Hokkaido, *tondenhei* (farmer-soldiers),⁴ and free migrants are regarded as the most important labourers employed in the development of Hokkaido. Although the introduction of convict labour in the late nineteenth century is a well-known fact, it has been considered only as a transient policy during a period of labour shortage. The significance of public construction projects undertaken by convicts has been recognized, but the use of convict labour has not been regarded as an essential part of government policy. Giving rise to a large number of casualties and the deterioration of public safety, convict labour in nineteenth-century Hokkaido is largely viewed as an unsuccessful policy, one that was abandoned shortly after its implementation.

As this chapter will show, not only were convict labourers vital for the development of Hokkaido, the idea of convict transportation to Ezochi – or Hokkaido – had a long history. In the late eighteenth century, as soon as Russian interest first materialized around the Kuril Islands and Ezochi, some thinkers began proposing the use of convict transportation. Until the mid-nineteenth century, it was one of the positions that many intellectuals and officials adopted in response to the issues facing Ezochi. In this chapter, I survey the history of ideas and policies regarding penal transportation from the eighteenth to the nineteenth centuries, and consider its historical significance and the role it played in the eventual incorporation of Hokkaido into the Japanese nation-state.⁵

Russian incursions in the late eighteenth century

Russia began to move southward along the Kuril Islands in the early eighteenth century. In 1768, some Cossacks chased the Kuril Ainu to collect *yasak* payments (fur) and reached Iturup Island, the northernmost part of the southern Kuril Islands.⁶ The first news of the Russian approach was carried by a Hungarian convict, Moric Benyovszky (1746–1786). He had been arrested for involvement in the Polish resistance movement, and had been transported to Kamchatka, in the Russian Far East. Benyovszky robbed a Russian ship and escaped in 1771. In the course of his return to Europe, he stopped in Japan and sent a letter to the head of the trading house of the Dutch East India Company in Nagasaki. In his letter, he warned of a Russian conspiracy to invade Japan.

Although it was quickly proved that this information was groundless, the incident triggered a boom in Russian studies in Japan.⁷ At the same time, Russia was also gradually approaching Japan to open trade relations. In 1778, Russians first landed on eastern Ezochi, followed by Lieutenant Laxman of the Imperial Russian military in 1792. British vessels also appeared off the coast of Etomo (present-day Muroran), in south-west Ezochi in 1796. Thanks to frequent visits from unsanctioned Western ships, Ezochi rapidly became the most important site in the Shogunate's security policy.

Under these circumstances, the Shogunate decided to take direct control over Ezochi, from 1799 to 1821. Although the first plan was *Kaikoku* – the incorporation of Ezochi into Japan and the assimilation of the Ainu into the Japanese population – it was swiftly altered after attracting criticism both within and beyond the Shogunate.⁸ Whilst a garrison was dispatched along the coast, incorporative policies such as Japanese migration, cultivation, the development of mining and the desired assimilation of the Ainu, were abandoned.

Ideologically, the majority of Japanese officials and intellectuals in the late eighteenth century believed that the Ezo islands constituted Japanese territory.⁹ However, in terms of actual policy, the Shogunate did not incorporate Ezochi. Instead, following a Sino-centric world order, they strengthened tribute trade with Ainu chiefs in order to ‘control’ Ezochi. It was during this period of initial Russian impact that the idea of sending undesirable members of Japanese society, such as criminals or vagrants, to Ezochi for development first emerged. During this period, development encompassed the desire to annex Ezochi.

Toshiaki Honda (1743–1820) was an intellectual who repeatedly advocated for a development policy over Ezochi. Born and raised in Echigo, part of the shipping route from Osaka to Matsumae, Honda went to Edo (present-day Tokyo) at the age of eighteen. Although he sometimes mentioned travel to Ezochi in his writings, he had never been there. Honda had connections with Shogunate officials and planned to join the Shogunate’s expedition to Ezochi in 1785 to 1786. However, he was ill at the time and instead dispatched his follower Tokunai Mogami, who, after this voyage, went on to participate in six of the Shogunate’s journeys of exploration to Ezochi, the Southern Kurils and Sakhalin. It has been noted that some of the earliest Shogunate policy regarding Ezochi showed strong similarities to Honda’s ideas: both aimed to incorporate Ezochi into Japan.¹⁰ However, as mentioned above, this first policy was abandoned.

Honda wrote often about Ezochi, particularly from 1786 to 1801, motivated by concerns over Russian imperialism and encroachment. He claimed that Kamchatka, which had been subordinate to the Matsumae domain, had been under Russian domination since the first half of the eighteenth century.¹¹ In the 1770s, Russia began to expand into the Kurils. To prevent further Russian expansion, Honda argued, it was necessary for the Japanese to develop the Kurils, Ezochi and Sakhalin.¹² Honda wrote that development of the Ezo islands would not only bring prosperity to Japan but would also clarify and distinguish the Japan–Russia border.¹³ He was quite conscious of Western imperialism and wrote that among European powers, such as Spain, France, Portugal, Britain and the Netherlands, the acquisition and development of colonies was the most important national project and had rendered them prosperous.¹⁴ For most Japanese in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Ezochi was known as a frozen, barren land. To persuade readers that Ezochi was instead a promising place for cultivation as well as mining and forestry, Honda reminded readers that Beijing was also located in the north.¹⁵ He also explained that Britain, one of the most prosperous European nations, was located as far north as Kamchatka.¹⁶

To achieve the development and incorporation of Ezochi, Honda suggested three courses of action: (1) the use of welfare measures and assimilation efforts targeted at

the Ainu; (2) the transportation of Japanese convicts to Ezochi; and (3) Japanese free migration to the island.¹⁷ He claimed that population growth was necessary for the successful operation of mining and other industries in Ezochi. However, as the Ainu population was too small to provide the necessary labour force, Japanese convicts should be sent to Ezochi to work in these industries. If permitted to become citizens there, ultimately convicts would become settlers making a living through fishing and agriculture. As development proceeded, the Japan–Russia border would become more clearly defined, which was a positive move for Japanese national defence. Under a benevolent system, convicts would have the chance to make a positive contribution to national interests and their removal from the mainland world would improve public safety.¹⁸ He also thought that people in northern regions would become promising settlers, if the authority permitted it.¹⁹

Honda repeatedly advocated the use of the convicts in the development of Ezochi. However, it is not clear where his ideas came from. He was, though, a great admirer of Western countries and idealized both the British Empire and the Russian Empire during the era of Catherine the Great. In his writing Honda emphasized that the prosperity of the Western powers derived from their colonies,²⁰ but he did not mention penal transportation as one of their strategies of occupation and development.²¹ Nonetheless, he must have known something about the use of convict transportation in the European and Russian empires. In *Keisei hisaku* (1798), for example, Honda wrote about Benyovszky – who in 1771 had triggered Japanese interest in Russia – introducing him as a convict who had been transported to Kamchatka and ordered to engage in development work there.²² However, Honda did not describe in any detail the convict transportation system in Russia. He only mentioned Benyovszky to emphasize the immediate need for the development of Ezochi in the context of Benyovszky's warning about the possibility of Russian invasion. Although the authorities did not see this as a serious or imminent threat, Honda thought that Japan should prepare nonetheless.

Even if ideas about penal transportation were not necessarily derived from Western practice, it is true, however, that Japanese encounters with Western imperialism triggered a shift in the Japanese worldview. Indeed, Honda criticized Japanese officials and intellectuals for following Chinese practice in the way they were dealing with their desire to annex Ezochi but not to develop it. He thought that to compete with the Western powers, their methods of colonization should be adopted.²³ Honda understood that to make a secure claim on Ezochi as Japanese territory, it was necessary for the Japanese to both occupy and develop the land. This was not a widely shared notion in the early modern period. As seen above, in terms of policy the Shogunate chose to strengthen tribute trade with Ainu chiefs in Ezochi and Sakhalin,²⁴ which was a practice generally seen in early modern east and south-east Asia.²⁵ The trade relations that accompanied these rituals symbolized, to the Japanese, the subordination of the chiefs and their people. In contrast, Honda insisted that colonizing Ezochi by the assimilation of the Ainu and the migration of undesirable or poor people was the best way to shore up national defence.

Honda's contemporary Seiri Koga (1750–1817) also argued that convict transportation was a good strategy for increasing the population of Ezochi. At the same

time, as a Confucianist (scholar of Chinese studies), he cautioned against following the example of ancient China, referring to an episode when Wang Mang, a Han Dynasty official, established a new county on the western frontier and toughened the laws so that more people would be classed as criminals and be eligible to be sent there to populate the new region. The people bore a grudge against these measures.²⁶

Among those who appear to have been strongly influenced by Honda was Nobuhiro Satō (1769–1850). In his 1808 *Seiyō Rekkoku Shiryaku* (A Brief History of Western Countries), Sato traced the globality of European imperialism. His discussion included Europe's destruction of empires and polities in the Americas, the Russian invasion of Siberia, and Britain's colonization of parts of Africa and Asia.²⁷ He also proposed measures against Western imperialism in *Bōkaisaku* (A Proposal for Coastal Defence) (1808). Satō thought that Japan should be most cautious of Russia in the north of Japan and Britain in the South Pacific. At the same time, he described Britain as a powerful country, despite being located in northern Europe, and relatively poor in resources because of its many colonies and its expansive global trade. Following this example, he argued, Japan should develop Ezochi, and trade its goods and resources with the Qing, Annam and Siam. The next step would be to conquer Kamchatka and then further expansion into North America would be possible.²⁸ To head off any potential threat from Britain, and for the purpose of development, the Japanese should relocate any surplus population from the Izu Islands to the Ogasawara Islands.²⁹ Satō proposed not only the migration of settlers but also the conquest of new territories by force. For this purpose, he suggested sending convicted offenders to Ezo islands, Sado, Oki or the Izu Islands and training them as soldiers.³⁰ Satō recommended more active overseas expansion than Honda who also claimed Japanese expansion to North America via Kamchatka by trade with native peoples.³¹ However, during his lifetime, few supported his position, and he never engaged in real politics.³² It is said that it was Toshiminichi Ōkubo, one of the central figures of the Meiji Restoration government, who rediscovered Satō. His writings were widely read from the late nineteenth century to the early twentieth century.³³ We will return to Ōkubo in the discussion below.

Border issues after 1855

In the first half of the nineteenth century, convict transportation to Ezochi was a common subject in the writings of Japanese thinkers.³⁴ What's more, by 1855 it is obvious that Japan was aware of European convict transportation to the colonies. Shunsuke Kagami,³⁵ for example, in his proposal to transport criminal offenders to Ezochi, mentioned the influence of Western countries on contemporary thought.³⁶ However, the Shogunate does not seem to have seriously considered transportation until the very end of the Tokugawa era, when competition with Russia over Sakhalin became heated.

In March 1854, Japan and the United States signed the Convention of Kanagawa and designated Shimoda and Hakodate as ports to supply fuel and water to American ships. Japan later concluded similar treaties with other global powers, nations including the

United Kingdom, France, the Netherlands and Russia. In the same year, the Shogunate established the Hakodate Magistracy (*Hakodate bugyō*). The following year, Japan and Russia concluded the Treaty of Shimoda. The treaty drew the Japanese–Russian border between the Iturup and Urup islands but left Sakhalin open to settlement by both. This meant that the border disputes between the two countries were not resolved. Indeed, two months later, the Shogunate again took direct control of Ezochi, the Southern Kurils and Sakhalin.

The Tokugawa Shogunate held that whilst the Japanese had maintained trading posts and fishing grounds on the southern coast of Sakhalin since 1790, the Russians had only recently settled the island and did not have relationships with the indigenous peoples there.³⁷ Moreover, the inhabitants of the northern half of Sakhalin had long-standing relations with China.³⁸ To them, the Russian claim to the possession of Sakhalin was not convincing. Based on the East Asian worldview at the time, the Shogunate ideology was that the areas inhabited by the Ainu – including southern Sakhalin, Ezochi and the Kuriles – were Japanese territory, because the Ainu were ‘subjects’ of Japan.

On the other hand, the second period of the Shogunate’s direct control over Ezochi differed from the first period in that the Shogunate more or less recognized that colonization was necessary for national defence. In a report on the Japanese exploration of Ezochi in 1854, Shogunate officials Hori and Muragaki expressed their concerns as follows:

[As Hakodate will be opened to foreign ships], Westerners might come looking for information about Ezochi. If foreigners come to know the situation there, they, advocating righteousness, might settle their people to clear the land and, pretending to protect the Ainu, tame them by bringing them goods. As the Ainu do not know right from wrong, in order to avoid ill treatment by Japanese fishery workers, they will become subordinate to them.³⁹

Hori and Muragaki proposed that the Shogunate take direct control of Ezo islands, settle warrior class (*samurai*) people there, and let them clear the land and engage in cultivation following the old system of *tonden nohei* (farmer-soldiers). They explained that this would enable the island’s self-sufficiency.⁴⁰ If Ezochi was left as it was with no intervention foreign nations might regard it as *terra nullius* (nobody’s land) as Britain had Australia prior to invasion, and therefore available for colonization. Indeed, at the time, the Russians were already cultivating the region around Unra in Sakhalin.⁴¹

In the late eighteenth century, although some writers who were conversant with European practices proposed that Japan annex and settle Ezochi, the Shogunate did not recognize the significance of Japanese migration. In the mid-nineteenth century, however, in the context of a more general opening up of the country, the Shogunate in its first stage of policy prescribed the incorporation of Ezochi into Japan through the migration of ethnic Japanese. In this period, more people shared the idea of opposing Western encroachment in this way. The Shogunate implemented a series of programmes for the annexation of Ezochi, the Kurils and Sakhalin. However, they regarded people of the warrior class as the most desirable settlers. Further, they decided

that development should begin in the south, the area closest to Japan.⁴² In the mid-nineteenth century, there were many advocates of convict transportation as a means of colonization. Indeed, it can be said that by this time it was widely held that it could effect the development of Ezochi. However, after 1855 when the Ezochi issue became urgent, some intellectuals spoke out to criticize convict transportation. During this period, there emerged two camps: one that promoted the idea of convict transportation and had done so since the eighteenth century, and one that stood against it.

Hōzan Yokoi (1814–1855) was a member of the latter group; he had earlier accompanied Hori and Muragaki's exploratory visit. He voiced criticism of convict – and vagrant – transportation in *Hokumonshigi* (My Opinion on the Northern Border), 1855. He thought that poor farmers and the *Eta*, the people who occupied the lowest social rank, represented the most suitable labour force for this endeavour. He wrote that vagrants would not be diligent workers, and that convicted criminals could not easily reform themselves to become settlers. Moreover, they might do harm to the indigenous people of the island.⁴³ Tōin Shionoya (1809–1867) praised Yokoi's arguments.⁴⁴ Another contemporary, Kōan Fujimori (1799–1862) wrote that the transportation of convicts and peasants was inadequate for Ezochi's labour needs and, moreover, that forced migration was inhumane.⁴⁵ He sought models for settlement elsewhere, looking to the case of California, and suggesting the establishment of mines and new industries as means of attracting free migrants to Ezochi.⁴⁶ However, he was not completely anti-transportation. His point was that the convict population in Japan was far from sufficient for Ezochi's development, for which he estimated that 1,200,000 people were necessary.⁴⁷ Convicts and vagrants were suited for limited purposes only, including work in the mines or undertaking other kinds of undesirable labour.⁴⁸

Though the Hakodate Magistracy aimed to accomplish the free migration of warrior-class people or other 'good' citizens, when the Crimean War ended in 1856, the Shogunate became concerned about the mounting threat of Russian intrusion into Sakhalin. Elders then directed the Hakodate Magistracy to urgently promote Japanese migration in order to supply the labour necessary to shore up coastal defences on Sakhalin. They suggested convicts and vagrants as ideal workers.⁴⁹ However, the Magistracy rejected this idea, explaining that it would be both costly and an obstacle to welfare of the indigenous peoples. It outlined an alternative plan, to send 100 people to Sakhalin to open a fishing ground and begin the development of Ezochi from the south.⁵⁰ In practice, the Shogunate populated a small number of garrisons in coastal areas, including Kusunnai (present-day Il'inskiy), Nishi-Tonnai (present-day Kholmsk), Kusun Kotan (present-day Korsakov) and Shiranushi (present-day Kril'on). These stations operated mostly during the summer. The Shogunate also strengthened trade relations with the Ainu and developed fishing.⁵¹

Even in Ezochi, migration and development did not progress as the Hakodate Magistracy expected. The total number of migrants in Ezochi was only 116 in 1862. Besides, the areas they settled were not far from the Japan–Ezochi border and comprised areas to the south of Ishikari region.⁵² In 1866, despite its earlier antipathy, the Hakodate Magistracy proposed to the Shogunate the transportation of convicts, expressing its concerns as follows:

In June this year, English and French officials will be dispatched to Nikolayevsk from Yokohama. Although their purpose is not clear, it might be to investigate Russian southward expansion. Depending on their discussion about the border there, as they have claimed before that Tsushima domain was subordinate to Korea, they might claim troublesome things after this visit. Besides, as Ainu and Japanese customs are different, among Westerners, there are some people who claim that the Ainu are one of the ten lost tribes and that Japan has invaded their land. Thus, Ezochi's case may be much more complicated than that of Tsushima ...

If the penal code is revised immediately, the development of Ezochi will be possible at a lower cost. Most strong and prosperous countries in Europe today have abolished the death penalty. So has Russia. They send criminals to barren lands such as Siberia. Depending on the crime, there are convicts sentenced to hard labour for life. As we also have sparsely populated lands, we should abolish the death penalty except for persons who murder their masters or parents, and transport convicts to islands like Iturup, Kunashir, Shikotan, Rishiri and Rebun. If officials are dispatched during the summer and autumn to trade rice, miso, clothing and fishing tackle for fish and seaweed, they will not starve or freeze to death ... If convicts sentenced to banishment (*jutsuihō*) and transportation (*ontō*) are sent to Ezochi, we can settle them in sparsely populated lands to be engaged in industry depending on their skill, or to be set to hard labour depending on their crime. If officials oversee them to ensure indigenous people are not harmed, even villains would refrain from doing evil.⁵³

The Hakodate Magistracy asked the Shogunate to revise the penal code in order to make colonization by convict transportation possible. In September 1864, it received information that Russia had sent 130 convicts to Due in Sakhalin.⁵⁴ However, of even greater importance than this news was its cautiousness with regard to Britain and France, who were engaged in rivalry with Russia over territory and influence. Indeed, the Magistracy suggested the remote islands around Ezochi, not Sakhalin, as transportation destinations. The Shogunate knew that these two countries were interested in Ezochi as a strategic point in their contestation with Russia.⁵⁵

In its proposal, the Magistracy added that although it was planning to settle farmers in the area beyond the Ishikari region, this was not enough for foreigners to lose interest in settlement.⁵⁶ It was deeply concerned about rapid Russian colonization and suspicious about the actions and intentions of Britain and France. In order to compete with these powers, there was no time to wait for free migrants to settle of their own volition. At this stage, the Hakodate Magistracy, which had initially preferred free migration over penal transportation, began to argue for the forced migration of convicts as an attractive means for the quick and cheap occupation of new territory. The Shogunate responded that though it was difficult to abolish the death penalty, it was possible to send convicts sentenced to transportation or other penalties. It suggested that the Magistracy undertake further investigations.⁵⁷ However, in 1868 and before the policy could be implemented, the Shogunate collapsed.⁵⁸

There is another element of the context in which these events took place in which the magistracy's policy shift occurred. After 1855, the situation in North East Asia

changed drastically. In 1689, Russia and China had agreed that the Amur basin was Chinese territory. In 1854, the year of the Shogunate's preliminary investigation of Sakhalin, it was still under the influence of China, and Japanese officials (as indicated above) perceived it to be Chinese territory. However, during the Crimean War (1853–1856), Russia required supply routes to the fortress in Kamchatka to prepare for the attack by the British and French fleets. This situation increased the importance of the Amur River.⁵⁹ From 1855, Russian Cossacks began to settle in the area. In 1858, China and Russia concluded the treaty of Aigun. It designated the Amur district as Russian territory, and the Ussuri district as a region jointly administered by China and Russia. The latter became a Russian territory under the convention of Peking in 1860. Despite the treaty of 1689, Russia effectively expanded its territory by settling the thinly populated area of the Amur basin. As a result, China lost control of this vast region.

This incident both accelerated the colonization of the Ezo islands and set a precedent for Japan's future policy. It was clear that even with a signed treaty in effect, if lands were left thinly populated or relatively unexploited, foreigners might occupy them. This would lead to the original treaty-holder's loss of land and the conclusion of a new much less advantageous agreement. Indeed, in 1867 during negotiations in St Petersburg, Hozumi Koide, the official representative of the Hakodate Magistracy, commented that Russia was likely to take over Sakhalin and invade Ezochi, just as they had done Chinese territory.⁶⁰

During the Boshin War (1868–1869), the Shogunate collapsed and the Meiji Restoration government assumed power. The new government immediately sent 200 people to the south coast of Sakhalin,⁶¹ and in September 1869 it renamed Ezochi 'Hokkaido', based on the naming conventions of ancient Japanese political divisions. Ezochi literally meant 'barbarian's land', and the government thought it should have a more appropriate Japanese name. In the same year, the government sent 500 vagrants to Nemuro, Sōya and Sakhalin.⁶² However, these settlement projects failed because many migrants or vagrants either died or returned to the mainland.

In 1875, under the Treaty of St Petersburg, Sakhalin was ceded to Russia and the Kuril Islands to Japan. Despite the fact that the Japanese had been trading and fishing in Sakhalin long before Russian settlers arrived, ultimately Russia secured control of the island. Although Japan gained the northern portion of the Kuril Islands in exchange, this experience had a traumatic effect on the Japanese government's policy regarding Hokkaido. As a result, it concentrated on the island's 'rapid' development.

The introduction of convict transportation

Historians regard *tondenhei* (farmer-soldiers) and free migrants as the principal labourers used for the development of Hokkaido. However, the government's migration policy was unsuccessful for the first twenty-five years, and free migration did not increase until the first half of the 1890s. Preceding this later influx of voluntary settlers was the introduction of a penal transportation system for which the only destination

was Hokkaido. The implementation of convict labour in Hokkaido from the 1880s to the 1890s is well known in the history of Hokkaido. It is usually explained as a measure designed to deal with a series of anti-government revolts from 1874 into the 1880s. The government needed a place to confine a large number of detainees, but it was also facing a labour shortage in Hokkaido. Transportation was the solution to both problems.⁶³

According to this widely accepted understanding, the penal transportation system of the late nineteenth century appears as a sort of sudden invention to cope with urgent matters. However, as shown in the previous sections of this chapter, the idea of transportation to Ezochi (Hokkaido) has a long history that began in the late eighteenth century when incorporation first became a political issue. And at the end of the Tokugawa period, the Shogunate planned to adopt the policy. Clearly penal transportation was not a sudden and original invention of the Meiji government after the 1870s. Rather, they inherited the Shogunate's unrealized project of convict transportation to the new territory.

As the occupation of Ezochi was closely related to national security, many intellectuals and people of the warrior class had a strong interest in it, both within and beyond the Shogunate. As we have seen, convict transportation became a widely discussed issue from the mid-nineteenth century. Some of the central figures of the Meiji Restoration government shared the enthusiasm of earlier writers. As mentioned above, it was Toshimichi Ōkubo who rediscovered and re-evaluated the writings of Nobuhiro Satō, one of the advocates of convict transportation in the early modern period.⁶⁴ Subsequently, in 1877, Ōkubo proposed convict transportation to Hokkaido. Prior to the Meiji Restoration, and similarly to Satō, Shinpei Etō had also proposed convict settlement in Ezochi as a springboard to the occupation of Kamchatka.⁶⁵ Etō became the first minister of justice and went on to advance judicial reform following the example of French law.

On 4 December 1868, as soon as the Meiji government assumed power, Tomomi Iwakura submitted proposals on new systems for the military, taxation, education, penal code and parliament. He also suggested that rebels, criminals and *Eta* ('untouchable' outcastes) should be sent to develop Ezochi.⁶⁶ Ten days later, before compiling the new penal code, the government announced Ezochi as the sole destination for transportation. However, as there was no transportation system yet in place, former practices were to be maintained until it was ready.⁶⁷

Early modern Japan was a federation of *Han*, or domains, which were ruled by *Daimyō*, or feudal lords. The Tokugawa Shogunate was the leader of this federation. Each domain had its own penal code, and used small remote islands as places of transportation. These destinations were on Japan's most distant peripheries, and included Iki Island and Izu, Gotō, Amakusa, and Oki islands. In the case of Matsumae domain, the destination of transportation was Kudō, a village near the Matsumae–Ezochi border.⁶⁸ However, in the Tokugawa period, the standard penalties were capital and corporal punishment. Transportation was not exercised frequently and the number of transportees was not large.⁶⁹ Besides, they were not incarcerated in designated facilities but made a living for themselves under the surveillance of native villagers.⁷⁰ It was a completely different style of punishment to both Meiji innovations

in imprisonment and the convict transportation system that was instigated in late nineteenth-century Japan.⁷¹

The Meiji government undertook the establishment of new legal systems, including a new penal code based on those of Western countries. In 1867, when the Shogunate returned administrative power to the Imperial Court the latter promised to use the Shogunate's penal code, but at the same time they revealed their intention to create a new one.⁷² In 1868, the government produced a *Karikeiritsu* (provisional penal code). After the Tohoku War (part of the Boshin War), in December 1868 Iwakura submitted the proposal mentioned above, in which he claimed that the revision of the penal code was necessary.

Regarding the background to the Meiji government's enthusiasm for a new penal code, Tezuka points out that there was a close relationship between political power and punishment.⁷³ However, the most widely accepted explanation is that a new penal code was required for the revision of unequal treaties.⁷⁴ In 1858, the Shogunate concluded treaties with the United States, Russia, the Netherlands, Britain and France, in which Japan approved consular jurisdiction for Western countries in treaty ports, and lost the right to set its own tariffs. Taneomi Soejima, who first encouraged Japanese lawmakers to refer to French law – the Napoleonic Code – recalled later: 'Although I acted with confidence, I thought that it would be impossible to make Westerners obey our laws, until we had abolished beheading.'⁷⁵

The Ezochi issue can also be seen as key to the government's enthusiastic attitude towards the penal code. The Meiji government inherited the Japan–Russia border issue, and this was another urgent diplomatic problem. In Iwakura's proposal in December 1868 (mentioned above), the article he most elaborated upon was the development of Ezochi, which was closely related to border and national security issues. He suggested Ezochi as a destination for the transportation and settlement of social 'undesirables'. In April 1869, Iwakura again petitioned the court to deal with three key issues: the revision of the unequal treaties, finance problems and the development of Ezochi. He asserted:

Although many intellectuals have claimed the necessity of Ezochi's development, I regret to say that the Tokugawa Shogunate had not exercised effective measures. The Russians have been interested in Ezochi for a long time and we should not leave the Empire's territory to their encroachment. ... If Ezochi [is developed and] becomes a little Japan, it will bring the Japanese empire enormous profit, and also inhibit Russian desire. Besides, it would augment the prestige of the Japanese empire, for it is closely tied to its changing fortunes and prospects.⁷⁶

Considering the fact that penal transportation to Ezochi had been prescribed at a very early point in the new regime, it is reasonable to see it as an important part of the context in which the Meiji government hurried to complete the new penal code.

In 1869, this project began. Soejima directed Rinshō Mitsukuri to translate the French penal code into Japanese,⁷⁷ in the belief that in order to maintain independence, Japan needed to introduce Western-style law. However, *shinritsu kōryō* (the outline of a new code), which was promulgated in February 1871, was in fact influenced by Chinese law,

for all the scholars who engaged in its compilation were Sinologists. It was also a reflection of the Meiji government's desire to seek the restoration of the ancient empire of Japan, which was strongly influenced by China.⁷⁸ *Shinritsu kōryō* consisted of five punishments: *chi* (flogging with a light stick), *jō* (flogging with a stick), *zu* (penal servitude), *ru* (transportation) and *shi* (the death penalty). It designated Hokkaido as the destination for transportation and ordered that convicts would engage in labour there, divided into three classes depending on their crime. After one or two years, they were to be registered as settlers.⁷⁹ However, transportation to Hokkaido was never put into practice.

One month before the distribution of *shinritsu kōryō*, the government established the *jun ruhō* (code of quasi-transportation). This substituted transportation for mainland penal servitude as an interim measure. *Gyōbushō* (the Ministry of Justice) petitioned the government to legislate the *jun ruhō*, claiming that *shinritsu kōryō* would lead to an increase in the number of convicts sentenced to transportation. The *kaitakushi* (Hokkaido development commissioner) was not ready to receive them.⁸⁰ Besides, in the *kaitei riturei* (revised code), influenced by Western law and promulgated in July 1873, the four punishments other than the death penalty were replaced with imprisonment, and transportation was abolished. However, this did not mean that the penal colony plan for Hokkaido was abandoned.

In October 1872, the Ministry of Justice dispatched officials to Europe, specifically France, to investigate their judicial systems. Among the members of the delegation was Akira Tsuruta. He had been engaged in the compilation of the *shinritsu kōryō* and would play a central role in drafting Japan's first Western-style penal code. One of the goals of the delegation was to recruit an adviser, and subsequently it invited Gustave Emile Boissonade to the role.⁸¹ On 20 September 1875, chaired by Tsuruta, the first meeting at the Ministry of Justice to create a Western-style penal code began.⁸² Tsuruta proposed categories of punishment for serious offences including the death penalty, penal transportation, penal servitude and imprisonment. Convicts sentenced to penal transportation and penal servitude for life were to be sent to a remote island.⁸³ There was just one dissenting voice, and in the main members accepted Tsuruta's proposal. However, they did not propose a particular location, perhaps because the choice was under the jurisdiction of the Home Ministry.⁸⁴ In discussions between Tsuruta and Boissonade, though, Ezochi was suggested as the destination.⁸⁵

During this period, a series of anti-government revolts by people of the warrior class occurred. In November 1876, Takato Ōki, the minister of justice, petitioned for penal transportation to Hokkaido as a measure to deal with them. This time, the *kaitakushi* responded that the island would be able to receive convicts.⁸⁶ In January 1877, the home minister Toshimichi Ōkubo also petitioned for penal transportation to Hokkaido. He argued that since 1871 when transportation and penal servitude had been replaced with imprisonment, prison escapes and violence against prison officials, including homicide, had increased. The number of prisoners sentenced to more than five years had grown by more than 3,000 since 1871, which had created serious prison overcrowding. Besides, under the existing penal code, political offenders were treated in the same way as other felons. To improve the situation, Minister Ōkubo argued that imprisonment for more than five years should be replaced with transportation and penal servitude; the former for political offenders, and the later for other offenders.

Both should be sent to Hokkaido and engaged in land clearing or work in the fishery. After completing the term of their punishment, they should be offered housing and the means to bring their families to Hokkaido. This would reduce the harmful impact of mainland imprisonment and through permanent settlement give convicted criminals the chance to make a positive contribution to the public interest.⁸⁷

Thus we can see that both the justice and home ministries were moving towards the realization of penal transportation to Hokkaido concurrently with their compilation of a new penal code. Indeed, at the end of 1877, Boissonade submitted a draft of a penal code to Justice Minister Ōki. Shortly afterwards Home Minister Ito again proposed penal transportation to Hokkaido.⁸⁸ In 1880, the government dispatched Home Ministry officials to the island to investigate prison sites.

Another new penal code was promulgated in 1880 and passed into law in January 1882. It prescribed five categories of punishment for felony: the death penalty (*shikei*), servitude (*tokei*), transportation (*rukei*), imprisonment with labour (*chōeki*) and imprisonment without labour (*kingoku*). Among them, transportation and imprisonment without labour were to be used for political offences, and servitude and imprisonment with labour were to be used as punishment for general crimes. Those sentenced to servitude or transportation were to be transported to an island. The penal code clarified that female convicts sentenced to servitude were not to be transported but were to be imprisoned in mainland prisons. It made no such prescription regarding transportation, although in practice no women were ever transported.

Shūchikan prisons were established to deal with political offenders, who rapidly increased in number in the 1870s. The Home Ministry's initial plan was to establish five central prisons on the Japanese mainland – at Miyagi, Tokyo, Aichi, Osaka and Fukuoka – following the French prison system. However, this plan changed, as the new penal code prescribed transportation to an *island*.⁸⁹ Among eight *shūchikan* built in the late nineteenth century, three were on the mainland – Miyagi, Tokyo and Miike – and five were in Hokkaido – Kabato, Sorachi, Kushiro, Abashiri and Tokachi. Felons were first sent to the mainland *shūchikan* and then transported to Hokkaido. Whilst local authorities ran general prisons, *shūchikan* were national prisons used exclusively to imprison felons who were sentenced to servitude, transportation and imprisonment without labour.

Before enforcement of the new code, in September 1881 the government sent prison officials and forty convicts to Subetsu (present-day Tsukigata) in the Kabato county of Hokkaido, which became the site of the first *shūchikan*. Four hundred and sixty more convicts were sent later in the same year.⁹⁰ Hokkaido's *shūchikan* were constructed between 1881 and 1895, and received male convicts sentenced to penal servitude and transportation. By the 1890s, about 7,000 inmates were confined there (Table 11.1). More than 90 per cent of inmates were aged between twenty and fifty.⁹¹ Despite the fact that this system was originally intended as a solution against the increase in political offenders, it is difficult to calculate the actual number of political convicts sent. Before the enforcement of the new penal code, there was no distinction of punishment between political crime and ordinary crime. Even under the new code, convicts sentenced to transportation as punishment for a political offence, were few in number; 0.2 per cent or less. According to annual reports, most convicts had been convicted for murder, robbery or arson, not for political offences.⁹² This does not mean that political offenders were actually not sent to Hokkaido but shows the change of

Table 11.1 Population of Convicts in *Shūchikan* Prisons in Hokkaido

Year	Kabato	Sorachi	Kushiro	Abashiri	Tokachi	Total
1886	1,434	2,003	772			4,209
1887	1,383	1,966	790			4,139
1888	1,454	2,163	860			4,477
1889	2,365	2,975	1,117			6,457
1890	2,317	3,048	1,409			6,774
1891	2,357	2,630	663	1,200		6,850
1892	2,338	2,549	1,291	769		6,947
1893	1,497	2,502	1,943	1,288		7,230
1894	1,449	1,953	2,285	1,272		6,959
1895	1,393	1,713	1,383	1,220	1,313	7,022
1896	1,561	1,561	1,172	1,371	1,176	6,841
1897	1,028	1,003	965		797	3,793
1898	897	847	895		679	3,318
1899	945	893	922		699	3,459
1900	?	?	?		?	3,174
1901	?	?	?		?	2,763
1902	969			704	817	2,490
1903	825			1,095	772	2,692

Sources: Hokkaido shūchikan, ed., *Hokkaido shūchikan tōkeisho*, 1–3; Hokkaido shūchikan, ed., *Hokkaido shūchikan nenpō*, 4–9; Hokkaidochō, ed., *Hokkaidochō tōkeisho*, 9–15 (1898–1905); Tanaka, *Nihon shihonshugi*, 107.

government's attitude against anti-government movements after 1882, immediately after the enforcement of the new penal code.

During 1880 to 1886, the Japanese liberty and civil rights movement became radical and uprisings occurred frequently. Police stations and merchants were often attacked. Under the new law, members of the movement who were arrested were supposed to be treated as political offenders. However, during the trial of the Fukushima Incident (1882), the government argued that in so doing activists celebrated their political martyrdom. In order to prevent this, the government decided that offenders should be stigmatized as 'shameless criminals' instead of honoured as heroes of political resistance. Thus activists were treated, sentenced and registered in the same way as arsonists, robbers or murderers.⁹³

Convict labour and free settlement

As we have seen, the government instigated plans for penal transportation in the mid-1870s. This development is usually explained as a measure to deal with the anti-government revolts of that period. It is true that the revolts accelerated the realization of

the project in the short term. However, we should remember that penal transportation to Hokkaido had been a prescribed policy since 1868. The government had learned from the Sino-Russo border issues around the Amur basin and from the loss of Sakhalin in 1875 that without securing land through settlement and improvement, it was impossible to maintain possession in the face of international advances. In contrast to the government's concerns, however, Japanese free migration did not progress. The Meiji government faced the same problem as the Shogunate. After 1875 when Hokkaido came to mark the northern Japanese border, there was an even greater need for rapid development for the purpose of national defence.

As mentioned above, in 1869, the Meiji government sent 500 vagrants to Sakhalin and Hokkaido. In the same year, they established the *imin fujo kisoku* (migrant aid rule) to provide them with food, basic necessities and agricultural tools for the first three years. However, this policy was unsuccessful because many of the migrants returned to the mainland as soon as government aid ceased. The government thus regarded the warrior class as the most promising settler group. Among them, it encouraged people from the north-eastern domains (who had fought against the Meiji government and lost the Boshin War) to move to Hokkaido. Some of them went to Hokkaido as free settlers. Others were recruited as *tondenhei*, or farmer-soldiers. However, early *tondenhei* villages were only built in areas close to Sapporo. The population of migrants did not increase as the government had hoped.

Most of the *shūchikan* in Hokkaido were built in sparsely populated inland areas. In the case of Tsukigata, Ichikishiri (present-day Mikasa) and Shibechea where the Kabato, Sorachi and Kushiro *shūchikan* were established, towns rapidly grew around prison sites. Prisons not only confined convicts but offered job opportunities to merchants and craftsmen. Public facilities such as city halls, theatres and hospitals soon opened in or around prisons. In Obihiro and Abashiri, for instance, the sites of the Tokachi and Abashiri *shūchikan*, although migrants had already settled before the prisons were built, both towns grew dramatically after they opened.⁹⁴ Each prison in Hokkaido had its role: Kabato and Tokachi were agricultural, Sorachi was based around coal mining, Abashiri focused on construction and Kushiro was for sulphur mining, though it was abolished in 1888 because of high mortality rates amongst convicts who died or were injured as a result of exposure to poisonous gases.⁹⁵

The most significant contribution of the *shūchikan* to the history of Hokkaido was, however, highway construction. A problem for Hokkaido was not only the small migrant population but its distribution and pattern of occupation.⁹⁶ Kiyoshi Tsukigata, warden of the Kabato prison, expressed anxiety on the issue in his 1885 petition *Hokkaido kaitaku shigi* (My Opinion about the Development of Hokkaido) as follows: 'According to the survey by the census bureau in 1881, the population of Hokkaido is 168,084 ... Most people are living along the coast and are engaged in fishing. The rest are merchants or factory workers in cities. Farmers are very few, making up less than 10 per cent of the population.'⁹⁷

Tsukigata, asserting the importance of agriculture over fishing, proposed the use of convict labour for road construction and land clearance, both of which would make it easier for migrants to move and settle inland. Since 1881, a succession of officials had argued for a road which would allow people and goods to cross the island. However,

the stumbling block was always its cost, for the number of both indigenous people and free migrants was inadequate.⁹⁸ Tsukigata proposed that convict labour would be the best solution.⁹⁹ It is not clear to whom he submitted his petition or what affect it had on the government's decision. However, after Tsukigata resigned in August 1885, Kentarō Kaneko, a government official who visited Hokkaido from July to October 1885, submitted a report to Hirobumi Itō proposing that convicts undertake highway construction.

Kaneko, referring to British colonial policy, proposed reforms in the government's development policy for Hokkaido. He believed that it was desirable to appoint an administrator (like the governor generals of British colonies), and suggested the need for both a land survey and infrastructural works. Specifically, he proposed that convicts construct a road which would run from east to west, and along which *tondehei* villages would be established.¹⁰⁰ Based on Kaneko's report, in 1886 the Hokkaido government was established and the Home Ministry transferred the jurisdiction of the island's *shūchikan* prisons to it. Subsequently, from 1886 to 1893, the government employed convicts intensely in highway construction.

As Tsukigata pointed out, one of the reasons why migration to inland areas did not progress easily was because of the absence of roads. By the mid-1880s, highways that ran into inland areas only existed in southern areas (Map 11.2). After 1886, convicts constructed a highway that connected Sapporo, the capital, to prison towns through eastern Hokkaido. Along this road, twenty-five *tondenhei* villages were built. Convicts

Map 11.2 Convict-built roads and *tondenhei* villages

Figure 11.1 Population growth in Hokkaido

Sources: Ōkurashō, ed., *Kaitakushi jigyō hōkoku*, 1 (Tokyo: Ōkurashō, 1885); Hokkaidochō, ed., *Hokkaidochō tōkeisho*, 10 (Sapporo: Hokkaidochō, 1889); Hokkaidochō, ed., *Hokkaidochō tōkeisho*, 15 (Sapporo: Hokkaidochō, 1905).

built the *tondenhei* houses in Takikawa, Nagayama and Akkeshi.¹⁰¹ The highway which ran from Sapporo to Abashiri also had an additional military purpose, for later in 1900, the 7th Division of the Japanese army was stationed in the mid-point town of Asahikawa.

The migrant population increased dramatically after the 1890s (Figure 11.1). This phenomenon has usually been explained as the result of two factors: the migration policy of the Hokkaido government and the impact of the mainland economy. It is the case that the government changed regulations around land sales to encourage mainland settlers to move to Hokkaido. Further, on the mainland, deflation (which had begun in 1881) pushed bankrupt farmers out to new frontiers. However, it is also certainly the case that it would not have been possible to settle people inland without the convict-built roads.

Shūchikan prisons in Hokkaido were notorious for their inhumane treatment of convicts. For instance, in the highway construction between Asahikawa and Abashiri in 1891, more than 200 of the total number of 1,000 convicts died in just nine months.¹⁰² The cause of convicts' death was mostly illness resulting from inferior sanitation and hard labour. Among the five prisons in Hokkaido, the death rate in the Sorachi *shūchikan* was the highest because of mining under a harsh conditions.¹⁰³ The *Shūjin rōdō emaki* (An Illustrated Handscroll of Convict Labour), painted by a convict in Sorachi, depicts labour in the Horonai coal mine, including the collapse of a shaft and a gas explosion (Figure 11.2).

Ironically, the more the settler population increased, the stronger the criticism against convict labour became. There were no convict uprisings in Hokkaido's *shūchikan* prisons. However, convict escapes were frequent. From 1881 to 1898, 766 convicts broke out of prisons.¹⁰⁴ 1891 recorded the highest number; 136 convicts escaped in a single year.¹⁰⁵ This was 42 per cent of the total number of convict escape in the whole of

Figure 11.2 *Shūjin rōdō emaki* (an illustrated handscroll of convict labour), c. 1881–1889

Source: National Museum of Japanese History

Japan in the year. For settlers, convict escapes were highly threatening because convicts would break into their houses to steal money, clothing or foods. During one brutal incident of 1884, seven convicts stole a sword from a guard during land clearing work and escaped. They made for the nearby coastal town of Atsuta, went to a pawnshop, killed the owner, stole his money, and raped his wife and daughter.¹⁰⁶

The number of escapes reflects not only the harsh conditions but also the poor system of surveillance. In one 1892 report, prison officials admitted that it was difficult to watch convicts while they were working in the mines and on road construction.¹⁰⁷ The Home Ministry inspected *shūchikan* prisons in Hokkaido in 1894, and reported that there were no guards in coal mines; some convicts did no work, gambling was endemic and convicts had sex with each other. The report also criticized the guards' inability to recapture escaped convicts.¹⁰⁸

A convict memoir gives us insights into the ambiguities of hard labour and 'freedom' in Hokkaido. Kenshi Okunomiya (1857–1911) was an activist in the liberty and civil rights movement. He was imprisoned in Kabato prison from 1889 to 1897. He wrote of seeing the dead bodies of many escaped convicts but otherwise noted that he liked the Kabato regime because it was much looser than that of mainland prisons.¹⁰⁹ He also described the road construction site in the Kamikawa region. Convicts lived in bamboo grass huts, which allowed them to come and go freely, even at night. Some convicts stole food and liquor from neighbouring warehouses or shops. After work, they enjoyed eating, drinking and gambling. Some performed *rakugo*, or traditional comic storytelling, and songs; others went fishing. Perhaps surprisingly, they did not attempt to escape, and they worked hard on road building. There was a kind of chief in each group of convicts. His influence was apparently stronger than that of the guards, and so they used the 'chiefs' to control the convicts.¹¹⁰ Isamu Koike (1854–1940), also an activist and imprisoned in Sorachi *shūchikan* from 1888 to 1897, described this ambiguity too. He noted the high mortality rate but described also the lawlessness and 'freedom' of convict life in both the prison and the mine.¹¹¹

In the imperial Diet of December 1892, several members of the House of Representatives claimed that only the Hokkaido government and Colliery and Railway Company benefited from convict labour. It gave rise to the image of Hokkaido as an unattractive place to which felons were sent, which created a negative impression

among potential free migrants and thus an obstacle to development.¹¹² In 1893, Home Minister Inoue reported that penal transportation was not beneficial for either the penal system or the development of Hokkaido. Although it had been implemented to promote development, the number of voluntary migrants had increased and convicts turned out to be a menace to settlers. If they were released in Hokkaido, he argued, it would harm the free population. Therefore, convicts who were due to complete their term within a year should be sent back to mainland prisons.¹¹³ In 1894, the government accepted this proposal. It abolished extramural convict labour, too; public construction ceased in 1893, and coal mining in 1895.¹¹⁴

The government's abandonment of the first effort to settle convicts in Hokkaido and their decision to return convicts to the mainland, was a precautionary measure to prevent criticism within and beyond Hokkaido. Indeed, it cannot be said that settlers were tolerant of ex-convicts. For instance, in 1897, on the occasion of the Empress Dowager's demise, 2,473 convicts received mitigation of sentence under an amnesty and the government released 439 convicts. Among the 106 convicts let out of the Kabato prison, 20 settled in the northern outskirts of Tsukigata. The prison planned an ex-convict village there. However, settlers responded by separating their settlement from Tsukigata, forming a new village called Urausu in 1899.¹¹⁵

In 1907, the government revised the penal code and abolished penal transportation to Hokkaido altogether. Ultimately, Hokkaido was only a penal colony for twenty-seven years. As penal transportation ended so quickly, the project now appears temporary and the result of a more or less haphazard policy. As we have seen, this was not the case. Moreover, its short duration does not mean that it was not important. There had been quite a few criticisms of the 1880 penal code. One of them was that it brought back transportation after their previous abolition; another that it was not an effective means of prisoner rehabilitation.¹¹⁶ After the Meiji Restoration, Japan became more open to Western thought and history, and intellectuals began to claim that free migration was preferable to convict labour.¹¹⁷ The government nonetheless decided to reintroduce penal transportation, in order to encourage migration to and develop Hokkaido rapidly, and to prove that it had been Japan's territory all along. Without such efforts, the government believed that Hokkaido was susceptible to foreign invasion. And when that purpose was achieved, they abolished it without hesitation.

The Ainu

During the convict transportation period, the government advanced a policy of relocating the Ainu. This was another project in which the government erased Hokkaido's separate history. Traditional Ainu villages were small and scattered throughout a vast area. Each village was made up of ten to twenty households or less. In order to open these lands to Japanese migrants and capitalists, government gathered the Ainu into larger settlements under various pretexts. From 1870 to 1880, for instance, it removed settlements from the centre to the outskirts of cities such as Sapporo, Yoichi and Otaru. Ainu relocation not only functioned as a policy of segregation but was also compatible with a policy of assimilation by encouraging them to engage in farming,

instead of hunting and gathering, in new settlements. From 1883 to 1886, as a means of teaching Ainu agriculture, for instance, government relocated many small settlements in the Tokachi and Hidaka regions, creating some large settlements.¹¹⁸

Ainu removal accelerated from the second half of the 1880s, and continued until the end of the 1890s. As mentioned above, from 1886 highway construction progressed, and along these roads *tondenhei* villages were built. In the same period, the Hokkaido government sectioned land in order to sell it to capitalists and settlers. As part of this process, they put aside certain portions of land as Ainu allotments. Early cases took place in the Ishikari basin where the first two *shūchikan* were built (Kabato and Sorachi prisons). Later in 1889, Ainu villages in the middle Ishikari River were removed to an allotment in Ushisubetsu.¹¹⁹ In 1894, the Ainu along the upper Ishikari River were removed to the Chikabumi allotment.

In this region, convict labour and Ainu relocation crossed and became entangled. Road construction by convicts destroyed the environment in which the Ainu lived, and they also witnessed and suffered the problems of escaped convicts. The Ainu woman Kura Sunazawa, in her memoir, describes her grandfather, Monokute, telling her the reason why he decided to move from Nagayama to Chikabumi allotment. He said that it was because 'awful things began to happen'. Monokute described how, one day, he had met an escaped convict who, threatened him with a sword unless he took him across the river by boat. Monokute believed that regardless of whether or not he carried the convict, he would be murdered (Figure 11.3). So he stepped hard on

Figure 11.3 Two Ainu men and a convict. Drawing by Kura Sunazawa. The man on the right is her grandfather, Monokute. The man in the centre with a sword is a convict

Source: Sunazawa, *Ku skup oruspe*, 41.

Table 11.2 Population Growth in the Ishikari Basin Area*

	1880	1886	1887	1888	1889	1890	1891	1892	1896	1897
Total Population	0	2,372	2,613	2,900	3,760	9,006	12,351	17,019	57,856	71,662
Ainu	256	341	279	305	310	305	306	309	268	299

Sources: Naimushō sōmukyoku, ed., *Nihon zenkoku minseki kokō hyō, meiji 13 nen shirabe* (Tokyo: Naimushō, 1881); Ōkurashō, ed., *Kaitakushi jigyo hōkoku 1* (Tokyo: Ōkurashō, 1885); Hokkaido, ed., *Hokkaidochō Tōkeisho* (Sapporo: Hokkaidochō, 1888–1894, 1898–1899): 1–7, 9–10.

*The Ishikari Basin area consists of Kabato, Sorachi, Uryu and Kamikawa counties.

one side of the boat to tilt it, causing the convict to fall into the river and drown. Afterwards, Monokute got a reward from a government official. It seems that the convict had murdered a warder and stolen his sword in the course of his escape.¹²⁰

Sunazawa also writes of another episode in which one of her Ainu female relatives had witnessed the punishment called *nokogiribiki* (pulling the saw). This was one of the early modern punishments abolished by the Meiji Restoration government. She had seen a convict tied to a pillar by a bridge. A saw was tied to his neck and was activated whenever someone crossed the bridge. It was said that this man had murdered another convict.¹²¹

Nagayama, where Monokute originally lived, was the location for a convict-built *tondenhei* village. One of the militiamen who settled in a neighbouring village, drew a picture scroll '*tondenhei emaki*' in which the Ainu are depicted, and a caption notes: 'I ordered them to move.'¹²² Indeed, Ainu removal created vast tracts of 'uninhabited' land. The government sold it to settlers, the nobility and capitalists. As Table 11.2 shows, subsequently the population in the Ishikari basin area grew rapidly in the 1890s.

Conclusion

Since the late eighteenth century when the issue of national security in the face of Russian imperialism arose, many Japanese intellectuals claimed and promoted the idea of transportation to Hokkaido. However, at the same time, it is true that in policy terms it was not always regarded as the best measure. Government often viewed free migration or the establishment of militia villages as more preferable options. However, it was not easy for Japanese settlers to move to Hokkaido, for it was regarded as a frozen, barren land where rice did not grow. Therefore, thinkers continuously proposed the transportation of convicts or vagrants, and the government sought to adopt it as policy when they faced difficulties in securing the sufficient voluntary migration of 'good citizens' – both during the Tokugawa period and following the Meiji Restoration. Hence, it was perhaps inevitable that the government abolished penal transportation as soon as the migration of adequate numbers of desirable settlers got on track.

The origins of the idea of transportation in early modern Japan are unclear. Confucians referred to ancient Chinese systems. However, it is evident that Toshiaki

Honda was conscious of Western imperialism, and by the mid-nineteenth century at the latest, in Japan there was a strong awareness of the history and the practice of convict transportation in European countries and empires. Whatever the case, it was Western imperialism that opened up the discussion of migration to Ezochi among Japanese scholars and politicians. Moreover, it was through the Ezochi issue, that the Japanese first encountered Western imperialism in a substantive sense. It was different from the East Asian world order; quite different from the Asian practices through which Japan had maintained its imagined empire based on trade networks. To maintain this kind of empire, Japanese migration had not been necessary.

During the period in which Japan competed with the Western powers (including Russia) over Ezochi and Sakhalin, it learned that to maintain territories, it was necessary to establish a settled population, develop land and resources (including cultivation), and assimilate indigenous people. As the government believed that Ezochi had been part of the Japanese frontier since the eighteenth century, the colonization of Ezochi – or Hokkaido – was considered a matter of national security. Later, during the period from the late nineteenth century to the first half of the twentieth century, this aspect, namely expansion in the name of ‘national security’, became a prominent characteristic of Japanese imperialism.¹²³

Convict transportation to Hokkaido in the Meiji period has been understood as a measure to deal with anti-government revolts in the 1870s as well as to expedite the development of Hokkaido. As this policy was only in force for twenty-seven years and became notorious for the severity of the conditions of forced labour, it has been regarded as haphazard and unsuccessful.¹²⁴ In fact, it seemed to lack consistency, as can be seen in the swift abandonment of the first effort to settle convicts in Hokkaido. However, it certainly contributed to the promotion of migration inland, which was a top priority for the government. In this sense, convict transportation achieved its goal, and its abolition was the result of its success.

After the penal transportation era, convicts did not remain in Hokkaido. Most of them were repatriated to the mainland. They left highways, bridges and rice fields in their wake, but otherwise disappeared. In the same period, the Ainu were relocated from their original settlements to create new tracts of ‘uninhabited’ land for settlers. The project to transform Ezochi, land of the barbarian, into Japan’s periphery was complete. A history of Hokkaido compiled by the Hokkaido government in the 1930s represented its colonization as a story of the development of *terra nullius* by the government and free settlers.¹²⁵ Epistemically deleting convicts, as well as the Ainu, most Japanese people are able to believe that Hokkaido has always been Japanese territory. And so, the plans and ideology of early modern Japan have finally been realized.

Notes

- 1 We should be careful about accepting the early modern Japanese belief that Japan was ‘the ruler of the Ainu’ at face value. *Omemie* was called *uyumam* in the Ainu language,

- and it means trade, or the exchange of gifts accompanied with drinking and eating between friends or allies. See Minako Sakata, *Ainu koshō bungaku no episutemoroji: rekishi no hōhō toshitenō ainu sanbun setsuwa* (Tokyo: Ochanomizu shobō, 2011), ch. 6.
- 2 Yasunori Arano, *Kinsei nihon to higashi ajia* (Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppankai, 1988).
 - 3 On the contract fishery in Ezochi, see David L. Howell, *Capitalism from Within: Economy, Society, and the State in a Japanese Fishery* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1995).
 - 4 *Tondenhei* were former *samurai*, or warrior-class people who combined farming with military duty. After the Meiji Restoration, the class system was altered, and many lower rank *samurai* lost their former social position. The *tondenhei* system was implemented in 1874 to relieve the bankrupt warrior class, as well as to develop Hokkaido. They were supposed to engage in land clearing and cultivation during peacetime, and to be mobilized for defence in case of emergency.
 - 5 By two treaties concluded with Russia, the Treaty of Shimoda in 1855 and the Treaty of St Petersburg in 1875, Hokkaido was secured as a Japanese territory. However, its status was vague. Japan had never had colonies before, and so Hokkaido was regarded both as part of the mainland and as a colony. In actual policy, it became a part of the mainland in 1903 when suffrage was given to migrants in Hokkaido. See Hiroyuki Shiode, *Ekkyōsha no seijishi: Ajia taiheiyō niokeru nihonjin no imin to shokumin* (Nagoya: Nagoya daigaku shuppankai, 2016), 62.
 - 6 Toshiyuki Akizuki, *Chishimarettō o meguru nihon to roshia* (Sapporo: Hokkaido daigaku shuppankai, 2014), 62–63.
 - 7 Michiko Ikuta, *Gaikō girei kara mita bakumatsu nichiro bunka kōryūshi: Egakareta sōgo imēji hyōshō* (Kyoto: Minerva shobō, 2008), 10.
 - 8 Satoru Fujita, *Kinsei kōki seijishi to taigai kankei* (Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppankai, 2005), 167–169.
 - 9 *Ibid.*, 181.
 - 10 *Ibid.*, 182.
 - 11 Toshiaki Honda, ‘Hondashi sakuron ezo shūi’, in *Honda Toshiaki shū*, ed. Shirō Yokokawa (Tokyo: Seibundō shinkōsha, 1935; orig. 1789), 302. Honda’s understanding of Kamchatka was not correct. Before the Russian approach, Japanese trading ships had only reached as far as Kunashir Island. In 1800, the Shogunate opened a trading post on Iturup, which became the easternmost site of Japanese–Ainu trade until the end of the Tokugawa era.
 - 12 *Ibid.*, 302–304.
 - 13 Toshiaki Honda, ‘Sekii dōsei’, in *Hoppō mikōkai komonjo shūsei*, vol. 3, eds. Hajime Terasawa, Toshiaki Wada and Hidetoshi Kuroda (Tokyo: Sobunsha, 1978; orig. 1791), 126–128. Toshiaki Honda, ‘Seiiki monogatari’, in *Honda Toshiaki shū*, ed. Shirō Yokokawa (Tokyo: Seibundō shinkōsha, 1935; orig. 1798), 171.
 - 14 Honda, ‘Seiiki monogatari’, 148, 170.
 - 15 Honda, ‘Hondashi sakuron’, 299. Honda, ‘Sekii dōsei’, 128. Toshiaki Honda, ‘Shizen chidō no ben’, in *Honda Toshiaki shū*, ed. Shirō Yokokawa (Tokyo: Seibundō shinkōsha, 1935; orig. 1795), 261. Honda, ‘Seiiki monogatari’, 171.
 - 16 Honda, ‘Seiiki monogatari’, 170.
 - 17 Honda, ‘Hondashi sakuron’, 297–306. Honda, ‘Sekii dōsei’, 126–133. Honda, ‘Shizen chidō’, 258–264.
 - 18 Honda, ‘Sekii dōsei’, 126–129.

- 19 Ibid., 129.
- 20 Honda, 'Seiiki monogatari', 148.
- 21 On the subject of Honda's economic theory, Keene commented that although his idea was quite similar to western mercantilism, it was not derived from Western thought but was an original concept based on the writings of Japanese scholars. Donald Keene, *The Japanese Discovery of Europe, 1720–1830* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1969), 110. It might be said that Honda's original idea of transportation was based on Japanese and Chinese theories, further stimulated by Western imperialism.
- 22 Toshiaki Honda, 'Keisei hisaku', in *Honda Toshiaki shū*, ed. Shirō Yokokawa (Tokyo: Seibundō shinkōsha, 1935; orig. 1798). 42–43.
- 23 Ibid., 40–41.
- 24 On Sakhalin were there other indigenous peoples, too; Oroks and the Nivkh. They inhabited the central and northern parts of the island, while the Ainu resided in the south. The Japanese did not have close relations with Oroks and the Nivkh in the early modern period.
- 25 On the tribute trade system in early modern East Asia, see Takeshi Hamashita, *China, East Asia and the Global Economy: Regional and Historical Perspectives* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008).
- 26 Seiri Koga, 'Kyokuron jiji fūji', in *Nihon Keizai Taiten*, vol. 26, ed. Seiichi Takimoto (Tokyo: Meiji bunken, 1969; orig. 1804–1818), 199. In Ancient China, a system called *tuntian*, or colonist militia, existed in which soldiers settled on frontiers and engaged in cultivation. Under this system, convicts were also sent to such frontiers, and after the conclusion of their term, they were permitted to settle as civilians. Hiroshi Ishioka, 'Fu-Zuo and Chi-Xing in the Penal System that is Composed of Definite Labour Term during the Han Dynasty', *Hōseishi kenkyū* 50 (2000): 137–160.
- 27 Nobuhiro Satō, 'Seiyō rekkoku shiryaku', in *Satō Nobuhiro kagaku zenshū, ge*, ed. Seiichi Takimoto (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1927; orig. 1808).
- 28 Nobuhiro Satō, 'Bōkaisaku', in Takimoto, ed., *Satō Nobuhiro kagaku zenshū, ge* (orig. 1808), 821–825.
- 29 Ibid., 825–826.
- 30 Ibid., 827.
- 31 Honda, 'Seiiki monogatari', 172–182.
- 32 Takao Shimazaki, 'Satō Nobuhiro: Jinbutsu shisō narabini kenkyūshi', in *Nihon Shisō Taikei*, vol. 45, eds. Masahide Bitō and Takao Shimazaki (Tokyo: Iwanami shoten, 1977), 611.
- 33 Masahide Bitō, 'Kaisetsu', in Bitō and Shimazaki, eds., *Nihon shisō taikei*, 45: 583–584.
- 34 Ken-ichi Kuroda, *Nihon shokumin shisōshi* (Tokyo: Kōbundō shobō, 1942), 168–169. Examples of such writings include, for instance Nariaki Tokugawa, 'Hopō mirai kō', in *Mitogaku taikei*, vol. 5, ed. Yoshijirō Takasu (Tokyo: Mitogaku taikei kankōkai, 1942; orig. 1839). Kōan Fujimori, 'Shin seidan', in *Nihon Keizai Taiten*, vol. 45, ed. Seiichi Takimoto (Tokyo: Meiji bunken, 1970; orig. 1855). Shunsuke Kagami, 'Ezochi Gotakukon Ikensho', Hokkaido University Library, 1855. Shinpei Etō, 'Tokaisaku', in *Nanpaku Etō Shinpei ikō zenshū* (Yoshikawa Hanshichi, 1900; orig. 1856).
- 35 Kagami was a *rōnin*, or masterless *samurai*. This proposal was submitted to Shunpei Kawasaki, an official of the Shogunate.
- 36 Kagami, 'Ezochi gotakukon'.
- 37 Toshiyuki Akizuki, *Nichiro kankei to Saharintō: Bakumatsu meiji shonen no ryōdo mondai* (Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1994), 115–116.

- 38 Ibid., 135–136.
- 39 Hakodate Bugyō, ‘Ezochi gokaitaku sho okakitsuke sho ukagai shorui’, in *Shinsen Hokkaidoshi*, vol. 5, ed. Hokkaidochō [Hokkaido government] (Osaka: Seibundō shuppan, 1991; orig. 1862), 1401–1402.
- 40 Ibid., 1403.
- 41 Ibid., 1406.
- 42 Hokkaido [Hokkaido government], ed., *Shin Hokkaidoshi*, vol. 2 (Sapporo: Hokkaido, 1970), 728–731.
- 43 Hōzan Yokoi, ‘Hokumon shigi’, *Hokkai no shokusan* 6, no. 68 (1896; orig. 1855): 62.
- 44 Ibid., 70–71.
- 45 Fujimori, ‘Shin seidan’, 382.
- 46 Fujimori wrote: ‘since the discovery of silver mines in California, Chinese fortune seekers had rushed on board Western ships to work there.’ It is uncertain if this description is accurate. He might have mistake gold for silver. In early modern China, silver was used as currency. Ibid., 386.
- 47 Ibid., 384–385.
- 48 Ibid., 391.
- 49 ‘Shichi gatsu jūsan nichī rōjū tasshi’, in *Dai nihon komonjo: Bakumatsu gaikoku kankei bunsho*, vol. 14, ed. Tokyo teikoku daigaku (Tokyo: Tokyo teikoku daigaku, 1922; orig. 1856), 429–431.
- 50 ‘Jūichi gatsu jūni nichī hakodate bugyō jōshinsho’, in *Dai nihon komonjo: Bakumatsu gaikoku kankei bunsho*, vol. 15, ed. Tokyo daigaku shiryo hensanjo (Tokyo: Tokyo daigaku shuppankai, 1972; orig. 1856), 235–245.
- 51 Akizuki, *Nichiro kankei*.
- 52 Hokkaidochō, ed., *Hokkaidoshi*, vol. 1 (Sapporo: Hokkaidochō, 1918), 786.
- 53 Hakodate Bugyō, ‘Hakodate goyōdome’, in *Shin Hokkaidoshi*, vol. 7, ed. Hokkaidochō (Sapporo: Hokkaidochō, 1969; orig. 1864–1868), 646–648.
- 54 Akizuki, *Nichiro kankei*, 165. Convict transportation to Sakahlin began in 1858. See Naoki Amano, ‘Saharin rukei shokuminchi no imēji to jittai: henken to tekio’, *Kyōkai kenkyū* 1 (2010): 120; and Badcock and Pallot in this volume.
- 55 Akizuki, *Nichiro kankei*, 142.
- 56 Hakodate Bugyō, ‘Hakodate goyōdome’, 648.
- 57 Ibid., 646.
- 58 Separate from this plan, about twenty convicts were sent as miners to the Shiranuka coal mine in Ezochi in 1856. After Shiranuka was closed in 1864, these convicts were transported to a new coal mine in Iwanai, Ezochi. See Kazuyoshi Shigematsu, *Hokkaido gyōkeishi* (Sapporo: Zufu shuppan, 1970), 57–64.
- 59 Akizuki, *Nichiro kankei*, 139.
- 60 Ibid., 175.
- 61 Ibid., 214.
- 62 Hokkaidochō, ed., *Shin Hokkaidoshi*, vol. 3 (Sapporo: Hokkaidochō, 1971), 279.
- 63 Shigematsu, *Hokkaido gyōkeishi*, 120–122. Osamu Tanaka, *Nihon shihonshugi to Hokkaido* (Sapporo: Hokkaido daigaku tosho kankōkai, 1986), 103–105.
- 64 Bitō, ‘Kaisetsu’, 583–584.
- 65 Etō, ‘Tokaisaku’.
- 66 Kōmon Tada, ed., *Iwakurako jikki ge*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Kōgōgūshiki, 1906), 601–602.
- 67 Naikaku kirokukyoku, ed., *Hōki bunrui taizen*, vol. 26 (Tokyo: Naikaku kirokukyoku, 1891), 2.
- 68 Shigematsu, *Hokkaido gyōkeishi*, 67.

- 69 For instance, the total number of transpotees to Hachijōjima in the Izu islands from 1610 to 1866 was 1823. Keimukyōkai [prisons association], ed., *Nihon kinsei gyōkeishi kō, jō* (Tokyo: Kyōsei kyōkai, 1943), 617–618. Between 1862 and 1865 alone, on the other hand, in Edo, fifteen convicts were crucified, ten were burned at the stake and more than one hundred were beheaded each year. Daniel V. Botsman, *Punishment and Power in the Making of Modern Japan* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007), 17–18.
- 70 Ryōsuke Ishii, *Edo no keibatsu* (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 2013), 77–82.
- 71 Imprisonment was not a common form of punishment in early modern Japan. Jails (*rō*) in the Tokugawa period were not facilities to confine convicts but to hold people who were accused of crimes until their punishment was determined. See Ishii, *Edo no keibatsu*, 26–27; Botsman, *Punishment and Power*, 28. In the Meiji Restoration, under the influence of the Western penal system, imprisonment became the primary mode of punishment. Botsman, *Punishment and Power*, 169–170.
- 72 Yutaka Tezuka, *Meiji keihōshi no kenkyū, jō* (Tokyo: Keiō daigaku shuppankai, 1984), 3–4.
- 73 Ibid., 4.
- 74 Botsman, *Punishment and Power*, 142.
- 75 Taneomi Soejima, ‘Meiji shonen gaikō jitsureki dan’, in *Soejima Taneomi zenshū*, vol. 3, ed. Yoshitaka Shima (Tokyo: Keibunsha, 2007; orig. 1902), 389.
- 76 Tada, ed., *Iwakurakō*, 699–700.
- 77 ‘Soejima haku keireki gūdan’, in *Soejima Taneomi zenshū*, vol. 2, ed. Yoshitaka Shima (Tokyo: Keibunsha, 2004; orig. 1897–1898), 424. Yutaka Tezuka, *Meiji minpōshi no kenkyū, jō* (Tokyo: Keiō daigaku shuppankai, 1990), 27–28.
- 78 Tezuka, *Meiji keihōshi*, 35.
- 79 Naikaku kirokukyoku, ed., *Hōki bunrui*, 146.
- 80 Ibid., 119–120.
- 81 Haruyasu Sugiyama, Minoru Nomura, Tamio Yoshii and Tadashi Fujita, ‘Kaidai’, in *Nihon keihō sōan kaigi hikki*, vol. 1, ed. Waseda daigaku (Tokyo: Waseda daigaku shuppanbu, 1976), 26.
- 82 Shihōsho [Ministry of Justice], ‘*Keihō henshū nisshi*’, in *Nihon keihō sōan kaigi hikki, bessatsu*, ed. Waseda daigaku (Tokyo: Waseda daigaku shuppanbu, 1976; orig. 1875), 4.
- 83 Ibid., 5.
- 84 Bushō Okazaki, ed., ‘*Nihon keihō sōan kaigi hikki*’ in *Nihon keihō sōan kaigi hikki*, vol. 1, ed. Waseda daigaku (Tokyo: Waseda daigaku shuppanbu, 1976; orig. 1881), 89–90.
- 85 Ibid., 65, 92.
- 86 National Archives of Japan (NAJ), ‘Bōdō no zokuto Hokkaido chihō e hatsuhai kōeki ukagai’, in *Kōbunroku, meiji 9 nen, dai 73 kan, meiji 9 nen 11 gatsu, Shihōshō ukagai* (1876).
- 87 NAJ, ‘Rutokei o okoshi Hokkaido ni hakken no gi jōchin’, in *Kōbunroku, meiji 10 nen, dai 24 kan, meiji 10 nen 2gatsu, Naimushō ukagai 5* (1877).
- 88 NAJ, ‘Toru ryōshū hakkenchi yotei no ken’, in *Kōbunroku, meiji 13 nen, dai 219 kan, meiji 13 nen 2 gatsu, Naimushō ukagai 3* (1880). Home Minister Ōkubo was assassinated in May 1878, and was succeeded by Hirobumi Itō.
- 89 Botsman, *Punishment and Power*, 174–175.
- 90 Kabato Shūchikan, ed., ‘Kabato shūchikan enkaku ryakuki’, in *Shin Asahikawashishi*, vol. 6, ed. Asahikawashi henshū kaigi (Asahikawa: Asahikawashi, 1993; orig. 1885), 507–509.

- 91 Tanaka, *Nihon shihonshugi*, 107.
- 92 Hokkaido shūchikan, ed., *Hokkaido shūchikan dai 1–3 kai tōkeisho* (Tokyo: Hokkaido shūchikan, 1892–1894). Hokkaido shūchikan, ed., *Hokkaido shūchikan dai 4–9 kai nenpō* (Tokyo: Hokkaido shūchikan, 1895–1900).
- 93 Yutaka Tezuka, *Jiyūminken saiban no kenkyū, jō* (Tokyo: Keiō tsūshin, 1982), 128–129.
- 94 Chiaki Oguchi, *Nihonjin no sōtaiteki kankyō kan: konomarenai kūkan no rekishi chirigaku* (Tokyo: Kokon shoin, 2002), 25–55.
- 95 Shigematsu, *Hokkaido gyōkeishi*, 232–238.
- 96 According to 1886 government statistics, the total population of Hokkaido was 300,000. Forty per cent of settlers lived in the southern part of Oshima peninsula, which had been Japanese territory since the Tokugawa period; and 10 per cent in large cities (Sapporo and Otaru); and the rest in villages along the coast. Hokkaidochō, ed., *Hokkaidochō tōkeisho dai 1 kai* (Hakodate: Hokkaidochō, 1888), 119–124.
- 97 The Archives of Hokkaido, Kiyoshi Tsukigata, 'Hokkaido kaitaku shigi'.
- 98 Hokkaidochō, *Shin Hokkaidoshi* 3, 800–801. The government hired mainland workers for highway construction from Hakodate to Sapporo (1872–1873), for instance. The total cost of this construction was 840,000 yen. Ibid., 415–417. The budget for the Hokkaido Development Commissioner totalled 10 million yen for ten years.
- 99 Tsukigata, 'Hokkaido kaitaku shigi'.
- 100 Kentarō Kaneko, 'Hokkaido sanken junshi fukumeisho', in *Shinsen Hokkaidoshi*, vol. 6, ed. Hokkaidochō (Sapporo: Hokkaidochō, 1936; orig. 1885), 591–644.
- 101 'Kabato shūchikan, 'Kabato shūchikan', 536.
- 102 Minoru Akiba, 'Kitami eno michi', in *Hokkaido dōroshi*, ed. Hokkaido dōroshi chōsakai (Sapporo: Hokkaido dōroshi chōsakai, 1990), 212.
- 103 Tanaka, *Nihon shihonshugi*, 129.
- 104 Hokkaido shūchikan, ed., *Hokkaido shūchikan dai 9 kai nenpō* (Tokyo: Hokkaido shūchikan, 1900), 29–30.
- 105 Tanaka, *Nihon shihonshugi*, 139.
- 106 Shigematsu, *Hokkaido gyōkeishi*, 191–192.
- 107 Kabato shūchikan, 'Kabato shūchikan', 530.
- 108 Japanese Correctional Association Library M092/366: *Hokkaido kangoku jun-etsu fukumeisho*, May 1894, *Hokkaido kangoku jun-etsu fukumeisho*, October 1894.
- 109 Escaped convicts who resisted recapture were often killed on the spot. In 1882, for example, the Kabato shūchikan reported to the Home Minister that two escaped convicts had been killed in this way. They added that, 'as such incidents are frequent, they would not report on these matters in future'. NAJ, 'Kabato shūchikan chōekishū Ogawa Umekichi hoka ichimei hotō nosai zansatsu no ken', in *Kōbunroku, meiji 15 nen, dai 51 kan, meiji 15 nen 9 gatsu, Naimushō* 3 (1882).
- 110 Kenshi Okunomiya, 'Gokuri no ware: Okunomiya Kenshi zangeroku', in *Okunomiya Kenshi zenshū, jō* (Tokyo: Kōryūsha, 1988; orig. 1897), 160.
- 111 Isamu Koike, 'Koike Isamu jijoden 2', *Rekishi hyōron* 90 (1897; 1957): 55–56.
- 112 Dai nihon teikoku gikaishi kankōkai, ed., *Dai nihon teikoku gikaishi*, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Dai nihon teikoku gikaishi kankōkai, 1927), 629–630.
- 113 NAJ, 'Shūchikan seido no ken', in *Kōbun betsureku, Naimushō, meiji 19 nen–meiji 30 nen dai 1 kan* (1893).
- 114 Keimukyōkai, ed., *Nihon kinsei gyōkeishi kō, ge* (Tokyo: Kyōsei kyōkai, 1943), 1255.

- 115 Urausuchōshi hensan iinkai, ed., *Urausuchōshi* (Urausu: Urausuchō, 1967), 156.
- 116 Mizuho Himejima, *Meiji kangokuhō seiritsushi no kenkyū: Ōshu kangoku seido no dōnyū to jōyaku kaisei o megutte* (Tokyo: Seibundō, 2011), 66.
- 117 Kuroda, *Nihon shokumin shisōshi*, 190–223.
- 118 Noriko Katō, ‘Sanken ikkyoku jidai no tai Ainu seisaku to sono jitsujō’, *Hokudai shigaku* 20 (1980): 14–26.
- 119 Shintotsukawa chōshi hensan iinkai, ed., *Shintotsukawa hyakunen shi* (Shintotsukawa: Shintotsukawachō, 1991), 48.
- 120 Kura Sunazawa, *Ku skup oruspe: Watashi no ichidai no hanashi* (Sapporo: Hokkaido shinbunsha, 1983), 40–41.
- 121 Ibid., 41. *Nokogiribiki* was a supplementary punishment imposed on people sentenced to crucifixion. The condemned person was put into a wooden box and buried upright, except for his neck and head which protruded from the ground. A saw was put on either side of his head. Onlookers were allowed to pull the saw across his neck, though they rarely did so. It was more of a display than an actual punishment, its purpose to threaten not just the condemned person but also the general public. After a two-day display, the prisoner was crucified. See Keimukyōkai, *Nihon kinsei gyōkeishi kō, jō*, 739. Botsman, *Punishment and Power*, 26.
- 122 *Tondenhei emaki* is possessed by Hokkaido Museum.
- 123 Mark Peattie, *Shokuminchi: 20 seiki nihon teikoku 50 nen no kōbō*, trans. Toyomi Asano (Tokyo: Jigakusha, 2012).
- 124 It is said: ‘The *shūchikan* prisons in our country, except those of Hokkaido, always played a leading role in the establishment of the prison system.’ Keimukyōkai, *Nihon kinsei gyōkeishi kō, ge*, 4.
- 125 Hokkaidochō, ed., *Shinsen Hokkaidoshi* (Sapporo: Hokkaidochō, 1936–1937).