

ISSN 1997-3721

師大 **台灣史** 學報 No. 14

2021年12月31日出刊

BULLETIN OF TAIWAN HISTORICAL RESEARCH, NTNU

TAIWAN

**跨帝國史的臺灣鳳梨產業—
專業技術的遷移與轉化：從美國夏威夷到臺灣**

東榮一郎

A Trans-Imperial History of Taiwan's Pineapple Industry: Migration and Transfer of Colonial Expertise from U.S.-Controlled Hawaii to Japanese-Ruled Taiwan

Eiichiro Azuma*

This essay unveils a historical origin of Taiwan's modern pineapple industry by examining its connection to Hawaii before the Pacific War. The complex entanglement of Japanese immigrant experience in the United States and imperial Japan's migration-led colonialism forms a central thread in the transpacific connection, which involved the transfer of the migrant knowledge and farming expertise from North America to East Asia between the 1890s and the 1930s. Not only did the reverse movement of Japanese remigrants from Hawaii, their U.S.-bred colonial ideas, and the adapted techniques of American-style agricultural colonization inform the processes of government-supported economic developments inside Japanese-ruled Taiwan; but also their colonial farming expertise was co-opted and incorporated into its official policies. This essay examines examples of inter-imperial negotiations, exchanges, and fusions of settler colonial thinking and practices between the two Pacific empires: United States and imperial Japan. My discussions entail close and constant attention to material bases

* Professor of History and Asian American Studies, University of Pennsylvania

of the inter-imperial transfers, that is, the migrant bodies that moved between the political economies of America's white-settler empire and Japan's Pan-Asianist-settler empire. Thus, my analysis is not concerned simply with some ideas and techniques that were floating between one imperial sphere and another. It intends to illuminate the contingent and yet inseparable ties between the transferred colonial expertise, and the human migration that carried it from U.S.-controlled Hawaii and transplanted it in Japanese-ruled Taiwan.

Traversing the divided spheres of the imperial Pacific, Japanese remigrants facilitated the mobility of the vital knowledge and technique of colonial farming from the United States to imperial Japan, when the latter aspired to “develop” its new colonial territories in reference to other imperial models, especially America's national myth of frontier conquest that emphasized migration-based national expansion, agricultural colonization, and civilization-building. Entitled *In Search of Our Frontier: Japanese America and Settler Colonialism in the Construction of Japan's Borderless Empire*, my recent monograph looks into how the historical example and discourse of American-style frontier development inspired many Japanese to engage in overseas migration and agricultural colonization inside and outside Japan's formal empire under the slogan of “overseas development” (海外發展).

Here, American-style frontier development refers to the colonization of the landmasses that were considered untouched wilderness by the immigrants who identified them as settler-farmers. In the myth of U.S. nation-building, this form of “development” on the “frontier-land” of the American West by white settler farmers is celebrated as *the* chief engine of U.S. endeavors to establish a modern civilization, a new nation, and eventually an expanding empire spilling into the Asia-Pacific basin. In this context, indigenous peoples (“American Indians”) are equated to the

nature to be conquered/destroyed and savagery to be defeated by modern civilization.¹ Japanese fascination with U.S.-style, migration-led agricultural colonization provided a background for Meiji Japan's first major developmentalist project in Hokkaido, which hired white American agronomists and transplanted U.S.-style scientific agriculture, with tens of thousands of mainland Japanese who migrated there as settler farmers. Their agricultural colonization resulted in the displacement of indigenous Ainu people throughout Hokkaido.²

In a similar manner, the first colonial settlement-making in Japanese-ruled Taiwan took place in 1910 as the result of the destruction of aboriginal villages in "Qijiaochuan" (七脚川) district near Hualien, which led to the mass killing and forced removal of Ami people between 1908 and 1909. The land for "Yoshino Mura" (吉野村), the first Japanese immigrant village in Japan's overseas colony, was created in this prototypical "American" way.³ Indeed, these historical examples in

¹ For more detail, see Eiichiro Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier: Japanese America and Settler Colonialism in the Construction of Japan's Borderless Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2019), pp.13-17.

² Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, p.15; Fumiko Fujita, *American Pioneers and the Japanese Frontier: American Experts in Nineteenth-Century Japan* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1994), pp.7-8, 15-41; Katsuya Hirano, "Thanatopolitics in the Making of Japan's Hokkaido: Settler Colonialism and Primitive Accumulation," *Critical Historical Studies* 2, no. 2 (Fall 2015), pp.200-203; Sidney Xu Lu, "Colonizing Hokkaido and the Origin of Japanese Trans-Pacific Expansion, 1869-1894," *Japanese Studies* 36, no. 2 (2016), pp.258-261; and Sidney Xu Lu, *The Making of Japanese Settler Colonialism: Malthusianism and Trans-Pacific Migration, 1868-1961* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019), ch. 1.

³ On the "Qijiaochuan incident," see Lin Suzhen, Lin Chunzhi, and Chen Yaofang, *Yuan zhu min Zhong da li shi shi jian: Qijiachuan shi jian* (Taipei: Xing zheng yuan yuan zu min zu wei yuan hui, 2005), pp.42-163. On the early history of Japanese settler colonialism in eastern Taiwan, see Chang Subing, *Wei jing de zhi min: ri ben zai ai yi min cun* (New Taipei City: Wei cheng, 2017), pp.75-158; Akagi Takeichi, *Taiwan ni okeru Bokokujin nōgyō shokumin* (Taipei: Taiwan Sōtōkufu Shokusan-kyoku, 1929), pp.2-36; Kurihara Jun, "Taiwan Sōtōkufu ni yoru kan 'ei imin jigyo ni tsuite,'" in *Chūgoku minshū e no shiza*, ed. Kanagawa Daigaku Chūgokugo Gakka, pp.161-184 (Tokyo: Tōhō Shoten, 1998); and Aratake Tatsurō, "Nihon tōchi jidai Taiwan tōbu e no imin to sōshutsuchi," *Tokushima Daigaku Sōgō Kagakubu ningen shakai bunka kenkyū* 14 (2007), pp.91-104. The first three Japanese settlements were Yoshino, Toyoda (豊田), and Hayashida (林田) Villages. On privately-organized Kada (賀田)

Hokkaido and eastern Taiwan have strong imprints of and resemblances to what white Americans had done in the process of conquering the frontier-land and building a race-based national society in the U.S. West — the process that included: killing native peoples, pushing them outside so-called civilized society, and confining them in the “Indian Reservations” in order to make room for white settler farmers and other migrants of European extraction, or “Americans.” After the 1880s, many Japanese who decided to move to overseas places for the purpose of colonization (開拓) aspired to join such a modernizationist project of civilization building on frontier-lands inside and outside Japan’s formal empire. In the early years of its migration history, the U.S. West and Hawaii were most favored destinations for self-styled immigrant frontiersmen from Meiji Japan, although other places, especially South America, like Brazil, and Japan’s formal colonial territories, like Taiwan and Manchuria, later emerged as alternative sites of “overseas Japanese development” (日本民族の海外発展) following race-based Japanese exclusion from Anglophone North America and Australia.⁴

In Search of Our Frontier also traces origins of the Japanese “discourse on overseas development” (海外発展論) to the first modern-era settlements of Japanese immigrants in North America, especially northern California and Hawaii. This discourse constituted Japan’s nativized formulation and its articulations of U.S.

Village that paved the way to state-sponsored Yoshino immigrant village, see Hōgikai, ed., *Kada Kanesaburō-ō shōden* (Tokyo: Hōgikai, 1923), pp.63-84; Yamaguchi Masaji, *Higashi Taiwan kaihatsushi* (Taipei: Chunichi Sankei Shishin, 1999), pp.76-121, 158-197; and Liao Gaoren, *Yue du Riben guan ying yi min cun* (Hualien: Fengling Township Office, 2014), pp.71-176. Until the early 1930s, eastern Taiwan mostly attracted the attention of state and private settler colonialism, which increased the number of Japanese farm settlements to nine in Hualien and Taitung provinces. In concurrence with state-led promotion of mass migration to Manchuria in the mid-1930s, other parts of Taiwan started to receive a greater number of new agricultural settlers from Japan despite the already larger presence of Taiwanese farmers and residents. See Chang, *Wei jing de zhi min*, pp.159-232.

⁴ Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.3-6, 16-17, 29-44, and chapters 2-6.

frontier narrative. Starting in the late 1880s, these first-generation Japanese American immigrants around San Francisco and Honolulu took the lead in discursive formation on imperial Japanese destiny for overseas expansion and settlement even before Japan acquired its external colonies. In this sense, the Japanese communities of San Francisco and Honolulu emerged as major sites of Japan's expansionist and settler colonist knowledge production that worked in tandem with the simultaneous political and ideological developments inside the home empire during the 1890s and the 1900s. Because these U.S.-based immigrants had a first-hand experience as settler colonists in the most renowned "New World" frontier, they exerted an enormous influence over the shaping of imperial Japan's colonial thinking and practices that would soon unfold in its formal colonial territories, including Taiwan.⁵

My book employs a set of new concepts and interpretive frames that are useful not only for an analysis of inter-imperial negotiations and accommodations between Japan and the United States but also for understanding salient aspects of Japanese imperialism. First, my book introduces the concept of "settler colonialism" into the study of empire, colonialism, and migration. Having been popularized in Anglophone academia, including the United States, the concept of settler colonialism allows us to problematize and complicate the entwined processes of colonial economic changes, socio-cultural assimilation and civilizationist reforms, displacement and exploitation, and oppression and genocide, from the perspectives of "natives." Their perspectives were shaped in the context of their experiences as colonized people, whose land was robbed by "immigrants"/"colonizers," whose culture was decimated and replaced by the colonizers', and whose life-style altered under the influences of immigrant settlement-making, economic "development,"

⁵ Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.5-6, 16-17, 29-44.

and modernization. Therefore, settler colonialism is particularly helpful, when we tackle the questions of the various effects that migration, colonization, and development had on the colonized populations, and of the different forms of ethnic/race relations that evolved between immigrant settlers and local inhabitants within the hierarchical system of colonial rule. However, because settler colonialism as a theoretical framework has its roots in Anglophone/Eurocentric historical case studies and examples, its application to the Japanese imperial context requires careful theoretical adjustments. My book shows the utility and limitations of settler colonialism as an interpretive frame and a historical method in the study of migration-led Japanese colonialism, and its impacts on Japan's colonial territories and extraterritorial immigrant settlements outside the formal empire, like North and South America.⁶

Second, *In Search of Our Frontier* adopts an inter-imperial and trans-imperial perspectives by looking at the movements of migrant bodies, ideas, and technologies of colonial development and governance between and across the two Pacific empires. By doing so, we can rescue the study of colonialism and migration from the conventional “single empire” perspective that looks only at the relations between the imperial metropole (Japan) and its colonies (Taiwan, Manchuria, etc.) Because Japanese imperialism did not emerge in a geographic vacuum detached from other parts of the world, it is important to have an inter- and trans-imperial perspective to understand how it was always entangled with what other imperialisms did.⁷ This perspective makes it possible to view Japanese immigrant society in America as an integral part of Japan's imperial formation as much as it was a part

⁶ Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.5-8.

⁷ Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.9-13.

of U.S. settler racial empire. Yet, it is also important to point out that these cross-border relationships were not randomly forged.

Indeed, since local political economies in one empire were already diverse enough, the inter- and trans-imperial perspective needs to be doubly attentive to varied local conditions across different imperial spheres. It means the specific manifestations of inter/trans-imperial entanglements between the U.S. and Japanese empires tended to be place-specific. Hence, my book looks at specific patterns of “trans-local” linkage formation between North America’s Japanese settlements and Japan’s formal colonies: namely, California-Manchuria connections and Hawaii-Taiwan connections — the latter being a central focus of this essay.⁸ Between these locations, there were waves of reverse migrations — especially Japanese immigrant farmers who moved back from white-dominated North America to their own racial empire of Japan. These remigrants were often recruited by Japan’s colonial regimes and monopoly capital to help develop Japan’s new frontiers by offering their experience-based knowledge as American settler farmers. Their U.S.-bred colonial expertise in agricultural development was particularly valued and desired by Japan’s colonial regimes and industries when they encountered the unfamiliar terrains, climates, and farm conditions in places, like Taiwan. In Japan of the 1890s and the early 1900s, for example, there were very few domestic Japanese who were familiar with how to grow tropical crops and fruits, like sugarcanes and pineapples, except for abstract knowledge taken from books, because no tropical regions existed in the Japanese archipelago before its emergence as a colonial empire. Who could then help develop colonial agricultural economies in Taiwan? Looking at Hawaii, there

⁸ Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.18, 155, 183-184.

were already many Japanese immigrants, who had relevant experiences that Japan's colonial regime and capitalists were looking for.⁹

Although they were not numerous, a significant number of the transpacific remigrants from Hawaii to Taiwan were self-styled “frontier farmers,” who tended to view the development of agricultural land and natural resources — whether in the United States or in imperial Japan — as being connected to the national mandate of “overseas development.” Many hundreds of these “pioneers” of national/racial expansion had migrated to and congregated in Hawaii (and California) from the mid-1880s through the early twentieth century, because they considered the U.S. western territories to be the most authentic frontiers that awaited a “civilized” and “expansive” race (膨張民族／人種), like the Anglo-Saxons and Japanese. Having been inspired by the American popular discourse on frontier development and its built-in racist rhetoric, they had maintained both psychological and material connections to the colonialist and racist endeavors of their homeland, Japan, and for this reason, it was not a farfetched proposition for them to remigrate from Hawaii to Taiwan — if circumstances called for such a move.¹⁰

For many U.S.-based Japanese immigrants, there emerged particular historical circumstances that rationalized the return to their home empire, first between 1894 and 1907, and then between the late 1910s and the 1920s. During these periods, white exclusionist agitation in the American West and Hawaii led to the rise of institutionalized U.S. racism against Japanese immigrants, propelling many to seek alternative frontiers to live as masters of their own destiny and development, not as

⁹ Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, chapter 6. Japanese immigration to Hawaii started in 1885 under a bilateral treaty between the Hawaiian Kingdom and Japan. Although the vast majority of Hawaii-bound Japanese were sugar plantation workers before 1907, significant portions of non-laborers included educated immigrants. Combined with some of these non laborers, many sugar plantation workers also subsequently looked to pineapple work as an avenue to economic mobility or independence.

¹⁰ Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.16, 44-53,62-63, 153-155, 183-184.

an oppressed racial minority under the thumb of white men.¹¹ Put differently, these immigrants continued to believe in their superiority and autonomy as settler colonists, wishing to stay being a master race under the sovereign control of their own empire by remigrating to Japan's frontier. Meanwhile, Japan's colonial regimes, including Taiwan, began their own efforts to bring some of the U.S.-based Japanese immigrants for agricultural development through their expertise in U.S.-style large-scale scientific farming. In 1906-1907, for example, the Government-General of Taiwan (台灣總督府) acted on behalf of the island's nascent sugar companies to recruit experienced Hawaii residents who had been either visiting or returned to their home prefectures in Japan. While promising "considerable remunerations" to successful applicants, the colonial regime served as a remigrant recruitment center for the purpose of jump-starting Taiwan's pivotal new industry by importing invaluable technical knowledge and skills that these remigrants had acquired during their work and life in Hawaii.¹²

In the early 1920s, pineapple emerged as a central focus in the Government-General's new plans for agro-industrial development, because that crop looked particularly promising from the standpoint of profit-making. Around 1923, Japanese officials started concerted efforts for crop diversification to enhance the revenue-generating capacity of colonial agriculture in Taiwan, and they strove to build an infrastructure for rationalized industrial agriculture modeled most notably after the U.S. tropical colony of Hawaii. Whereas pre-existing rice farming and sugarcane cultivation were tied to domestic consumption, canned pineapple products were intended for the global consumer market in the context of the overall state policy to

¹¹ Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, chapters 2 and 4.

¹² *Taiwan Nichi Nichi Shinpō*, June 30, 1907. See also Ōzono Ichizō, *Taiwan rimenshi* (Taipei: Nihon Shokuminchi Hihansha, 1936), pp.354-355.

create an export-oriented economy to strengthen colonial Taiwan's financial standing and competitiveness. In order for a new pineapple industry to be successful, however, it was deemed necessary to transplant scientific farming expertise and advanced canning technology from either Singapore (British empire) or Hawaii (U.S. empire) — the top exporters of canned pineapple at that time. The large presence of Japanese immigrants — over 123,000 in 1924 — made Hawaii more attractive than its Southeast Asian rival as a source of human resources and experience-based knowledge for Taiwan's new industry.¹³

Accordingly, two types of Japanese pineapple experts moved from Hawaii to Taiwan after the early 1920s: experienced growers of the Hawaiian variety of “Smooth Cayenne” (開英種) pineapple, and the immigrants with experience in the mechanized canning process of that crop variety. Even though Taiwanese were no stranger to pineapple farming, Smooth Cayenne was very different from locally-grown varieties and required specialized cultivation methods. It was considered better suited for canning purpose than native Taiwanese pineapples, which were smaller in size and less solid in texture. The importation of Smooth Cayenne formed an indispensable component in the development of a modern canning industry. With cultural capital rooted in their Hawaii background, Smooth Cayenne growers from America's tropical colony could find unique opportunities and command authority

¹³ On colonial Taiwan's new agro-industrial policy, see Chen Tsu-yu, “Nihon tōchiki ni okeru Taiwan yushutsu sangyō no hatten to hensen (jō),” *Ritsumeikan Keizaigaku* 60, no. 5 (January 2012), pp.29-31; Ōkurashō Kanri-kyoku, *Nihonjin no Kaigai katsudō ni kansuru rekishiteki chōsa 6, Taiwan-hen 1* (Tokyo Yumani Shobō, 2002), pp.75-76; and Sekizawa Toshihiro, “Shokuminchi-ki Taiwan ni okeru Nikkei pain kanzume kōjō no keiei,” *Keiei shigaku* 46, no. 1 (June 2011), pp.32-33. On the initial rivalry between Singapore and Hawaii as a development model and the triumph of the latter, see Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, p.189.

vis-à-vis settler farmers from the Japanese home islands as well as local Taiwanese farmers.¹⁴

Thus, in the middle of the 1920s, historical developments on both sides of the Pacific — a resurgence of exclusionist racism in the United States and Japan's attempt to recruit U.S.-based residents for its colonial enterprise — paved the way to the influx of Japanese remigrants into Taiwan from Hawaii. It was in this context that modern pineapple industry took hold in southern and central Taiwan with the support of Japan's colonial regime and monopoly capital. On a grass-roots level, former Hawaii residents assumed the role of teachers and facilitators of new farming and canning techniques, promoting what can be termed "Hawaiianization" of the rural landscape of Japan's tropical frontier. As the rest of the essay details, the triangular partnership of the colonial regime, monopoly capital, and Hawaii-bred agro-industrial expertise formed a crucial background for Taiwan's rise in the global pineapple trade towards the late 1930s.¹⁵

In 1925, the arrival of a longtime Hawaii resident named Okazaki Nihei (岡崎仁平) — followed by many others like him — signaled the beginning of Hawaiianization in Taiwan's pineapple economy. One year after the passage of the 1924 U.S. Immigration Act which prohibited the entry of new immigrants from Japan, Okazaki gave up on the white supremacist United States to live as a colonial master in his own racial empire. The longtime Hawaii resident took an offer from Japanese capitalists to help build and take charge of the day-to-day operations of the first Hawaii-style pineapple farm-cannery complex in Laopi (老埤), a small

¹⁴ On the introduction into Taiwan of Smooth Cayenne and advanced canning methods by former Hawaii residents, see Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.188-190.

¹⁵ On a general history of Taiwan's pineapple canning industry, see Kao Shu-yuan, *Jing ji zheng ce yu chan ye fa zhan: yi Ri zhi shi qi Taiwan feng li guan tou ye wei li* (Taipei: Dao xiang, 2007); and Wang Yufeng and Huang Yujin, *Feng li guan tou de huang jin nian dai: Golden age of pineapple can* (Kaohsiung: Kaohsiung shi zheng fu wen hua ju; Taipei: Yu shan she chu ban, 2019).

town in the Pingtung province. Under the newly-established Taiwan Pineapple Cultivation Company (TPCC: 台灣鳳梨栽培株式会社), Okazaki served as the first manager of the Laopi plantation and spearheaded the construction of its modern cannery equipped with latest machinery from the U.S. tropical colony. When he gave a speech before Government-General officials in Taipei in 1925, Okazaki declared that “colonization” had been his “pursuit” and his dream ever since he had settled down in Hawaii, and he added that he and his family were now willing to “die for the cause of [laying the ground for the] pineapple industry” in Japan’s tropical frontier.¹⁶ A firm believer in modern scientific farming, Okazaki desired to act as the initiator of “progress in scientific and systematic [farming] methods” in Japanese-ruled Taiwan — the progress that he had experienced and contributed to in U.S.-controlled Hawaii.¹⁷ Okazaki’s new venture in Laopi facilitated the spread of Hawaii-style pineapple farming in the Kaohsiung-Pingtung region. Land cultivated for Hawaii-originated Smooth Cayenne pineapple jumped from 12 percent to 25 percent in just one year between 1929 and 1930 — the time when the planting of pineapple saplings became intensified on Okazaki’s Laopi plantation after massive land clearing. Before the Pacific War, the first mechanized modern cannery to which Okazaki was connected — and the three newer facilities that followed it — “packed only the Hawaii varieties” that were harvested on Okazaki’s

¹⁶ Okazaki Nihei, “Hawai no hōri jigyo ni tsuite,” *Taiwan Jihō* 70 (August 1925), p.30. In Japanese, Okazaki stated: 台湾植民発展のためパイナップル業と討ち死する迄やって見たい覚悟である。On his move to Taiwan from Hawaii, see also “Hōri no ken’ isha Okazaki-shi raitai,” *Taiwan Nichi Nichi Shinpō*, May 2, 1925; and “Hawai no shoki ni nita Taiwan no hōri sangyō,” *Taiwan Nichi Nichi Shinpō*, July 22, 1925.

¹⁷ Okazaki, “Hawai no hōri jigyo ni tsuite,” p.31.

pineapple plantation in order to produce top-grade canned products for export to the world market.¹⁸

Behind the rise of the mechanized canning business that relied on Smooth Cayenne pineapple lay not only the afore-mentioned economic mandate of colonial Taiwan but also associated investments from Japan's industrialists, especially the man named Takasaki Tatsunosuke (高碓達之助) who managed the Tōyō Can Manufacturing Company (Tōyō: 東洋製罐株式会社), Japan's leading tin can manufacturer.¹⁹ The new agro-industrial policy of the Government-General encompassed the priority sale of state-owned lands for pineapple plantations, free distribution of Smooth Cayenne saplings from a newly established government agricultural center in Kaohsiung's Dashu (大樹) district, and state subventions (one-third the cost) for the purchase of the latest canning equipment — often from the United States.²⁰ Backed by this new policy, Takasaki Tatsunosuke had endeavored to set up a large-scale pineapple plantation and introduce rationalized cultivation and canning processes since the early 1920s. He had entertained the idea of combining can manufacturing with the harvest of content materials in order to dominate the business process and maximize profitability. In 1922, Takasaki put that idea into practice by founding Taiwan's first and only tin can factory in central

¹⁸ See Ōta Takeshi, ed., *Taiwan taikan* (Tainan: Tainan Shinpōsha, 1935),p.144; and Taiwan Keizai Kenkyūsho, ed., *Hōri gōdō no shinsō* (Taipei: Taiwan Keizai Kenkyūsho, 1936),pp.8-10, in "Asanuma Inajirō monjo," Modern Japanese Political History Materials Room, National Diet Library, Tokyo. Tallies by the author. The latter source notes that most producers of the native pineapple varieties were Taiwanese farmers.

¹⁹ With the help of Japanese industrialists, Takasaki had played a central role in the establishment of Tōyō in Japan in 1917. See Takasaki Tatsunosuke-shū Kankō Inkaikai, ed., *Takasaki Tatsunosuke-shū*, Jō (Tokyo: Tōyō Seikan Kabushiki Kaisha, 1965),pp.69-108.

²⁰ Katō Ken'ichi, "Hōri no kōshu yōshiki ni tsuite," *Taiwan Nōjihō* 27, no. 6 (June 1931),pp.28-29; Taiwan Sōtōkufu Shokusan-kyoku, *Taiwan no Hōri sangyō* (Taipei:Taiwan Sōtōkufu Shokusan-kyoku Tokusan-ka, 1934),p.40; and Chen, "Nihon tōchiki ni okeru Taiwan yushutsu sangyō no hatten to hensen (jō),"p.30.

Kaohsiung, followed by the establishment of a large-scale pineapple farm and canning facilities in the neighboring regions.²¹

Thus, it was Takasaki who invited Okazaki Nihei to set up the Laopi plantation, and it was also Takasaki who provided capital for TPCC and its affiliated canneries while taking full advantage of state subventions. Tightly bound by the common desire to elevate Japan's status relative to its imperial rivals, former Hawaii residents, Japanese capitalists, and local colonial administrators orchestrated the establishment of Taiwan's brand-new agricultural-industrial complex, which consisted of plantation-style farm operations, advanced canning factories, and state-run agricultural experimental stations. It represented Japan's challenge to its U.S. and British competitors in the global pineapple trade. And yet, that challenge was predicated upon the systematic transplantation of the *very rival's* farming and canning secrets through transpacific Japanese remigration from Hawaii. This seeming paradox — that is, challenging the U.S. pineapple hegemony with its own technology — actually illuminated a longstanding method of Japan's empire-building and settler colonialism since the time of Hokkaido colonization, which had drawn on the U.S. example of frontier development in the first place.²²

Okazaki's personal trajectory reveals how Hawaii's Japanese immigrants saw no contradiction between pursuing "overseas Japanese development" in the U.S. colonial tropics and wishing to "die for the cause of" colonization in Japan's southern frontier. Having immigrated to Hawaii in 1907, Okazaki had firmly

²¹ Takasaki Tatsunosuke-shū Kankō linkai, ed., *Takasaki Tatsunosuke-shū*, Jō, pp.63-65; Takasaki Tatsunosuke, "Taiwan Hōri kanzumegyō seisaku," *Kanzume Jihō* 4, no. 2 (February 1925), p.4; Sakata Kunisuke, ed., *Dai Nikai Hontō keizai jijō chōsa hōkoku* (Taipei: Nanshi Nanyō Keizai Kenkyūkai, 1932), p.110; and Taiwan Sōtokufu Shokusan-kyoku, ed., *Taiwan no Hōri sangyō* (Taipei: Taiwan Sōtokufu Shokusan-kyoku Tokusan-ka, 1930), p.2.

²² "Sekaiteki shōhin to shiteno Taiwan Hōri kanzumegyō no chii," *Kanzume Jihō* 6, no. 3 (March 1927), pp.11-14; Takasaki, "Taiwan Hōri kanzumegyō seisaku," pp.4-11; and Ōta, *Taiwan taikan*, p.143.

embraced the settler colonist idea of overseas development and consciously aspired to emulate the example of America's legendary Puritan pioneers to promote Japan's national expansion.²³ Not content with working as a sugarcane fieldworker under the dictate of white American plantation owners, Okazaki looked to pineapple farming as a way to carve out a niche for economic independence and Japanese racial prosperity in white-dominated Hawaii. Only a decade after James Dole had organized Hawaii's first pineapple plantation-cannery complex, Okazaki's choice of the crop not only demonstrated his naïve expansionism mixed with strong racial nationalism, but it also followed the general pattern of appropriation of white American colonial practice by many self-styled Japanese immigrant frontiersmen, like him.²⁴ By the late 1910s, Okazaki had been already widely known as one of Hawaii's most important Japanese authorities on the pineapple. When Japanese officials, including Nitobe Inazō (新渡戸稲造), and agricultural technocrats from colonial Taiwan visited Hawaii on inspection tours during the 1910s, they frequently paid a visit to Okazaki to get the latest information on the pineapple, and it was on these occasions that this Hawaii immigrant learned about the opportunities for pineapple enterprise in colonial Taiwan. With an eye to assisting the development of modern pineapple farming in Japan's tropical frontier, Okazaki periodically shipped stumps, tops (crowns), and suckers of Smooth Cayenne for experimental vegetative propagation at Taiwan's state-run agricultural center during the decade.²⁵

²³ Fukushima Hawai-kai, ed., *Ko-Okazaki Nihei ou tsuitō kinenshi* (Fukushima: Fukushima Hawai-kai, 1952), pp.84-85.

²⁴ See Okazaki Nihei, "Rirekisho" (ca. 1930), in Kanbō Hishoka: Han ninkan ika shintai gengi (July-September 1930), in Taiwan Sōtokufu collection, Academia Sinica (hereafter TSC).

²⁵ Fukushima Hawai-kai, ed., *Ko-Okazaki Nihei ou tsuitō kinenshi*, pp.2-4, 17-30, 47-49, 82-86; Takahashi Kanji, *Fukushima iminshi: Hawai kikansha-hen* (Fukushima: Fukushima Hawai-kai, 1958), pp.11-12; Kawazoe Zen'ichi, *Ishokuju no hana hiraku* (Honolulu: Ishokuju no Hana Hiraku Kankōkai,

Okazaki's interest in Taiwan intensified when Takasaki Tatsunosuke visited Honolulu in 1924 to observe Hawaii's pineapple canning industry. In order to obtain a good understanding of how Hawaii's modern pineapple industry worked and to prepare for his ambitious Taiwan project, Takasaki looked to Okazaki's expertise and hired him as special advisor and guide to Hawaii's plantation industry. After this firsthand observation, Takasaki then invited Okazaki to Taiwan to assess the suitability of large-scale Smooth Cayenne cultivation and mechanized canning there. Okazaki's three-month tour through rural Taiwan subsequently generated a positive report, which argued that southern Taiwan's soil and climate were similar to its Hawaiian counterparts. Produced by Hawaii's foremost Japanese expert on the pineapple, the assessment was precisely what Takasaki had desired since the building of his tin can factory in Kaohsiung in 1922.²⁶

With Takasaki as investor and Okazaki as on-the-ground farm manager, TPCC was established in 1925, as noted before. A subsidiary to Tōyō and sister company of Naigai Shokuhin (Naigai: 内外食品株式会社), TPCC operated a plantation-style pineapple estate in Laopi — not far from Takasaki's tin can factory and its affiliated canneries run by Naigai in the greater Kaohsiung-Pingtung region. Although the plantation site was initially almost completely untouched, the massive estate was projected to become the biggest pineapple farm in Japan's tropical colony. And Okazaki was asked to manage the entire plantation operation in Laopi. Apparently, Okazaki assembled a team of former Hawaii residents as his full-time

1960),pp.303-304; Katō, "Hōri no kōshu yōshiki ni tsuite,"p.28; Okazaki, "Hawai no hōri jigyo ni tsuite,"pp.27-28; and "Hōrika kōshū," *Hawai Hōchi*, February 16, 1923.

²⁶ Takasaki Tatsunosuke, *Hawai ni okeru Hōri kanzume jigyo* (Tokyo: Kanzume Fukyū Kyōkai, 1924), p.1; Takasaki, "Taiwan Hōri kanzumegyo seisaku," p.4; Okazaki Nihei, "Hōri ni tsuite," *Kanzume Jihō* 5, no. 7 (July 1925),pp.2-4; Takahashi, *Fukushima iminshi*,p.12; Taiwan Seikan Kabushiki Kaisha, "Taiwan hōrigyo seisaku" (1925),pp.3-4, 12-16; and Tōyō Seikan Kabushiki Kaisha, *Tōyō Seikan gojūnen no ayumi* (Tokyo: Tōyō Seikan Kabushiki Kaisha, 1967),p.45.

aids. A Japanese visitor described in early 1929, “everything [was] done in a Hawaiian way because leading staff [had] gained [their knowledge and skills] from years of experience in Hawaii.”²⁷

The visitor's observations suggested that Okazaki's example inspired other Hawaii residents to seek employment as pineapple experts elsewhere in Taiwan, too, when a few more plantation-style farms were established after the late 1920s — often with *zaibatsu* financial backing. Indeed, Nakao Magoichi (中尾孫市), Okazaki's old friend, separately moved from Oahu to Kaohsiung to assume a managerial position at a Fengshan pineapple plantation owned by Naigai, another subsidiary of Takasaki's farm-industrial syndicate.²⁸ Other groups of Hawaii Japanese also moved to seek better opportunities in Japan's tropical frontier when white-dominated Hawaii came to look more and more incompatible to their settler colonial expectations.²⁹

Not only did Okazaki's example help bring more human resources from Hawaii's Japanese immigrant community, but he also introduced the latest U.S. machinery to Taiwan's pineapple farms and canning factories. Based on his previous experience, Okazaki utilized two U.S.-made Fordson tractors and a 150-horsepower steam plow for initial plowing and hallowing of virgin soil, much to the surprise of local observers, who had never seen such a spectacle of modernity. The

²⁷ Kengaku Eijirō (pseudo.), “Hōri kanzume hanbai gyōsha no Taiwan yūki,” *Kanzume Jihō* 8, no. 4 (April 1929), p.69. He stated in Japanese: スムースカイエン種鳳梨の大量栽培並に大量缶詰製産者の経営方針が、総て布哇式……何れも首脳者は布哇に於て多年の経験を有する方々だから無理からぬ事とは思ふ。

²⁸ On Nakao, see Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.195-196, 323n49. Under the leadership of Takasaki Tatsunosuke, these affiliated firms composed a monopoly syndicate, which also included TPCC and its parent company, Tōyō. They worked concertedly to promote Hawaiianization of Taiwan's pineapple industry. See Kanae Kurabu, *Kanae* v. 1 (Kaohsiung: Kanae Kurabu, 1931), pp.1-6, 85-86, in the Taiwan History collection, National Taiwan University Library.

²⁹ On other examples of remigrants, see Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.189,191.

gasoline-powered tractors were among the first to be introduced to Taiwan, for most existing machines in the island were still antiquated steam tractors on sugarcane fields. With the support of machine-power, a half million Smooth Cayenne plants — imported directly from Hawaii — were laid on the newly-developed farmland in Laopi under the supervision of Okazaki and his Hawaii associates.³⁰

Okazaki was also responsible for the technical aspects of the organization of Taiwan's first modern cannery started by Naigai in 1928. For this historic project, Okazaki was dispatched to Honolulu to negotiate the purchase of the most advanced machinery, including the Ginaca automated peeling and slicing machines, one of the revolutionary changes that Dole Corporation brought to the industry in Hawaii.³¹ These machines contributed to the dramatic reduction of labor cost and production time, while standardizing the size and shape of cut pineapple for export-grade canned products. Beginning in 1932, Okazaki also worked to establish a modern pineapple cannery in Guanmiao near Tainan, with the machinery and equipment that he and his friend Nakao Magoichi procured in Honolulu and imported from there; the Hawaii remigrant also helped organize a plantation-style farm in the outskirts of Guanmiao. Presumably, much of the financial support came from Takasaki's capitalist syndicate.³²

³⁰ Akagi, *Taiwan ni okeru Bokokujin nōgyō shokumin*, pp.172-184; and “Kōbō no Taiwan hōri kanzumegyō,” *Jigyō no Nihon* 8, no. 3 (March 1929), pp.46-47. In order to promote the industry's conversion to Smooth Cayenne, the company and Takasaki's can manufacturing firm actively distributed tens of thousands of the imported slips and suckers to other pineapple growers, farm organizations and firms, and agricultural experiment stations throughout Taiwan. See Taiwan Seikan Kabushiki Kaisha, “Taiwan hōrigyo seisaku,” pp.27-30; and K. Sakimura, “On the Pineapple Industry in Formosa,” *Pineapple Quarterly* 5, no. 1 (March 1935), p.31, in the Hawaiian collection, Hamilton Library (hereafter HCUH), University of Hawaii at Manoa.

³¹ See *Taiwan Nichi Nichi Shinpō*, September 30, 1925; December 13, 1926; November 9, 1927; June 28, 1928; and also, Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.197-200.

³² On his Guanmiao venture, see Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.209-211.

On their original plantations in Pingtung and Kaohsiung, Okazaki, Nakao, and their associates also practiced Hawaii-style labor management of ethnic division and control, by consciously employing heterogeneous groups of workers consisting of local Taiwanese men and women, and Paiwan aborigines. From the outset, the potential for exploiting cheap indigenous labor had constituted a core of Okazaki's 1925 recommendations for TPCC's Laopi plantation site, because it was situated next to the villages of Paiwan aboriginal tribes — an abundant source of cheap and exploitable labor in Okazaki's eyes.³³ His enthusiasm for the use of Paiwan workers impressed local Japanese authorities so much that pineapple wage labor was swiftly incorporated into the general policy mandate of assimilating aborigines into the colonial capitalist economy in the Kaohsiung region.³⁴

Similar to the routine practice in Hawaii's plantation economy, Okazaki utilized an ethnically mixed workforce for land clearing, pineapple cultivation, and harvesting. Paiwan workers were always placed at the bottom of the economic hierarchy, with their wages kept lower than those paid to Taiwanese workers. TPCC did not consider the need for Paiwan workers' basic subsistence — including food and residence — because they had their own residences and maintained a semitraditional lifestyle up in the mountains. In highly racist terms, a visitor from Tokyo described how the Laopi farm operation reified what was deemed the proper order of Japan's settler colony and ethnic power relations there. Ten Japanese managers and supervisors, including Okazaki, reigned over the “bestial” aborigines, as the observer condescendingly characterized Paiwan workers. Purportedly, they

³³ “Hawai no shoki ni nita Taiwan no hōri sangyō”; Shimoda Masami, *Nantō keizaiki* (Tokyo: Osaka Yagō Shoten, 1929), pp.204-206; Sawamoto Kōnan, *Taiwan o bekken shite* (Tokyo: Aoyama Shoin, 1930), pp.36-37; Itagaki Hōki, *Taiwan kenbutsu* (Tokyo: Itagaki Rikiko, 1931), pp.84-85; and “Kōbō no Taiwan hōri kanzumegyō,” pp.46-47.

³⁴ *Taiwan Nichi Nichi Shinpō*, September 3, 1926; October 12, 1927; and Fujisaki Sainosuke, *Taiwan no banzoku* (Tokyo: Kokushi Kankōkai, 1931), p.884.

behaved like “tamed lions” under the “benevolent” supervision of Okazaki and other Japanese, attending to their task “faithfully” from six o’clock in the morning till six thirty in the evening.³⁵

In colonial Taiwan’s pineapple industry, the scale and scope of Hawaiianization ranged from the crop choice (Smooth Cayenne) to the plantation farm method, and from canning technology to labor management. In this context, Okazaki — and his fellow Japanese remigrants from Hawaii — functioned as an indispensable cog in the industrial development program carried out by the joint efforts of Taiwan’s colonial regime, as well as Takasaki’s capitalist syndicate and the Mitsubishi-affiliated capitalists. By the mid-1930s, the two monopoly interests had established additional Hawaii-style plantations and cultivated Smooth Cayenne pineapples near Chiayi and Douliu.³⁶ Spearheaded by these colonial monopoly interests after 1935, the industry-wide consolidation of Taiwan’s pineapple canneries and farms took place under the general guidance of the Government-General, which enabled Japanese-ruled Taiwan to threaten the dominant position of U.S.-controlled Hawaii in the global canned pineapple export market toward the late 1930s.³⁷ And this ascent of Taiwan’s modern pineapple industry would not have so easily and quickly been attainable without the firsthand experience, real-life knowledge, and actual technology that these former Hawaii residents brought from the U.S. tropical colony. In return, these Japanese remigrants also benefitted handsomely on a personal level, not only because they could live as autonomous frontiersmen unmolested by white settler racism but also because they could enjoy

³⁵ Shimoda, *Nantō keizaiki*, pp.204-206; Sawamoto, *Taiwan o bekken shite*, pp.36-37; Itagaki, *Taiwan kenbutsu*, pp.84-85; and “Kōbō no Taiwan hōri kanzumegyō,” pp.46-47. The quote is from page 46 of the last source. On this topic, see also Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.202-204.

³⁶ Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.205, 210-211.

³⁷ Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, 209; and Kao, *Jing ji zheng ce yu chan ye fa zhan*, pp.143-171, 182-188, esp. 185.

the privilege and power of colonial masters in their own frontier, just like white Americans did in their “western” frontier, including Hawaii. Yet, before ending the analysis of Hawaii-Taiwan colonial nexus, it is necessary to complicate the narrative of settler-colonial remigration a little more with a brief discussion of consequences of Hawaii's influences that remigrants brought on colonized peoples of Taiwan.

Viewed from the standpoint of colonial power relations, the negative impacts of Hawaiianization in pineapple industry were felt most severely by Taiwanese cannery owners and farmers at the time of 1935 industry-wide consolidation, which was carried out under the control of the Government-General and colonial monopoly capital interests, especially Takasaki's syndicate. Before the mid-1930s, most of the small-scale cannery owners were local Taiwanese, who had the dreadful choice of participating in the consolidation scheme for an “unfair” amount of monetary compensations or that of refusing to do so for no compensation at all. And neither option spared the life of their cannery operations, and hence their position as independent business owners, because their outdated poorly-mechanized facilities were bound to be phased out under the monopoly's modernization plan backed by the colonial regime. This rendered most victims of consolidation small-scale Taiwanese cannery owners. Furthermore, because the vast majority of independent Taiwanese farmers had been engaged in the cultivation of the native pineapple varieties, the government-sponsored spread of unfamiliar Smooth Cayenne crops paved the way to the economic downfall of independent Taiwanese pineapple farmers, and, even worse, their displacement. It is for this reason that Taiwanese activists specifically attacked Takasaki's capitalist syndicate at the time of the 1935 industry-wide consolidation, condemning their hideous “plot” to

“gobble up small-to-medium sized factories run by Taiwanese people and bring the whole pineapple canning industry under their control.”³⁸

Okazaki and other Japanese remigrants from Hawaii were indispensable for the success of this capitalist “plot.” Their departure from the U.S. colonial tropics constituted a part of their response to white racism in Hawaii, that is, their “pursuit” for “colonization” without white men’s obstructions, as Okazaki once declared before Japanese colonial officialdom. Yet, their pursuit of racism-free settler colonialism in Taiwan made the former Hawaii residents chief facilitators of native Taiwanese displacement. This formed an ironic legacy of these remigrants’ response to America’s racist exclusion — a response that transformed a racial minority in the white-dominated frontier of Hawaii into oppressors of colonized peoples in imperial Japan’s frontier of Taiwan.

By looking at the Hawaii-Taiwan colonial nexus between the two Pacific settler empires, this essay explained why and how some Japanese residents in Hawaii renewed their ties and commitment to their home empire’s settler colonialism after the rise of white racial exclusionism in the United States. The story also explained the ways in which Japan’s colonial regime and metropole capital co-opted and took advantage of immigrant visions and practices, when Hawaii-based Japanese faced the choice between the reality of being an oppressed racial minority in white America and the promise of a new life as the colonial master in their own racial empire. The transpacific movements of their bodies, knowledge, ideas, and technologies resulted from the individual choices they made. Yet, their personal decisions could not be divorced from the concurrent unfolding of U.S. racial exclusion and of imperial Japan’s colonial domination, since the entanglements of

³⁸ Taiwan Keizai Kenkyūsho, ed., *Hōri gōdō no shinsō*, pp.3, 8, 45, 62. The quotes are from pages 3 and 45.

America's race politics and Japan's colonial policy agendas made Taiwan exceptionally attractive in the eyes of many Japanese in Hawaii. The stories of frontier settlers and teachers of pineapple farming from Hawaii to Taiwan shed light on the unknown migration circuits that rendered Japan's formal empire and its extraterritorial immigrant society in America indispensable partners in the common goal of overseas Japanese expansion modeled after U.S. examples of frontier development. It is for this reason that the study of Japanese colonialism needs to be connected to an analysis of historical unfolding and human mobility that took place outside the formal territories of the empire. With inter-imperial/trans-imperial perspectives that help bridge U.S.-controlled Hawaii and Japanese-ruled Taiwan, this essay offered a glimpse into my book's attempt at such a historical analysis, combined with transnational archival research.

References

- “Kōbō no Taiwan hōri kanzumegyō,” *Jigyō no Nihon* 8(3): 45-48.
- Hawai Hōchi*
- Okazaki Nihei, “Rirekisho” (ca. 1930), in Kanbō Hishoka: Han ninkan ikashintai gengi (July-September 1930), in Taiwan Sōtokufu collection, Academia Sinica (hereafter TSC).
- Sekaiteki shōhin to shiteno Taiwan Hōri kanzumegyō no chii,” *Kanzume Jihō* 6(3): 11-14.
- Taiwan Nichi Nichi Shinpō*
- Akagi Takeichi
- 1929 *Taiwan ni okeru Bokokujin nōgyō shokumin*. Taipei: Taiwan Sōtōkufu Shokusan-kyoku.
- Aratake Tatsurō
- 2007 “Nihon tōchi jidai Taiwan tōbu e no imin to sōshutsuchi,” *Tokushima Daigaku Sōgō Kagakubu ningen shakai bunka kenkyū* 14: 91-104.
- Chang Subing
- 2017 *Wei jing de zhi min: ri ben zai ai yi min cun*. New Taipei City: Wei cheng.
- Chen Tsu-yu,
- 2012 “Nihon tōchiki ni okeru Taiwan yushutsu sangyō no hatten to hensen (jō),” *Ritsumeikan Keizaigaku* 60(5): 17-49.
- Eiichiro Azuma
- 2019 *In Search of Our Frontier: Japanese America and Settler Colonialism in the Construction of Japan’s Borderless Empire*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fujisaki Sainosuke
- 1931 *Taiwan no banzoku*. Tokyo: Kokushi Kankōkai.
- Fukushima Hawaii-kai ed.
- 1952 *Ko-Okazaki Nihei ou tsuitō kinenshi*. Fukushima: Fukushima Hawaii-kai.

Fumiko Fujita

- 1994 *American Pioneers and the Japanese Frontier: American Experts in Nineteenth-Century Japan*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Hōgikai ed.

- 1923 *Kada Kanesaburō-ō shōden*. Tokyo: Hōgikai.

Itagaki Hōki

- 1931 *Taiwan kenbutsu*. Tokyo: Itagaki Rikiko.

K. Sakimura

- 1935 "On the Pineapple Industry in Formosa," *Pineapple Quarterly* 5(1): 29-47.

Kanae Kurabu

- 1931 *Kanae v. 1*. Kaohsiung: Kanae Kurabu.

Kao Shu-yuan

- 2007 *Jing ji zheng ce yu chan ye fa zhan: yi Ri zhi shi qi Taiwan feng li guan tou ye wei li*. Taipei: Dao xiang.

Katō Ken'ichi

- 1931 "Hōri no kōshu yōshiki ni tsuite," *Taiwan Nōjihō* 27(6): 28-37.

Katsuya Hirano

- 2015 "Thanatopolitics in the Making of Japan's Hokkaido: Settler Colonialism and Primitive Accumulation," *Critical Historical Studies* 2(2): 191-218.

Kawazoe Zen'ichi

- 1960 *Ishokuju no hana hiraku*. Honolulu: Ishokuju no Hana Hiraku Kankōkai.

Kengaku Eijirō (pseudo.)

- 1929 "Hōri kanzume hanbai gyōsha no Taiwan yūki," *Kanzume Jihō* 8(4): 67-73.

Kurihara Jun

- 1998 "Taiwan Sōtōkufu ni yoru kan'ei imin jigyo ni tsuite," in ed. by Kanagawa Daigaku Chūgokugo Gakka, *Chūgoku minshū e no shiza*, pp.161-184. Tokyo: Tōhō Shoten.

Liao Gaoren

- 2014 *Yue du Riben guan ying yi min cun*. Hualien: Fengling Township Office.

Lin Suzhen, Lin Chunzhi, and Chen Yaofang

- 2005 *Yuan zhu min Zhong da li shi shi jian: Qijiachuan shi jian*. Taipei: Xing zheng yuan yuan zu min zu wei yuan hui.

Okazaki Nihei

- 1925 “Hōri ni tsuite,” *Kanzume Jihō* 5(7): 1-5.
1925 “Hawai no hōri jigyo ni tsuite,” *Taiwan Jihō* 70: 23-31.

Ōkurashō Kanri-kyoku

- 2002 *Nihonjin no Kaigai katsudō ni kansuru rekishiteki chōsa 6, Taiwan-hen 1*. Tokyo Yumani Shobō.

Ōta Takeshi ed.

- 1935 *Taiwan taikan*. Tainan: Tainan Shinpōsha.

Ōzono Ichizō

- 1936 *Taiwan rimenshi*. Taipei: Nihon Shokuminchi Hihansha.

Sakata Kunisuke ed.

- 1932 *Dai Nikai Hontō keizai jijō chōsa hōkoku*. Taipei: Nanshi Nanyō Keizai Kenkyūkai.

Sawamoto Kōnan

- 1930 *Taiwan o bekken shite*. Tokyo: Aoyama Shoin.

Sekizawa Toshihiro

- 2011 “Shokuminchi-ki Taiwan ni okeru Nikkei pain kanzume kōjō no keiei,” *Keiei shigaku* 46(1): 29-55.

Shimoda Masami

- 1929 *Nantō keizaiki*. Tokyo: Osaka Yagō Shoten.

Sidney Xu Lu

- 2019 *The Making of Japanese Settler Colonialism: Malthusianism and Trans-Pacific Migration, 1868-1961*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
2016 “Colonizing Hokkaido and the Origin of Japanese Trans-Pacific Expansion, 1869-1894,” *Japanese Studies* 36(2): 252-274.

Taiwan Keizai Kenkyūsho ed.

- 1936 *Hōri gōdō no shinsō*. Taipei: Taiwan Keizai Kenkyūsho.

Taiwan Seikan Kabushiki Kaisha

1925 "Taiwan hōrigyō seisaku." 1-30.

Taiwan Sōtokufu Shokusan-kyoku ed.

1930 *Taiwan no Hōri sangyō*. Taipei: Taiwan Sōtokufu Shokusan-kyoku Tokusan-ka.

1934 *Taiwan no Hōri sangyō*. Taipei: Taiwan Sōtokufu Shokusan-kyoku Tokusan-ka.

Takahashi Kanji

1958 *Fukushima iminshi: Hawaii kikansha-hen*. Fukushima: Fukushima Hawaii-kai.

Takasaki Tatsunosuke

1924 *Hawaii ni okeru Hōri kanzume jigyō*. Tokyo: Kanzume Fukyū Kyōkai.

1925 "Taiwan Hōri kanzumegyō seisaku," *Kanzume Jihō* 4(2): 4-11.

Takasaki Tatsunosuke-shū Kankō Inkai ed.

1965 *Takasaki Tatsunosuke-shū, Jō*. Tokyo: Tōyō Seikan Kabushiki Kaisha.

Tōyō Seikan Kabushiki Kaisha

1967 *Tōyō Seikan gojūnen no ayumi*. Tokyo: Tōyō Seikan Kabushiki Kaisha.

Wang Yufeng and Huang Yujin

2019 *Feng li guan tou de huang jin nian dai: Golden age of pineapple can*. Kaohsiung: Kaohsiung shi zheng fu wen hua ju; Taipei: Yu shan she chu ban.

Yamaguchi Masaji

1999 *Higashi Taiwan kaihatsushi*. Taipei: Chunichi Sankei Shishin.

跨帝國史的臺灣鳳梨產業——

專業技術的遷移與轉化：從美國夏威夷到臺灣

東榮一郎*

本文檢視了夏威夷鳳梨產業移轉至太平洋戰爭前的來龍去脈，從而追溯臺灣現代鳳梨產業的根源。日本移民在美國的移民經驗，以及日本帝國由移民主導的殖民主義，如同一縷經線串起了泛太平洋各地，並在明治 23 年（1890）至昭和 5 年（1930）間，造就出移民知識與農耕專業技術從北美輸入東亞的現象。自夏威夷返回亞洲的日本再移民（remigrants），帶回了美國學到的殖民理念，以及歷經調整的美式農業殖民技術，無不對日治臺灣的經濟發展造成重要影響；不只如此，這些農耕專業技術也融入和整合至官方政策當中。

本文透過幾個案例，檢視太平洋兩個帝國美國與日本的移殖民思想與實務，探究美日之間的移住民（settler）如何協商、交流與融合。過去筆者的討論引起了各界密切且持續關注跨帝國物質移轉的議題，亦即，穿梭在美利堅帝國白人移住民與日本帝國的泛亞洲移住民之間的移民實體。因此，筆者關注的不僅是不同帝國疆域之間流動的理念和技術，也企圖探索殖民專業技術移轉偶發又無法切割的關聯性，以及將技術從美國控管的夏威夷移植至日治臺灣的移民者。

在帝國統治時期穿梭太平洋各疆域間的日本再移民，促使重要的殖民農耕知識與技術得以在美國與日本帝國流動，後者試圖效法其它帝國的成功模

* Professor of History and Asian American Studies, University of Pennsylvania

式，為日本「開發」全新殖民地，而美國以移民擴張國土、農業殖民和文明建設等策略開疆拓土的國家神話，更是日本仿效的主要對象。筆者近作《追尋新天地：日本帝國建構年代的日裔美洲和海外移民》（*In Search of Our Frontier: Japanese America and Settler Colonialism in the Construction of Japan's Borderless Empire*）試圖探討美式拓荒的歷史案例及相關論述如何激勵日本人在「海外發展」大旗的號召下，群起投入大日本帝國建立前的海內外移民與農業殖民。

此處的美式拓荒，意指以農業移住民身分移入原本杳無人煙的荒野之行為。在美國建國神話中，這種白人農業移住民在美國西部「國土邊境」上的「發展」形式，一向被頌揚為美國得以開創現代文明、新國度，以及擴張至亞太盆地的主要動力。這樣的脈絡下，美洲成為現代文明必須征服／摧毀的大自然，原住民族（「美洲原住民」）就成為必須擊倒的野蠻勢力。¹ 美國移民式農業殖民運動的成就讓日本著迷，在此背景下，明治時期的日本在北海道發起第一波大型開發計畫，聘請美國白人農學家赴日，並將美式科學農業移植國內，當時約有數萬人的日本內地民眾移民北海道定居，專事農業活動。這些農業殖民活動最終導致了原本生活在北海道的愛努人（Ainu）流離失所。²

同樣方法也在日治臺灣找到實驗舞臺，明治 41 年（1908）至明治 42 年（1909）間，臺灣花蓮附近的「七腳川」地區原住民部落遭到摧毀，當地阿美族人成為大規模殺戮的受害者並被迫遷徙，日本在臺首次殖民定居建設運動

¹ 詳情參見 Eiichiro Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier: Japanese America and Settler Colonialism in the Construction of Japan's Borderless Empire* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2019), pp. 13-17。

² Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, p. 15; Fumiko Fujita, *American Pioneers and the Japanese Frontier: American Experts in Nineteenth-Century Japan* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1994), pp. 7-8, 15-41; Katsuya Hirano, "Thanatopolitics in the Making of Japan's Hokkaido: Settler Colonialism and Primitive Accumulation," *Critical Historical Studies* 2, no. 2 (Fall 2015), pp. 200-203; Sidney Xu Lu, "Colonizing Hokkaido and the Origin of Japanese Trans-Pacific Expansion, 1869-1894," *Japanese Studies* 36, no. 2 (2016), pp. 258-261; and Sidney Xu Lu, *The Making of Japanese Settler Colonialism: Malthusianism and Trans-Pacific Migration, 1868-1961* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019), ch. 1.

亦於明治 43 年(1910)宣告完成。日本建立的第一個海外移民聚落「吉野村」，正是依照這種典型的「美國」模式所興建。³ 事實上，北海道和東臺灣的這些歷史案例，強烈反映並仿效美國白人在西部拓荒建立白人至上社會的殖民過程，類似的過程可能包括：殺害原住民、將其排除於所謂的文明社會之外，再將之強制圈禁於「印地安人保留區」內，據以騰出土地讓予白人農業移住民、前來採礦的歐洲移民，或所謂的「美國人」。1880 年代之後，許多日本人決定前往海外拓荒，在大日本帝國的國境內外，響應現代化文明的發展大業。移民史發展初期，自稱為海外移民拓荒者的明治日人最渴望前往美國西部與夏威夷等地發展，不過由於北美與澳洲等英語圈的排日氛圍日盛，致使「日本民族的海外發展」轉向他方，尤其是巴西等南美洲國家，以及臺灣、滿州國等日本真正的殖民地。⁴

《尋找國境》(In Search of Our Frontier) 一路追溯日本「海外發展論」的起源直至日本移民最初在北美洲移住地，尤其是南加州和夏威夷等地。這樣的海外發展論，宛如日本對於美國國土拓荒敘事的轉化和體現。1880 年代晚期前往美國舊金山和檀香山的首批日本移民，早在日本取得海外殖民地前，即先行實踐了日本帝國海外擴張與移住命運的論述。從這個角度來看，舊金山和檀

³ 關於「七腳川事件」，可參見林素珍、林春治、陳耀芳，《原住民重大歷史事件：七腳川事件》(臺北：行政院原住民族委員會，2005)，頁 42-163。關於日本移住殖民主義於東臺灣的早期歷史，請見張素珍，《未竟的殖民：日本在臺移民村》(新北：衛城出版，2017)，頁 75-158；赤木猛市，《台灣に於ける母国人農業植民》(臺北：臺灣總督府殖產局，1929)，頁 2-36；栗原純，〈台灣總督府による官營移民事業について〉，收於神奈川大學中國語學科編，《中國民衆への視座》(東京：東方書店，1998)，頁 161-184；荒武達朗，〈日本統治時代台灣東部への移民送出地〉，《德島大学総合科学部人間社会文化研究》14 (2007)，頁 91-104。最早的三個日本移住區分別為 Yoshino (吉野)、Toyoda (豐田) 與 Hayashida (林田) 村。為官辦吉野移民村作先鋒的民營 Kada (賀田) 村之相關資料，可參考芳誼會編，《賀田金三郎翁小伝》(東京：芳誼會，1923)，頁 63-84；山口政治，《東台灣開發史》(臺北：中日產經資訊，1999)，頁 76-121、158-197；以及廖高仁，《悅讀日本官營移民村》(花蓮：花蓮縣鳳林鎮公所，2014)，頁 71-176。在 1930 年代初期前，東臺灣一直是官方及民間移住殖民主義的主要移入地，花蓮與臺東縣的日本農民移住村數量曾增加到九處。配合日本政府於 1930 年代中期提倡的大規模移民滿州政策，有更多農業移住民移入臺灣其他地區，儘管已有更多臺灣農民和居民定居當地。請見張素珍，《未竟的殖民：日本在臺移民村》，頁 159-232。

⁴ Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.3-6, 16-17, 29-44, and chapters 2-6.

香山的日本社群成為當時日本擴張主義和移住殖民主義知識生產的主要根據地，而這些論述也與 1890 至 1900 年代間日本帝國內部盛行的政治和意識形態相互應和，聯袂前行。由於這些移民美國的日本人親身體驗過舉世聞名的「新世界」開拓史，因此對於日本帝國的殖民思維與實踐也發揮了重大影響力，不久之後在臺灣等正式殖民土地上落實。⁵

本書使用幾個新概念和詮釋框架，不僅可供分析美日等帝國之間的協商和合作關係，也有助於理解日本帝國主義的幾個重要面向。首先，本書採用「移住殖民主義」(settler colonialism) 一詞，試圖剖析討論帝國、殖民主義和移民等議題。包含美國在內的英語學術圈廣泛使用的移住殖民主義概念，可以讓我們從「住民 (natives)」的觀點，質疑並梳理殖民經濟演變、社會文化同化及文明改革、遷徙與剝削、壓迫與種族滅絕等千絲萬縷的複雜過程。這種原民觀點試圖從被殖民者的經驗背景出發，他們歷經土地遭「移入者」／「殖民者」掠奪、文化遭殖民者毀滅和取代、生活方式因移住殖民建設、經濟「發展」與現代化的介入而被迫改變。因此，移住殖民主義的概念，十分適合用來討論移民、殖民和發展被殖民族群受到的各種衝擊，以及在殖民統治階層制度下，移住民與原住民間各種形式的族裔 (ethnic)／種族 (race) 關係。但是，由於移住殖民主義架構源自英語系/歐洲中心的歷史研究與案例，因此若要套用在日本帝國制度，仍需適度調整。本書說明以移殖民主義為詮釋框架和研究法，來分析以移民為導向的日本殖民主義，將有何效用與侷限性；移殖民主義對日本殖民地和大日本帝國領土之外的移住地，如北美洲和南美洲的影響又為何。⁶

其次，《追尋新天地》一書採用跨帝國史觀，檢視跨太平洋的兩帝國之間，移民的實體、理念以及殖民發展與治理技術的流動。如此一來，研究者可以跳脫過去從「單一帝國」觀點探討殖民主義和移民議題的窠臼，不再只是關注殖民母國（日本）和殖民地（臺灣、滿州等）之間的關係。由於日本帝國主義並

⁵ Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.5-6, 16-17, 29-44。

⁶ Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.5-8。

非隔絕於世界其他地區，因此從跨帝國的角度，了解日本帝國主義為何總是與其他帝國主義糾葛在一起就顯得特別重要。⁷ 透過這種觀點會發現，當時美國境內的日本移民社會，既是日本帝國的重要組成，也是美國移住民種族帝國（U.S. settler racial empire）的一部分；同時我們也必須指出，這些跨國界關係的形成並非偶然。

事實上，光是單一帝國本身的政治經濟生態即已十分複雜，因此跨帝國研究更需要仔細審視不同帝國疆域所具備的不同本土條件。這意謂著帝國內與美日跨帝國之間的糾葛，往往具有的特性。因此，本書將探討北美日本移住區和日本殖民地之間形成的「跨國——本土」連結模式：包括了加州——滿州的相互連結，以及夏威夷——臺灣的相互連結，後者將是本文討論重點。⁸ 這幾個地方之間曾發生幾波移民返鄉浪潮，尤其是從白人主控的北美洲返回同種族帝國的日本農業移民。這些移民往往接受了日本殖民體系和壟斷資本的號召，貢獻自己過去在美農耕的經驗與知識，協助發展日本帝國的新疆域。他們在美國學得的農業發展技術，特別受到日本殖民政府和產業的重視與渴求，殖民政權需要這些知識，方能因應諸如臺灣的陌生之地、氣候和農業條件。例如，1880至1900年代初期的日本本土，幾乎沒有日本人知道如何種植熱帶農作物和水果，包括甘蔗與鳳梨在內，他們只具備書上的抽象知識，因為成為殖民帝國之前，日本疆域不曾延伸至熱帶地區。那麼誰能協助發展臺灣的農業殖民經濟？日本看到了夏威夷的例子，當地許多日本移民，也多半取得了日本殖民政權和資本家所渴望的相關經驗。⁹

雖然人數不多，但仍有相當數量的跨太平洋再移民從夏威夷遷居臺灣，並以「拓荒農民」自居，他們往往把在美國或日本帝國農業與天然資源的開發行

⁷ Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.9-13。

⁸ Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.18, 155, 183-184。

⁹ Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*，第六章。日本的夏威夷移民潮始於1885年，夏威夷王國與日本簽訂雙邊條約後。儘管在1907年之前，大多數前往夏威夷的日本人都是在甘蔗種植場工作，但在非勞工移民當中的受教育人士比例頗高，許多蔗農以及部分非勞工後來都試圖改種鳳梨，爭取經濟流動性或生計獨立。

為，視為對於日本「海外發展」政令的響應及參與。自 1880 年代中期一直到 20 世紀初，數百位這樣的國家/種族擴張的「拓荒者 (pioneers)」移民聚集在夏威夷 (和加州)，因為他們認為美國西部是最道地的拓荒之地，正等待如盎格魯薩克遜人和日本人這些「具備文明教養」和「擴張思想」的民族／人種前來大展身手。受到美國熱門的國土拓荒論和根深蒂固的種族歧視辭令影響，這些日本移民對於祖國，日本殖民主義和種族主義事業，也抱著心理和物質上的認同感，因此我們就可以了解為什麼這些夏威夷日本移民會選擇再次移居臺灣。¹⁰

對美國日僑而言，明治 27 年 (1894) 至明治 40 年 (1907) 間，以及 1910 晚期至 1920 年代。這段期間，美國西部和夏威夷等地發生白人排外浪潮，進而導致美國開始建立排日的種族主義體制，迫使許多日本人必須另尋他處拓荒方能自主、自由發展，而不是受白人壓迫控制的少數民族，致使日本移民更有理由返回祖國。¹¹ 換言之，這些堅持保有優越感與自主性的移民，冀望再次移民至日本邊疆拓荒，並在祖國的主權保障下，重拾優越種族的地位。在此同時，日本的殖民政權，包括臺灣在內，開始努力招募在美日本移民，共同參與殖民地的農業發展，傳授美式大規模科學農耕技術。例如，明治 39 年 (1906) 至明治 40 年 (1907)，臺灣總督府曾為剛成立的蔗糖會社代為招募農業專家，鎖定的對象乃是返日探親或重返祖國定居的夏威夷日本人。為了快速提昇臺灣糖業，殖民政府招募再移民，承諾給予「優渥報酬」，藉此換取再移民從夏威夷所學到的各項寶貴技術知識與技能。¹²

1920 年代初，鳳梨儼然成為總督府農業工業化發展計畫的核心項目，因為這似乎是最有利可圖的高經濟價值作物。大正 12 年 (1923) 左右，日本官員致力發展農作物多元化，提高臺灣殖民農業的利益，並仿效美國在夏威夷殖

¹⁰ Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.16, 44-53, 62-63, 153-155, 183-184。

¹¹ Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, 第二章與第四章。

¹² 〈糖業經營者募集〉，《臺灣日日新報》，1907 年 6 月 30 日，版 2。另見大園市藏，《台灣裏面史》（臺北：日本殖民地批判社，1936），頁 354-355。

民地的熱帶模式，大興基礎建設以發展工業化農業。原本生產稻米和甘蔗是為了滿足日本國內消費需求，鳳梨罐頭等加工產品則是企圖打入全球消費市場，以配合整體國家政策，創造出口導向經濟，強化臺灣殖民當局的財政實力與競爭力。然而，為了成功發展新鳳梨產業，日本政府認為必須從當時最成功的鳳梨罐頭出口地——新加坡（British empire）或夏威夷（U.S. empire），移轉科學農耕技術和先進的罐頭製造技術。夏威夷畢竟有過大量日本移民進駐，大正 13 年（1924）時更一度突破 12.3 萬人，因此夏威夷比位於東南亞的新加坡，更適合為臺灣提供這項新興產業的人力資源與經驗知識。¹³

在這樣的背景下，兩種類型的日本鳳梨專家自 1920 年代初期陸續從夏威夷前往臺灣：一種是有種植「開英種」經驗的鳳梨農，一種是懂得機械化生產鳳梨罐頭的移民。雖然臺灣人也懂得鳳梨種植之道，不過開英種鳳梨與臺灣本土鳳梨品種差異甚大，需要特殊農法。一般認為開英種鳳梨比臺灣本地鳳梨更適合用來製成罐頭，因為它體積較小、質地更軟。這些進口的開英種鳳梨，構成現代鳳梨罐頭產業發展關鍵的一環。開英種鳳梨農由於掌握了在夏威夷得到的文化資本，在面對來自日本祖國的農業移民與臺灣本地農民時，不僅能獨攬商機，甚至掌握主導權。¹⁴

因此，到了 1920 年代中期，一方面由於美國排外主義風行，另一方面日本又鼓勵在美日本移民投入殖民事業；在這種太平洋兩岸的情勢發展下，為夏威夷日本移民轉戰臺灣鋪路；臺灣中南部的現代鳳梨產業遂在日本殖民政權和壟斷資本下紮穩根基。來自夏威夷的移民在臺灣地方基層傳授新式農耕與

¹³ 關於殖民台灣的新農業——工業化政策，請見陳慈玉〈日本統治期における台湾輸出産業の發展と変遷（上）〉，《立命館経済学》60：5（2012 年 1 月），頁 29-31；大藏省管理局，《日本人の海外活動に関する歴史的調査 6：台湾篇 1》（東京：ゆまに書房，2002），頁 75-76；以及關沢俊弘，〈植民地期台湾における日系パイン缶詰工場の経営〉，《経営史学》46：1（2011 年 6 月），頁 32-33。關於新加坡與夏威夷最初的發展模式競爭以及夏威夷如何勝出，請參見 Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, p.189。

¹⁴ 關於前夏威夷移住民如何將開英種鳳梨及先進製罐技術引進臺灣，請參見 Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.188-190。

罐頭製造技術，使熱帶殖民地臺灣的鄉村景觀逐漸走向「夏威夷化（Hawaiianization）」。¹⁵以下章節將詳細論述殖民政權、壟斷資本和夏威夷式農業與工業化專業技術，所形成的三角合作關係，也說明這種三角合作如何為臺灣 1930 年代晚期的全球鳳梨貿易奠定關鍵性的基礎。¹⁵

大正 14 年（1925），長住夏威夷的日本人，岡崎仁平抵達臺灣，後續還有更多日人抵臺，開啟臺灣鳳梨產業夏威夷化的新篇章。大正 13 年（1924），美國頒布移民法，禁止日本移民進入美國；一年後，岡崎仁平離開白人至上的美國國土，準備回到日本祖國成為殖民者。這位夏威夷資深住民接受日本資本家聘僱，在屏東老埤協助興建全臺第一家夏威夷式鳳梨農場兼罐頭工廠，並負責日常營運事務。在剛成立的「臺灣鳳梨栽培株式會社」（以下簡稱 TPCC）裡，岡崎擔任老埤農場經理人，率先引進夏威夷最新美製機器，建立起現代化罐頭廠。

大正 14 年（1925）岡崎在臺北對總督府官員的演說裡表示，打從他定居夏威夷開始，「殖民化」一直是他「追尋的理想」與夢想，他還補充說，他與家人如今都願意在日本的熱帶國土上，為「奠定鳳梨產業的基礎這個理想而死」。¹⁶ 身為現代化科學農耕的堅定擁護者，岡崎期待擔任日治臺灣「科學與系統化農耕的推手」，這也是他在美治夏威夷所經歷和經營的事業。¹⁷ 岡崎在老埤新廠將夏威夷式鳳梨耕作制度推廣至高雄屏東等地，在昭和 4 年（1929）至昭和 5 年（1930），種植夏威夷開英種鳳梨的農地比例瞬間從 12% 增加至 25%，此時正值老埤農場大規模整地，廣泛種植鳳梨苗。太平洋戰爭爆發之前，

¹⁵ 關於臺灣鳳梨製罐產業通史，請見高淑媛，《經濟政策與產業發展：以日治時期台灣鳳梨罐頭業為例》（臺北：稻鄉出版社，2007）；王御風、黃于津，《鳳梨罐頭的黃金年代：Golden age of pineapple can》（高雄：高雄市政府文化局；台北：玉山社，2019）。

¹⁶ 岡崎仁平，〈布哇の鳳梨事業に就て〉，《台灣時報》70（1925 年 8 月），頁 30。岡崎的日文原文為：台湾植民發展のためパイナップル業と討ち死する迄やって見たい覚悟である。（為了臺灣殖民發展，我已決心投入鳳梨產業，為此而死也在所不惜。）有關他從夏威夷赴臺的報導，另見〈鳳梨の權威者岡崎氏來台〉，《臺灣日日新報》，1925 年 5 月 2 日，版 2；以及〈布哇の初期に似た 臺灣の鳳梨事業 品種の改良と適種選擇〉，《臺灣日日新報》，1925 年 7 月 22 日，版 2。

¹⁷ 岡崎仁平，〈布哇の鳳梨事業に就て〉，頁 31。

除了岡崎興建的第一間現代機械化罐頭廠，後續還有三間新廠落成，只使用產自岡崎鳳梨農場的「夏威夷品種鳳梨」裝罐，以量產外銷全球的頂級罐頭。¹⁸

機械化罐頭製造業則因開英種鳳梨順勢而起，相關產業之所以興盛，不僅是前述臺灣殖民政府的經濟政策扶植，也與日本企業家的投資密切相關，其中最著名的當屬日本最大馬口鐵罐製造商——東洋製罐株式会社（Tōyō Can Manufacturing Company）的經理高碕達之助。¹⁹ 臺灣總督府這項新農業工業化政策的內容，包括將國有土地優先售予鳳梨農場、開英種鳳梨種子免費從新成立的官方農業中心運送到高雄大樹區，同時更以政府預算補助廠商採購（三分之一費用）最新製罐設備，多數設備均購自美國。²⁰ 在新政策的支持下，高碕達之助成功建立起大規模鳳梨農場，並自 1920 年代初開始引進合理化栽培與製罐流程。他長期結合產收與製造以主導商業流程，創造最高收益。大正 11 年（1922），高碕的理想逐步實現，他在高雄中部建立臺灣第一間，也是唯一一間馬口鐵罐廠，接著又在鄰近地區開闢大規模鳳梨農場和製罐廠。²¹

高碕即是後來聘請岡崎仁平設立老埤工廠的推手，他同時還投資 TPCC 及其相關罐頭廠，並充分獲益於政府核撥的補助。為響應大日本帝國提高國際地位的願景，這群前夏威夷移民、日本資本家和臺灣本地殖民行政官員，共同推動臺灣新農業工業化，產業內容包括農場經營、設備先進的罐頭工廠，以及國營農業試驗所。全新的產業，代表著日本意圖在全球鳳梨貿易市場與英美等

¹⁸ 參見太田猛編，《台灣大觀》（臺南：臺南新報社，1935），頁 144；及臺灣經濟研究所編，《鳳梨合同の真相》（臺北：臺灣經濟研究所，1936），頁 8-10，引自東京國會圖書館憲政資料室，淺沼稻次郎關係文書。由作者本人計算。後者資料來源提到大多數本土鳳梨製造商為臺灣農民。

¹⁹ 在日本實業家的幫助下，高碕成為 1917 年建立日本東洋製罐株式會社的要角。請見高碕達之助集刊行委員會編，《高碕達之助集：上》（東京：東洋製罐株式會社，1965），頁 69-108。

²⁰ 加藤謙一，〈鳳梨の耕種様式に就て〉，《台灣農事報》27：6（1931 年 6 月），頁 28-29；臺灣總督府殖產局，《台灣の鳳梨産業》（臺北：臺灣總督府殖產局特產課，1934），頁 40；陳慈玉，〈日本統治期における台湾輸出産業の發展と變遷（上）〉，頁 30。

²¹ 高碕達之助集刊行委員會編，《高碕達之助集：上》，頁 63-65；高碕達之助，〈台灣鳳梨罐詰業政策〉，《罐詰時報》4：2（1925 年 2 月），頁 4；坂田國助編，《第二回本島經濟事情調查報告》（臺北：南支南洋經濟研究會，1932），頁 110；臺灣總督府殖產局，《台灣の鳳梨産業》（臺北：臺灣總督府殖產局特產課，1930），頁 2。

國一爭高下。然而，這場競爭的前提是透過日本跨太平洋再移民從夏威夷有系統地吸收、移轉競爭對手的農耕與製罐技術，這種以美國技術挑戰美國鳳梨霸權的作法，看似矛盾，卻恰好反映了日本自北海道殖民以來，建立帝國與移住殖民主義的一貫態度，也就是效法美國西部拓荒的經典範例。²²

從岡崎的移民軌跡反映了，夏威夷的日本移民並不認為在美國熱帶殖民地實現日本「海外雄飛」的理想，與前往日本南方國境為殖民大業「奉獻犧牲」有所矛盾。明治 40 年（1907）移民至夏威夷的岡崎堅信移住殖民者的海外發展理念，並且為了促進日本國土擴張，有意識仿效美國清教徒的拓荒傳奇。²³ 岡崎並非只想在美國白人農場主的指揮下，當個聽話的蔗糖工人，他把鳳梨種植視為經濟獨立，以及日本民族在白人主宰的夏威夷發展的跳板。在 James Dole 成立夏威夷第一個鳳梨種植場與罐頭廠複合園區後不到十年，岡崎也選擇了鳳梨種植業，這不僅顯示他天真的擴張主義心態夾雜著強烈的種族國族主義（racial nationalism），也和許多日本移民拓荒者一樣，挪用了美國白人的殖民策略。²⁴ 到了 1910 年代晚期，岡崎已是夏威夷最重要的日籍鳳梨種植權威之一。1910 年代，日本官員如新渡戶稻造和臺灣殖民政府的農業科技官僚前往夏威夷參訪，期間頻繁拜會岡崎，取得有關鳳梨產業的最新資訊；也因為這樣的機緣，這位夏威夷資深移民開始意識到鳳梨產業轉戰臺灣的契機。為了協助日本在熱帶國境上開發現代化鳳梨農業，整整十年，岡崎定期運送開英種鳳梨的母株（stumps）、冠芽和吸芽，至臺灣的官營農業試驗所進行繁殖實驗。²⁵

²² 〈世界的商品としての台湾鳳梨缶詰業の地位〉，《罐詰時報》6:3（1927 年 3 月），頁 11-14；高崎達之助，〈台湾鳳梨罐詰業政策〉，頁 4-11；以及太田猛編，《台湾大觀》，頁 143。

²³ 福島ハワイ会編，《故岡崎仁平翁追悼記念誌》（福島：福島ハワイ会，1952），頁 84-85。

²⁴ 岡崎仁平〈履歷書〉（1930 年頃）、〈官房秘書課：判任官以下進退原議〉、中央研究院臺灣史研究所檔案館臺灣總督府公文類纂（以下簡稱 TSC）。

²⁵ 福島ハワイ会編，《故岡崎仁平翁追悼記念誌》，頁 2-4、17-30、47-49、82-86；高橋莞治，《福島移民史：ハワイ帰還者の巻》（福島：福島ハワイ会，1958），頁 11-12；川添善一，《移植樹の花開く》（ホノルル：移植樹の花開く刊行会，1960），頁 303-304；加藤謙一，〈鳳梨の耕種様式に就て〉，頁 28；岡崎仁平，〈布哇の鳳梨事業に就て〉，頁 27-28；以及〈鳳梨科講習〉，《布哇報知》，1923 年 2 月 16 日。

大正 13 年（1924），高碕達之助造訪檀香山，參觀夏威夷的鳳梨罐頭業，岡崎對於臺灣的興趣也日益增加。為了更加了解現代化鳳梨產業的運作方式，並為臺灣的產業推廣做好準備，高碕聘請經驗豐富的岡崎出任特聘顧問，並請他導覽夏威夷種植業。繼此次初步查訪後，高碕邀請岡崎親自赴臺，評估大規模栽培開英種鳳梨和發展機械化罐頭廠的可行性。岡崎在臺灣鄉下停留了三個月，終於獲得肯定的結論。他認為南臺灣的土壤和氣候與夏威夷十分相似，有了這位夏威夷資深專家的保證，高碕自大正 11 年（1922）建立高雄罐頭工廠後的夢想終於得以實現。²⁶

如前文所述，大正 14 年（1925）TPCC 就在高碕擔任資方、岡崎出任農場經理人的模式下，正式落成。作為東洋製罐株式會社子公司和內外食品株式會社的姊妹公司，TPCC 在老埤鎮開始經營鳳梨農場，位置在高雄屏東等地的高碕罐頭廠，和內外食品株式會社經營的附屬罐頭廠都相距不遠。儘管農場的原址早先幾乎無人開墾過，當局仍然計畫將這片大規模的土地變成日本在臺最大的鳳梨農場，同時委派岡崎全權管理。不難想像的是，岡崎組織的工作團隊成員也都是從前的夏威夷移民。一位昭和 4 年（1929）初期的日本訪客描述：「這裡一切都走夏威夷風，因為領導班子的「知識和技術」都來自他們在夏威夷的多年經驗。²⁷

這名訪客的觀察，暗示了其他夏威夷住民仿效岡崎的先例，在臺灣其他地區尋找擔任鳳梨專家顧問的機會。1920 年代晚期之後，有幾個鳳梨農場也陸

²⁶ 高碕達之助，《布哇に於ける鳳梨罐詰事業》（東京：罐詰普及協會，1924），頁 1；高碕達之助，〈台灣鳳梨罐詰業政策〉，頁 4；岡崎仁平，〈鳳梨に就て〉，《罐詰時報》5：7（1925 年 7 月），頁 2-4；高橋莞治，《福島移民史：ハワイ帰還者の巻》，頁 12；臺灣製罐株式會社，〈台灣鳳梨業政策〉（1925），頁 3-4、12-16；以及東洋製罐株式會社，《東洋製罐五十年の歩み》（東京：東洋製罐株式會社，1967），頁 45。

²⁷ 見學榮次郎，〈鳳梨缶詰販賣業者の台灣遊記〉，《罐詰時報》8：4（1929 年 4 月），頁 69。當中日文原文如下：スムーズカイエン種鳳梨の大量栽培並に大量缶詰製産者の経営方針が、総て布哇式……何れも首脳者は布哇に於て多年の経験を有する方々だから無理からぬ事とは思ふ。（伴隨開英種鳳梨大量栽培の罐頭大量製造業者，其經營方針全是夏威夷式……這也是理所當然，因為其主導者都在夏威夷擁有多年經驗。）

續落成，而且通常都獲得財閥金援。事實上，岡崎的老友中尾孫市便從歐胡島（Oahu）前往高雄，在高碕農場——工業化集團的另一個子公司，「內外食品株式會社」的鳳山鳳梨種植場擔任經理人。²⁸ 日本移民考量白人主導的夏威夷越來越無法滿足移住者的殖民理想，也開始遷往日本帝國的熱帶邊境，尋找更多發展機會。²⁹

岡崎的例子不僅吸引更多夏威夷日本移民前往臺灣，他也將最先進的美國機械設備引進臺灣鳳梨農場與罐頭廠。根據先前在夏威夷的經驗，岡崎使用兩臺美製 Fordson 拖曳機和一架 150 匹馬力蒸汽犁，加速開墾原始土壤，這樣的現代化科技也讓在旁觀看的民眾大開眼界。石油動力拖曳機是首批引進臺灣的機械設備之一，當時臺灣島上大多數的甘蔗田仍使用老舊的蒸汽拖曳機。在岡崎及其夏威夷同仁的指導下，直接自夏威夷輸入的 50 萬株開英種鳳梨苗，在機械動力農耕的奧援下，開始在老埤農場生根發芽。³⁰

昭和 3 年（1928）「內外食品株式會社」在臺灣的第一間現代化罐頭工廠也由岡崎負責策劃。為了這項深具歷史意義的工作，岡崎被派遣至檀香山採購最先進的機械設備，包括 Ginaca 自動剝皮與削皮機，這是 Dole 公司率先引進夏威夷的革命性科技。³¹ 這種機器大幅減少了人力成本與生產時間，並產生

²⁸ 關於中尾孫市，請見 Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.195-196, 323n49。在高碕達之助的領導下，這些附屬企業組成壟斷性財團，其中也包含 TPCC 及其母公司東洋實業。這些企業共同推動臺灣鳳梨產業走向夏威夷化。請見鼎俱樂部，《鼎》創刊號（高雄：鼎俱樂部，1931），頁 1-6、85-86，國立臺灣大學圖書館臺灣史資料。

²⁹ 其他再移民案例，請參見 Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.189,191。

³⁰ 赤木猛市，《台湾に於ける母国人農業植民》，頁 172-184；及〈好望の台湾鳳梨罐詰業〉，《實業之日本》8：3（1929 年 3 月），頁 46-47。為了促使臺灣鳳梨產業改種開英種鳳梨，該公司與高碕製罐廠主動將上萬株進口裔芽和吸芽配送至全臺各鳳梨農、農場和企業和農業實驗站。見臺灣製罐株式會社，〈台湾鳳梨業政策〉，頁 27-30；及 K. Sakimura, “On the Pineapple Industry in Formosa,” *Pineapple Quarterly* 5, no. 1(March 1935), p.31，夏威夷曼諾亞校區漢彌爾頓圖書館夏威夷館藏區。

³¹ 見〈鳳梨栽培會社の 罐詰工場の位置 多分高雄に決定するらしい〉，《臺灣日日新報》，1925 年 9 月 30 日，版 n01；〈高雄鳳梨罐頭 開辦製造〉，《臺灣日日新報》，1926 年 12 月 13 日，版 4；〈鳳梨罐詰工場 新式工場設立〉，《臺灣日日新報》，1927 年 11 月 9 日，版 2；〈全島唯一を誇る 新式鳳梨罐詰工場 内外食器會社で 高雄堀江町へ新設〉，《臺灣日日新報》，1928 年 6 月 28 日，版 6；另可參考 Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.197-200。

體積與外型一致的鳳梨切片，供出口罐頭使用。自昭和 7 年（1932）起，岡崎也在臺南關廟建立現代化鳳梨罐頭廠，並使用他與好友中尾孫市從檀香山製造、進口的各種機器設備；這一群夏威夷移民也協助在關廟近郊籌辦農場，大部分的資金想必都來自高碕的財團。³²

在屏東與高雄的原始種植場，岡崎、中尾和其他同仁也推行夏威夷式勞動管理，有意地聘僱多元族群勞工，包括當地的臺灣漢族男性女性以及排灣族原住民，並根據不同族裔區分並控管勞工。大正 14 年（1925）岡崎建議 TPCC，老埤農場可多僱用廉價的原住民勞工，因為工廠靠近排灣族部落，岡崎認為他們恰恰能提供大量廉價可剝削的勞動力。³³ 眼見岡崎如此積極聘僱排灣族勞工，當地日本官員也迅速跟進，將鳳梨雇傭勞動納入一般政策目標，原住民族因此同化至高雄地區的殖民資本主義經濟體系裡。³⁴

岡崎仿照夏威夷種植場的常規作法，使用種族混合的勞動力，負責清地、鳳梨種植和收割等工作。排灣族勞工往往處於經濟底層，薪資也低於臺灣漢族勞工。TPCC 並未考慮到排灣族勞工的基本生活方式有其特殊性，包括飲食和住所等條件，因為排灣族人深山區仍保有部落家屋以及半傳統的生活習慣。一位來自東京的訪客，在形容老埤農場的營運方式如何物化日本移住殖民體制與種族權力關係時，明顯流露著種族歧視心態。包括岡崎在內的 10 位日本主管與督導人員，監管這群「野蠻」的「蕃」，該位訪客以輕蔑的態度指稱排灣族工人。據稱，這些勞工在岡崎和其他日本人「寬厚的」督導之下，宛如「被

³² 關於他設立的關廟廠，請見 Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.209-211。

³³ 〈布哇の初期に似た 臺灣の鳳梨事業 品種の改良と適種選擇〉；下田將美，《南島經濟記》（東京：大阪屋號商店，1929），頁 204-206；澤本江南，《台灣を瞥見して》（東京：青山書院，1930），頁 36-37；板垣邦器，《台灣見物》（東京：板垣りき子，1931），頁 84-85；以及〈好望の台湾鳳梨罐詰業〉，頁 46-47。

³⁴ 〈蕃人の鳳梨栽培〉，《臺灣日日新報》，1926 年 9 月 3 日，版 2；〈潮州屏東方面の蕃地に外國種鳳梨栽培 蕃地産業獎勵の目的で 外國蕃地栽培は最初の試み〉，《臺灣日日新報》，1927 年 10 月 12 日，版 2；及藤崎濟之助，《台灣の蕃族》（東京：國史刊行會，1931），頁 884。

馴服的獅子」，「忠誠地」從早上六點一直工作到傍晚六點半。³⁵

在殖民地臺灣的鳳梨產業中，夏威夷化的規模與範疇包括從作物的選擇（開英種）到農場經營方式，以及從製罐技術到勞動管理等層面。在這樣的背景下，岡崎及其他同樣來自夏威夷的日本再移民，遂成為臺灣殖民政權、高碕財團以及三菱商事相關資本家等勢力推動工業化發展計畫當中，不可或缺的一環。1930 年代中期，這兩股壟斷資本勢力又在嘉義與斗六附近，陸續建立起數個夏威夷式農場。³⁶ 昭和 10 年（1935）後，在殖民壟斷資本的介入以及臺灣總督府的強制政令下，全臺所有鳳梨罐頭廠和農場進行產業整併，這也使得 1930 年代末期以前，臺灣鳳梨產業竟已能挑戰美國夏威夷在全球鳳梨罐頭外銷市場的獨霸地位。³⁷ 若沒有前夏威夷移住民從美國熱帶殖民地帶來的一手經驗、實作知識與先進科技，臺灣現代鳳梨產業可能無法如此迅速興盛起來。另一方面，這些日本再移民本身也獲利甚豐，他們不僅擺脫了白人種族主義歧視，過著自主自治的拓荒生活，同時還能在本國邊境享受殖民者的特權與權力，就像美國白人在「西部」國土，包括夏威夷等地所獲得的待遇一樣。但是，在結束有關夏威夷與臺灣殖民軸線的分析之前，為了深入剖析這套移住殖民再移民敘事，筆者將簡短探討夏威夷再移民帶給臺灣被殖民者的影響，與其引發的後果。

從殖民權力關係觀之，受到鳳梨產業夏威夷化衝擊最鉅者，當屬昭和 10 年（1935）受到產業整併政策波及的臺灣罐頭業者和農民；當時鳳梨產業在臺灣總督府的主導下，成為殖民資本家的獨占事業，尤其是高碕所經營的株式會社。1930 年代中期以前，小型罐頭廠的經營者，多數都是當地的臺灣漢人，如今他們陷入兩難，如果不願以「不公平」的補助金額配合整併，就什麼補償

³⁵ 下田將美，《南島經濟記》，頁 204-206；澤本江南，《台湾を瞥見して》，頁 36-37；板垣邦器，《台湾見物》，頁 84-85；及〈好望の台湾鳳梨罐詰業〉，頁 46-47。這段引文出自〈好望の台湾鳳梨罐詰業〉，頁 46。相關主題亦可參考 Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.202-204。

³⁶ Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, pp.205, 210-211.

³⁷ Azuma, *In Search of Our Frontier*, p.209；及高淑媛，《經濟政策與產業發展：以日治時期台灣鳳梨罐頭業為例》，頁 143-171、182-188，尤其是第 185 頁。

也拿不到。這兩種選擇都無法為他們的罐頭廠帶來活路，也無法保有獨立經營者的身分，因為他們沒有機械化的廠房，勢必在殖民政權支持的現代化壟斷政策遭到淘汰。因此，這次整併計畫的多數受害者，都是小型罐頭廠的臺灣小資本家。此外，大多數的臺灣地主與自耕農，原本所種植者均為本土原生種鳳梨，由於殖民政府贊助的開英種鳳梨大肆推廣，導致本土鳳梨農面臨生計中斷甚至流離失所的困境。昭和 10 年（1935）產業整併時，引發臺灣社會運動人士的不滿，大力抨擊高碕株式會社，指責他們藉由邪惡的「計謀」，意圖「併吞臺灣人經營的中小型工廠，圖謀掌控全島鳳梨罐頭業」。³⁸

岡崎和其他夏威夷再移民，則是這群國家御用資本家「計謀」成功的主要推手。他們離開瀰漫著白人種族主義的夏威夷，是為了「追尋」不受白人阻撓的「殖民理想」，岡崎本人亦曾如此在日本殖民官員面前宣示。但他們落腳臺灣，替自己實踐著沒有種族歧視的移住殖民主義，卻導致了臺灣人必須流離他方。因此，這些再移民對於美國種族排外現象的反抗，如今看來分外諷刺；導致原本在美國人土地上遭白人壓迫的少數黃種人，變成了在日本帝國殖民地壓榨臺灣人的殖民者。

透過兩大太平洋移住帝國之間形成的這條夏威夷——臺灣軸線，本文試圖闡述夏威夷的日本移住民在美國掀起排外風潮後，為何以及如何再次與祖國日本移住殖民主義有所聯繫及認同。這個故事也反映了，當年夏威夷的日本移民考量自己究竟該留在美國承受弱勢族群處境，還是前往祖國殖民地享受殖民者的新生活之際，日本殖民政權和母國資本聯手利用這群移民的理想與經驗。日本移住民基於個人選擇，造成其身體、知識、理念和科技在跨太平洋地區移動，但他們個人的選擇並無法與當時美國排外和日本殖民事業切割開來，因為美國的種族政治和日本的殖民政策的關係盤根錯節，臺灣因此成為許多夏威夷日本人眼中的拓荒樂園；夏威夷拓荒移住民在臺灣指導鳳梨產業的一段歷史，揭露出不為人知的移民迴路軌跡，這樣的輾轉移民過程，也促使日本

³⁸ 臺灣經濟研究所編，《鳳梨合同の真相》，頁 3、8、45、62。引文出自第 3 及 45 頁。

帝國及其海外移民社會，得以共同實現大日本帝國以美國拓荒為師的海外擴張目標。有鑑於此，筆者認為，日本殖民主義相關研究，必須擴展至帝國本土以外同時期及人群移動活動的相關分析。本文透過跨帝國觀點，串連起美國夏威夷和日治臺灣兩地，以實證說明了我在著作裡試圖開創的跨國檔案研究及歷史分析的方法。

引用書目

《布哇報知》

《臺灣日日新報》

〈好望の台湾鳳梨罐詰業〉，《実業之日本》8（3）：45-48。

〈世界的商品としての台湾鳳梨缶詰業の地位〉，《罐詰時報》6（3）：11-14。

岡崎仁平〈履歷書〉（1930年頃），收於《官房秘書課：判任官以下進退原議》，中央研究院臺灣史研究所檔案館臺灣總督府公文類纂。

下田將美

1929 《南島經濟記》。東京：大阪屋号商店。

大園市藏

1936 《台湾裏面史》。臺北：日本殖民地批判社。

大藏省管理局

2000 《日本人の海外活動に関する歴史的調査 6：台湾篇 1》。東京：ゆまに書房。

山口政治

1999 《東台湾開發史》。臺北：中日產經資訊。

川添善一

1960 《移植樹の花開く》。ホノルル：移植樹の花開く刊行会。

太田猛編

1935 《台湾大觀》。臺南：臺南新報社。

王御風、黃于津

2019 《鳳梨罐頭的黃金年代：Golden age of pineapple can》。高雄：高雄市政府文化局；
臺北：玉山社出版。

加藤謙一

1931 〈鳳梨の耕種様式に就て〉，《台湾農事報》27（6）：28-37。

坂田國助編

1932 《第二回本島經濟事情調查報告》。臺北：南支南洋經濟研究會。

見學榮次郎

1929 〈鳳梨缶詰販売業者の台湾遊記〉，《罐詰時報》8（4）：67-73。

赤木猛市

- 1929 《台湾に於ける母国人農業植民》。臺北：臺灣總督府殖産局。

岡崎仁平

- 1925 〈布哇の鳳梨事業に就て〉，《台湾時報》70：23-31。
1925 〈鳳梨に就て〉，《罐詰時報》5（7）：1-5。

東洋製罐株式會社

- 1967 《東洋製罐五十年の歩み》。東京：東洋製罐株式会社。

板垣邦器

- 1931 《台湾見物》。東京：板垣りき子。

林素珍、林春治、陳耀芳

- 2005 《原住民重大歷史事件：七腳川事件》。臺北：行政院原住民族委員會。

芳誼會編

- 1923 《賀田金三郎翁小伝》。東京：芳誼會。

栗原純

- 1998 〈台湾總督府による官営移民事業について〉，收於神奈川大学中国語学科編，
《中国民衆への視座》，頁 161-184。東京：東方書店。

荒武達朗

- 2007 〈日本統治時代台湾東部への移民送出地〉，《徳島大学総合科学部人間社会文化
研究》14：91-104。

高淑媛

- 2007 《經濟政策與產業發展：以日治時期台灣鳳梨罐頭業為例》。臺北：稻鄉出版社。

高碓達之助

- 1924 《布哇に於ける鳳梨罐詰事業》。東京：罐詰普及協會。
1925 〈台湾鳳梨罐詰業政策〉，《罐詰時報》4（2）：4-11。

高碓達之助集刊行委員会編

- 1965 《高碓達之助集：上》。東京：東洋製罐株式會社。

高橋莞治

- 1958 《福島移民史：ハワイ帰還者の巻》。福島：福島ハワイ会。

張素玢

2017 《未竟的殖民：日本在臺移民村》。新北：衛城出版。

陳慈玉

2012 〈日本統治期における台湾輸出産業の発展と変遷（上）〉，《立命館経済学》60（5）：17-49。

鼎俱樂部

1931 《鼎》創刊號。高雄：鼎俱樂部。

廖高仁

2014 《悅讀日本官營移民村》。花蓮：花蓮鳳林鎮公所。

福島ハワイ会編

1952 《故岡崎仁平翁追悼記念誌》。福島：福島ハワイ会。

臺灣經濟研究所編

1936 《鳳梨合同の真相》。臺北：臺灣經濟研究所。

臺灣製罐株式會社

1925 〈台湾鳳梨業政策〉：1-30。

臺灣總督府殖産局

1930 《台湾の鳳梨産業》。臺北：臺灣總督府殖産局特産課。

1934 《台湾の鳳梨産業》。臺北：臺灣總督府殖産局特産課。

澤本江南

1930 《台湾を瞥見して》。東京：青山書院。

藤崎濟之助

1931 《台湾の蕃族》。東京：国史刊行会。

關澤俊弘

2011 〈植民地期台湾における日系パイン缶詰工場の経営〉，《経営史学》46（1）：29-55。

Eiichiro Azuma

2019 In Search of Our Frontier: Japanese America and Settler Colonialism in the Construction of Japan's Borderless Empire. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Fumiko Fujita

- 1994 *American Pioneers and the Japanese Frontier: American Experts in Nineteenth-Century Japan*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

K. Sakimura

- 1935 “On the Pineapple Industry in Formosa,” *Pineapple Quarterly* 5(1) :29-47.

Katsuya Hirano

- 2015 “Thanatopolitics in the Making of Japan’s Hokkaido: Settler Colonialism and Primitive Accumulation.” *Critical Historical Studies* 2(2):191-218.

Sidney Xu Lu

- 2016 “Colonizing Hokkaido and the Origin of Japanese Trans-Pacific Expansion, 1869-1894.” *Japanese Studies* 36(2):251-274.
- 2019 *The Making of Japanese Settler Colonialism: Malthusianism and Trans-Pacific Migration, 1868-1961*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

