

The Reception of Thomas Robert Malthus in Europe, America and Japan

Hokkai Gakuen University, Sapporo, Japan, 4-5 September 2018

A conference supported by a JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP17H00982.



1. The project. — 2. Programme. — 3. The authors. — 4. Provisional abstracts.

1. The project

Malthus's writings, published two centuries ago, never ceased to be discussed among economists and politicians. His ideas on population and poverty, in particular, reappeared in political discourses all over the world during these last decades, even if it is in a more or less hidden way. This is the reason why an assessment of the reception of Malthus's works in different European countries, in America and in Japan is not only a fascinating piece of comparative analysis in the history of economic thought, but also a topical contribution to the understanding of current debates.

The reception of Malthus in Europe, America and Japan

Contents

The various contributions — one per country or group of countries — deal with the many aspects of the reception of Malthus's writings during the 19th century to the First World War. This includes the different translations of his works, the reception of his political economy proper, the reception of his 'principle of population', etc., at different levels: debates among economists, debates in the political and ethical spheres, with possible echoes in parliaments and even in fictions (novels, short stories, plays etc.).

Keywords

Malthus, Malthusianism, History of economic thought, Markets and crises, Population, Poverty, Dissemination of ideas, Political philosophy, Ethics.

List of contributors

Please see below.

Programme

Please see below. Please note that, in this programme, the chapters are listed according to the alphabetical names of countries. The order of presentation will probably be different.

Provisional abstracts

Please see below. Please note that the abstracts are also provisional.

Contact

Professors Hiromi Morishita, morish@m6.gyao.ne.jp
and Masashi Izumo, izumo@kanagawa-u.ac.jp

2. Programme

Introduction

1. France

Gilbert Faccarello (Panthéon-Assas University, Paris, France)

The reception of Malthus in Europe, America and Japan

2. Germany and Austria

Christian Gehrke (Karl Franzens University, Graz, Austria)

3. Italy

Daniela Donnini Macciò (independent scholar, Italy) and Roberto Romani (University of Teramo, Italy)

4. Japan

Masashi Izumo (Kanagawa University, Yokohama, Japan) & Hiromi Morishita (Hokkai Gakuen University, Sapporo, Japan)

5. Portugal and Brazil

José Luís Cardoso (University of Lisbon, Portugal) and Alexandre Mendes Cunha (Federal University of Minas Gerais, Brasil)

6. Russia

Maxim Markov (Saint Petersburg State University) and Denis Melnik (National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow)

7. Spain and Spanish speaking countries

Javier San Julián Arrupe (University of Barcelona, Spain)

8. United Kingdom

Ryan Walter (University of Queensland, Australia)

9. United States of America

David Andrews (State University of New York at Oswego, USA).

The reception of Malthus in Europe, America and Japan

3. The authors

David Andrews

David Andrews is Professor and Chair of the Economics Department at the State University of New York at Oswego. He serves as an Associate Editor at *History of Economic Issues*. His research has been focused on the writings of J.M. Keynes, Piero Sraffa, Adam Smith and classical political economy. He has written one book, *Keynes and the British Humanist Tradition: the moral purpose of the market* (Routledge 2010). His other recent publications include: ‘Keynes and Christian Socialism: Religion and the Economic Problem’ (*The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 24(4), 2017), ‘Natural price and the long run: Alfred Marshall’s misreading of Adam Smith’ (*Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 39(1), 2015), ‘Adam Smith’s natural prices, the gravitation metaphor, and the purposes of nature’ (*Economic Thought*, 3(1), 2014), and ‘The Background to Hawtrey’s Ethics’ (*History of Political Economy*, 42(2), 2010).

José Luís Cardoso

José Luís Cardoso is research professor and director of the Institute of Social Sciences of the University of Lisbon. He has published articles in the main international journals on the history of economic thought. He is co-founder of the *European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* and was President of the European Society for the History of Economic Thought (ESHET) in 2014-2016. His recent publications include ‘Liberalism and enlightened political economy’ (*The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 22(6), 2015), ‘The Anglo-Portuguese Methuen Treaty of 1703: Opportunities and Constraints of Economic Development’ (in A. Alimento, and K. Stapelbroek (eds.), *The Politics of Commercial Treaties in the Eighteenth Century. Balance of Power, Balance of Trade*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017), and ‘Circulating economic ideas: adaptation, appropriation, translation’ (in A.M. Cunha and C.E. Suprinyak (eds), *The political economy of Latin American Independence*, Routledge, 2017). He also edited *The German Historical School and European Economic Thought* (with M. Psalidopoulos, Routledge, 2016) and *Economic Analyses in Historical Perspective. Festschrift in Honour of Gilbert Faccarello* (with H.D. Kurz and Ph. Steiner, Routledge, 2017)

Alexandre Mendes Cunha

Alexandre Mendes Cunha is Associate Professor and the Head of the Center for European Studies at the Federal University of Minas Gerais (UFMG), Brazil, where he also currently holds a Jean Monnet Chair granted by the European Commission. His research interests include the history of economic and political thought, intellectual history and history of European integration. His recent publications include the collection *The Political Economy of Latin American Independence*, co-edited with Carlos E. Suprinyak (Routledge, 2017), articles in journals such as *History of Political Economy* and *Cambridge Journal of Economics* and different book chapters, and in particular ‘A previously unnoticed “Swiss connection” in the dissemination of cameralist ideas during the second half of the 18th century’ (*History of Political Economy*, 49, 2017), ‘When development meets culture: the contribution of Celso Furtado in the 1970s’ (*Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 2017), and ‘Administrative

The reception of Malthus in Europe, America and Japan

Centralisation, Police Regulations and Mining Sciences as Channels for the Dissemination of Cameralist Ideas in the Iberian World' (in Marten Seppel and Keith Tribe (eds), *Cameralism in Practice: State Administration and Economy in Early Modern Europe*, Boydell & Brewer, 2017).

Daniela Donnini Macciò

Daniela Donnini Macciò is an independent scholar based in Italy. Her recent publications include 'G.E. Moore and Cambridge economics: Ralph Hawtrey on ethics and methodology' (*The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 2015), 'Ethics, economics and power in the Cambridge Apostles' internationalism between the two World Wars' (*The European Journal of International Relations*, 2016), 'The Apostles' justice: Cambridge reflections on economic inequality from Moore's *Principia Ethica* to Keynes's *General Theory* (1903-1936)' (*Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 2016), and 'Pigou on philosophy and religion' (*The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 2017).

Gilbert Faccarello

Gilbert Faccarello is Emeritus professor at Panthéon-Assas University, Paris, France. He is a co-founder of *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought* published by Routledge, and acted as a chairman of the Council of the European Society for the History of Economic Thought. His publications include books and articles in HET, mostly with Routledge. Recently, he also edited *The Reception of David Ricardo in Continental Europe and Japan* (Routledge, 2014, with Masashi Izumo), *Handbook on the History of Economic Analysis* (Edward Elgar, 2016, 3 volumes, with Heinz D. Kurz), and *Political Economy and Religion* (2017, a special issue of *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*). He is also, with H.D. Kurz, the co-editor of the Routledge Historical Resources site devoted to the History of Economic Thought.

Christian Gehrke

Christian Gehrke is an Associate professor at the Department of Economics of the University of Graz, Austria, and a co-director of the *Graz Schumpeter Centre*. He has published several papers, mostly on classical economics, in various HET journals, and has edited and co-edited some books, including *Sraffa and Modern Economics* (2 vols, jointly with Roberto Ciccone and Gary Mongiovi, Routledge, 2011). He is a co-editor of the *Centro Sraffa Working Papers* series and serves on the editorial boards of *Metroeconomica* and of *The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*. He is a member of the ESHET Council since 2012, where he also chairs the History of Economic Analysis Award Committee. His most recent publications include 'Ricardo's Discovery of Comparative Advantage Revisited: A Critique of Ruffin's Account' (*The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 22(5), 2015), 'The neoclassical approach to induced technical change: From Hicks to Acemoglu' (*Metroeconomica* 68(4), 2017), 'Foreign trade, international values, and gains from trade: Ricardo, Pennington, Whewell, and John Stuart Mill' (in Shigeyoshi Senga et alii (eds), *Ricardo and International Trade*, Routledge, 2017), and many entries in G. Faccarello and H.D. Kurz (eds), *Handbook on the History of Economic Analysis*, Edward Elgar, 2016).

The reception of Malthus in Europe, America and Japan

Masashi Izumo

Masashi Izumo is Professor at Kanagawa University, Yokohama, Japan. He is an executive member of the JSJET (Japanese Society for the History of Economic Thought), where he is also editor of *The History of Economic Thought*. He is co-founder of the Ricardo Society Japan, and committee member of the Malthus Society Japan. His recent publications include *The Reception of David Ricardo in Continental Europe and Japan* (co-edited with Gilbert Faccarello, Routledge, 2014), 'John Ruskin in early twentieth-century Japan: some episodes' (in *Economic Analyses in Historical Perspective. Festschrift in Honour of Gilbert Faccarello*, edited by J. L. Cardoso, H. D. Kurz and Ph. Steiner, Routledge, 2017). He also edited *Malthus and his Contemporaries* (Nihon Keizai Hyoronsha, 2006, with H. Iida and Y. Yanagita).

Maxim Markov

Maxim Markov is Associate Professor at the Saint Petersburg State University. His research focuses on the history of Russian economic thought and public economics, with a special interest to ethical problems. Recent publications: 'I.I. Rubin at the St. Petersburg University' (in *I.I. Rubin: Political Economy in Retrospect*, Moscow, 2017, in Russian), and 'Fields of Discourse Perturbed: The Revolution of 1905 and Economic Teaching and Thinking at St. Petersburg University' (in *Re-examining the History of the Russian Economy: A New Analytic Tool from Field Theory*, Palgrave Macmillan, forthcoming).

Denis Melnik

Denis Melnik is Associate Professor at the National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia. His current research focuses on the history of Russian and Soviet economic thought and on theories of economic development. He has been a visiting scholar at the New School for Social Research in New York and Kanagawa University in Japan. His recent publications include 'The Diffusion of Ricardo's Theories in Russia' (in G. Faccarello and M. Izumo (eds), *The Reception of David Ricardo in Continental Europe and Japan*, Routledge, 2014), 'Between Leviathan and Mammon: In Search of Moral Economics' (*Social Sciences. A Quarterly Journal of the Russian Academy of Sciences*, 48(1), 2017), and 'Revolutionary Economic Reasoning in the Context of Revolution: The Origins and Fate of Bolshevik Economics' (*Slavic Review*, 76(3), 2017).

Hiromi Morishita

Hiromi Morishita is Professor at Hokkai-Gakuen University, Sapporo, Japan and President of the Malthus Society Japan. His publications include *The Malthusian Controversy on Population and the Age of Reform* (in Japanese, Tokyo : Nihon Keizai Hyouron Sha, 2001), and, as a co-author, *Malthus, Mill and Marshall* (in Japanese, Kyoto: Showado, 2013), and *A Dictionary of Malthusian Principles of Population* (in Japanese, Kyoto : Showado, 2016).

The reception of Malthus in Europe, America and Japan

Roberto Romani

Roberto Romani is an Associate Professor in the History of Economic Thought at the University of Teramo, Italy. He was a Research Fellow at the Centre for History and Economics, King's College, Cambridge, and a Member of the School of History at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton. His publications include *L'economia politica del Risorgimento italiano* (Bollati Boringhieri, 1994), *National Character and Public Spirit in Britain and France, 1750-1914* (Cambridge University Press, 2002), and *Sensibilities of the Risorgimento: Reason and Passions in Political Thought* (Brill, 2018).

Javier San Julián Arrupe

Javier San Julián is Lecturer at the Department of Economic History, Institutions, Policy and World Economy, University of Barcelona, Spain. His research has focused on the process of institutionalisation of political economy, the transmission of economic ideas to the sphere of politics, and the evolution of ideas on public finance in the 19th century, analysing more specifically the debates on progressive taxation. His recent publications include 'The Institutionalisation of Political Economy in Italy and Spain (1860-1900): A Comparative Approach' (*The European Journal of the History of Economic Thought*, 21(1), 2014), 'In search for a replacement for economic journals: The diffusion of political economy in cultural reviews in the liberal age in Spain, 1868-1914' (*Revista de Historia Económica. Journal of Iberian and Latin American Economic History*, 33, 2015), and 'Compete vs. protect, idealism vs. pragmatism. Debates on the crisis of the end of the 19th century in Spain', *Revue Économique*, 66(5), 2015).

Ryan Walter

Ryan Walter is Senior Lecturer at the University of Queensland, Australia. He is currently investigating how British political economists defended their discipline in the early nineteenth century from attacks on its findings and mode of argumentation. Recent publications include *A Critical History of the Economy* (Routledge, 2014), 'Slingsby Bethel's Analysis of State Interests' (*History of European Ideas*, 41(4), 2015), 'Adam Smith's Free Trade Casuistry' (*Global Intellectual History*, 1(2), 2016), and 'The Enthusiasm of David Ricardo' (*Modern Intellectual History*, forthcoming).

4. Provisional abstracts

1. France

While not necessarily properly understood, Malthus's works were extensively discussed in France during the 'long' nineteenth century, that is, until the First World War — the interest for this author continued during the following decades, but with no really new interpretations.

First of all, the number of edition of the French translation(s) of his *Essay on the Principle of Population* is astonishing: while the first edition of the *Essay* seems to have been unnoticed,

The reception of Malthus in Europe, America and Japan

8 editions of translations of the successive versions were published during the first half of the nineteenth century, from 1809 onward. Moreover large excerpts of the second edition of the *Essay* were published as early as 1805, and abridged editions came out during the second half of the nineteenth century. Malthus's *Principles of Political Economy* (first and second editions) and *Definitions in Political Economy* were not forgotten, but less extensively received and discussed. This certainly made France an exceptional case in the study of the reception of Malthus, and all the more if we realise that, at that time, the French editions in political economy were read and used in non-French speaking continental countries.

This chapter studies the reasons and typical circumstances of this success. First, the assessments of the *Principles* and the *Definitions* by French economists is examined. Jean-Baptiste Say played an important part in the reception of these works, especially (but not only) as regards the discussion of the possibility of general gluts and the validity of the so-called 'law of markets'. While Say's followers also wrote extensively on the subject, their assessments, as time went by, were certainly not uniform, and more complex than usually asserted. Moreover, liberal political economists were not alone in the field: other authors appreciated Malthus's ideas, especially among Christian political economists or some other currents of thought critical of the free trade ideas. These discussions, however, remained more or less confined in some specialised literature.

The *Essay*, by contrast, was widely discussed, because of the huge controversies, which took place, from the first decades of the century onward, about pauperism and the 'social question'. In this case discussions were not confined to limited circles, but involved all quarters in society: liberals, Catholics, Protestants, associationists, socialists, etc., all participated in lively debates about the 'principle of population', with even echoes in Parliament. The name of Malthus became that of a saint or a devil, according to the various conflicting opinions. This chapter studies the main arguments in the field — for a proper perspective, our period is divided into two specific moments: the first half of the century, when people strongly believed that the country was over-populated; and the second half, when suddenly, for statistical, historical and political reasons, it was believed that France was almost depopulating, and debates started to rage about neo-Malthusianism and even eugenics.

Finally, this chapter also shows how controversies about Malthus had an important echo in public opinion, through the use of Malthus's name and ideas in some works written by the most important novelists of the time, from Honoré de Balzac to Émile Zola. All this shows that the debates were not only a matter of discontents in economic theory, but involved also political philosophy, ethics and morals — and it is striking to see how the arguments used at that time progressively reappear in public debates since some decades.

2. Germany and Austria

The chapter will first briefly review the German translations of Malthus' writings. It will then turn to the reception of Malthus' *Essay on the Principle of Population* and of his theory of crises and overproduction in the first half of the 19th century. After a brief section on the Malthusian and Neo-Malthusian movement, represented by authors like Weinhold and Stille, the authors dealt with will include J.H. von Thünen, F.B.W. Herrmann, K.H. Rau, and Friedrich List. The paper will then turn to the discussion of the stance on Malthus' population theory and his views on social policy taken by German Liberals and the Free Trade movement, focusing on its major representative J. Prince-Smith. Of course, Malthus'

The reception of Malthus in Europe, America and Japan

theory of value and distribution, and in particular his theory of rent, will also be discussed with regard to the authors mentioned above, if appropriate.

In the second half of the 19th century Malthus's *Essay on the Principle of Population* was discussed rather extensively – and rather controversially – among socialists and Marxists in the German-speaking countries. The paper will briefly summarize the views of Wilhelm Weitling, Johann-Carl Rodbertus, Ferdinand Lassalle, Eugen Dühring, Karl Marx, and Friedrich Engels on Malthus's population theory. With regard to these authors, the focus is on their differing assessments of the relationship between Malthusianism and Darwinism and on the connection between the Malthusian population theory and the “iron law of wages”. Next, the positions of “Socialist Darwinists” like Friedrich Albert Lange and Ludwig Büchner are discussed. The paper then turns to the contributions of some of Marx and Engels's followers, most notably Karl Kautsky and Eduard Bernstein, and their debates with the so-called “Socialists of the chair”, which included Schäffle, Roscher, Schmoller, Knies, Wagner, and Brentano. The paper then reviews various contributions from the last two decades before the Great War, by authors such as Ladislaus von Bortkiewicz, Julius Wolf, Heinrich Dietzel, Franz Oppenheimer and others, in which the Malthusian population theory was discussed in connection with the newly emerging problem of declining birth rates. Finally, Rudolf Goldscheid's specific variant of “Left-wing Social Lamarckism” is examined and critically discussed against the background of the ideas of contemporary Social Darwinists. A further section will be devoted to the influence of Malthus on Knut Wicksell's writings on the population question (in German).

With regard to the reception of Malthus in the non-economic or fiction literature, attention will be drawn to the Swiss novelist Gottfried Keller and to the philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche.

3. Italy

Malthus the demographer helped shaping economic and social thought on the peninsula in the nineteenth century, whereas Malthus the economist was quickly dismissed in favour of Say. In the first half of the nineteenth century, the existence of Italian forerunners of Malthus's *Essay on the Principle of Population* (Beccaria, Ricci, and Ortes) was regularly pointed out, and a turning point in its reception was Angelo Messedaglia's *Della teoria della popolazione principalmente sotto l'aspetto del metodo* (1858). Malthus's works were translated into Italian only as late as the 1850s; the French translations were used by most. The chapter is organised as follows.

The debate on economic crises. Italians generally rejected the uncomfortable implications of Malthus's theories on the future of industrial accumulation and the disharmonies between the interests of the various classes they implied. Explanations of economic crises rested on Say's arguments. Italians denounced luxury expenditure and unproductive consumption on moral grounds; yet Melchiorre Gioja and Carlo Bosellini defended consumption from Say's critique.

First reactions to the principle of population. Gioja, Gian Domenico Romagnosi, and Carlo Cattaneo rejected the principle of population for neglecting social and geographical complexities. To Gioja (1815-17), agricultural production depended on the existence and variety of the manufactured goods that farmers could receive in exchange; hence population size rested on people's purchasing power and eventually on the performance of the

The reception of Malthus in Europe, America and Japan

economy as a whole. In 1830, Romagnosi penned a comprehensive denunciation of the principle as methodologically unsound; moreover, pauperism in England was due to protectionism, restrictions on labour mobility, huge estates, the aristocratic dominance of the political system, and not to any alleged natural law. He evidenced the fact that, to Italians then striving after liberty and national independence, the pessimistic vision of the principle of population was unpalatable. The views of Pellegrino Rossi and Antonio Scialoja are also considered, as well as the issues of poor relief and the Poor Laws.

Malthus turned optimist. In the 1850s the Italian economists-patriots embraced a “progressive” Malthusianism. This development was chiefly due to Francesco Ferrara. Shocked by the socialist uprising in Paris in 1848, Ferrara re-formulated the population pressure as a necessary stimulus to effort. The natural search for satisfaction of ever higher needs, in combination with the spur to action represented by the Malthusian law, was to lead to an unlimited *incivilimento*. This interpretation was shared by other writers then active in Piedmont: Antonio Scialoja, Gerolamo Boccardo, and even Camillo Cavour, soon to lead Italians to independence.

Catholic political economy and the principle of population. In view of the scriptural instruction “to go forth and multiply”, it is perhaps surprising that many Italian Catholic authors subscribed to Malthus’s principle in the first half of the century. Antonio Rosmini and Carlo Morichini were the most authoritative exponents of this current of Catholic Malthusianism. A decisive turn in Catholic culture occurred in the second half of the century, when the Jesuit review *Civiltà cattolica* (1850) strove to identify the substance of a Catholic political economy in tune with pope Pius IX’s growing antagonism to liberal modernity. *Civiltà Cattolica* built a normative, and highly abstract, model of a non-utilitarian political economy, in which no room whatsoever was made for Malthus’s law. Its principal exponents were Luigi Taparelli d’Azeglio and Matteo Liberatore. With the encyclical *Rerum novarum* (1891) consolidating “social” Catholicism, the rejection of Malthusianism was total.

From Messedaglia to Pareto, Loria, and Nitti. Messedaglia put forward a methodological critique: Malthus had reasoned a priori, devising a principle that was inflexible in spite of its weak empirical foundations. Even if one accepted Malthus’s two progressions, the actual increase in population would be limited at any point in time by the lesser increase in the means of subsistence – the two series were not independent, in fact, to the effect that population could always exceed subsistence by a small margin only. Once dynamically considered, the “system” was “stable”. At the turn of the twentieth century, Vilfredo Pareto had a substantial chapter on population in both his *Corso di economia politica* (1896-7) and *Manuale di economia politica* (1906). The former sanctioned that Malthus’s principle was not a focus of economic science any longer. Population size depended on an evaluation “of the cost of production (economic and moral) of man” relative to the expected return (economic and moral) on investment. Pareto also criticised Malthus on methodological grounds. What ultimately ruled out the principle, in Pareto’s view, was his famous “income curve”, showing that, in the long term, the lowest level of income had increased and the inequality of incomes had diminished in the many countries examined — namely, wealth had grown faster than population.

The chapter finally deals with the links between eugenics and Malthusianism.

The reception of Malthus in Europe, America and Japan

4. Japan

Malthus's name and works had already been introduced to Japan by the early 1870s — the beginning of the Meiji period. Malthus was probably first introduced through *Hyakka Zensho* (*Encyclopaedia*), published by the Ministry of Education — a translation of *Chambers's Information for the People*, edited by William and Robert Chambers. The translation began in 1873, only five years after the Meiji Restoration. It consists of 97 volumes in total: one of them, *Keizairon* (*Political Economy*), translated by Horikoshi Aikoku in 1874, refers to Malthus. In 1876, Motono Sukerokurō contributed “Jinkō Zōshoku no Kaika ni Gai aruno Setsu” (“A Theory that an Increase in Population Brings Harmful Effects”) to the *Hyōron Shimibun*, a periodical journal — however, the paper was based on a text later included in another volume of *Hyakka Zensho: Jinkō Kyūbin oyobi Hoken* (*Population – Poor Laws – Life-Assurance*), which also refers to Malthus and was translated by Nagata Kensuke in 1877.

The first translation of Malthus's *Essay on the principle of population*, undertaken by Mikami Masatake, was based on the text published in *Parallel Chapters from the First and Second Editions of an Essay on the Principle of Population 1798-1803*, edited by William James Ashley in 1895. It was not published until 1910, and even then only in an abridged form. It has been said that Ōshima Sadamasu's 1877 *Jinkōron Yōryaku* (*Outline of Population Theory*) was based on Malthus's *Principle of population*, but this was in fact a translation of George R. Drysdale's *The Elements of Social Science, or, Physical, Sexual, and Natural Religion*. The first complete translation of Malthus's *Principle of Population*, by Taniguchi Kichihiko, was published in 1923, and was then followed by numerous other translations. Malthus's writings other than the *Essay*, however, only began to be translated after 1929.

What circumstances surrounded the acceptance and dissemination of Malthus's writings in Japan, and how did Japanese intellectuals, including novelists, receive and interpret his works from the 1870's to the 1920's? The following points will be addressed.

First, the translation of Western economic writings played a significant role in advancing and expanding the field of Malthus studies in Japan, particularly from the Meiji Restoration to the early twentieth century. It is important to note that Malthus's theory of population was introduced to Japan together with arguments for and against it that were made during the same period in the context of the controversies surrounding overpopulation and birth control in the West. Second, commemorations of Malthus's birth and death are considered epochal in the history of Malthus studies and economic thought in Japan; a ceremony to commemorate the 150th anniversary of his birth took place at Kyoto Imperial University in 1916, and commemorative events were held to mark the 100th anniversary of his death in 1934.

Third, up until the 1920s, almost all Japanese scholars who studied Malthus focused their attention on his theory of population, except for two prominent economists, Fukuda Tokuzō and Kawakami Hajime. These scholars were particularly interested in confronting the practical challenges of their day and age, such as poverty, unemployment, social reform, the right to live, and so on. It should also be emphasised that some intellectuals and novelists even attempted to use Malthus's population theory to support their political ideas regarding immigration, colonisation, nationalism, and the Emperor system. Fourth, the question of why so much attention was paid to Malthus's population theory in Japan, while his theory of political economy went relatively unnoticed, must be carefully addressed — a question, which is linked to the fact that translations of J. S. Mill, A. Smith, J.-B. Say, A. Marshall, W.

The reception of Malthus in Europe, America and Japan

S. Jevons, F. List, and K. Marx were published much earlier than those of Malthus and David Ricardo. There is thus the need for a careful re-examination of the historical process of the reception of Western economic thought in Japan, the scope of which goes beyond issues of “economics” to include Japanese modernity itself.

5. Portugal and Brazil

The purpose of this chapter is to map and to interpret the diverse readings and appropriations of the work of Thomas Robert Malthus in Portugal and in Brazil throughout the nineteenth century.

Special attention is given to the way the most significant of his works have been read, discussed and used by Portuguese and Brazilian authors, contemporary of Malthus or who lived in Malthus’s lifetime period. Three cases will be discussed, namely: the comments and appreciations of José da Silva Lisboa (1819) to the *Essay on the Principle of Population* (1798), reflecting on the significance of Malthusian theses on the relationship between population growth and available means of subsistence; the French translation and the critical analysis that Francisco Solano Constâncio (1820) made to the *Principles of Political Economy* (1820), in the context of the discussion on the validity of J.-B. Say’s law of markets and on the occurrence of crises of overproduction; and José Ferreira Borges’s (1834) use of the *Definitions in Political Economy* (1827), in his search for a systematization for the university teaching of political economy.

Privileged attention given to these authors does not exclude other approaches to the dissemination of Malthus among Portuguese speaking authors, with a significant impact on the nineteenth century political debate in Portugal and Brazil on demographic issues and their implications in the economic and social spheres.

6. Russia

The cultural context of early-nineteenth-century Russia was marked by the outmost popularity of the British political economy. The reception of British ideas, despite well-known francophone inclination among the Russian nobility, was not occasional. Since the 16th century Britain was one of the main, at some periods the principal, trading partners of Russia. With the French revolution and subsequent wars with France, the alliance between the two countries strengthened. On the British side, wars with France changed the traditional routes of the ‘grand tour’ to which well-off Britons had been accustomed: instead of France, Switzerland, Italy they started to explore Scandinavia, Finland and Russia. It was precisely the itinerary taken by Thomas Malthus in 1799–1800, who also intended to collect data for the second edition of his *Essay on the Principle of Population*.

Malthus spent some time in Russia and visited St. Petersburg, but little is known on the details of that stay. In 1826 he was elected a foreign fellow of the Imperial Academy of Sciences, and, in 1830, he got an honorary professorship at the Imperial St. Petersburg. However, little if any is known on Malthus’s connections to Russia either. The first task of the chapter is to shed some light into these episodes using Russian archives and available published sources of that period.

The reception of Malthus in Europe, America and Japan

Another task is to provide a systematic treatment of the reception of Malthus's ideas in nineteenth-century Russia. Until now the literature only focused on some normative responses (mainly rejections) of the Malthusian vision of demographic trends, which inspired both conservative and radical reactions to the dangers ascribed to the establishment of a large-scale industrial production. In 1844, for example, Vladimir Odoyevsky published a collection of philosophical essays and novellas, *Russian Nights*. One of them was a dystopian piece, *The Last Suicide*, an explicit rejection of Malthus. The tradition established by Odoyevsky had a lasting effect on subsequent Russian literature. Malthus was repudiated by Leo Tolstoy and one of the protagonists of Dostoevsky's *Idiot* called Malthus "a cannibal of the mankind". At the turn of the twentieth century the subject of "population checks" still attracted attention in the popular culture, as represented in one of Chekhov's humorous short stories.

The initial moral indignation toward Malthus's population theory, characteristic of the conservative reaction to economic liberalism, was shared by representatives of the radical reaction to the same. In 1847, Alexander Butovsky, a representative of the liberal circle of Petersburg imperial bureaucracy, published his three-volume course on political economy — the first such course published in Russian — and he referred to Malthus's population theory as the foundation of the distribution of income. The course inspired a harsh reaction of a young member of the faculty of St. Petersburg University, Vladimir Milyutin. He published a series of articles where he first criticized Butovsky's course and then turned attention to Malthus. Milyutin's contribution remained a most profound study of Malthus's population theory in Russian, and it inspired subsequent radical authors, including Nikolay Chernyshevsky.

Malthus's demographic ideas were not the only facet of his legacy that attracted attention in Russia. The radical reaction to economic liberalism of the 1830s and 1840s, which affected the formation of Russian socialism and anarchism, was not the only current of thought attentive to Malthus, and Butovsky was not the first liberal-minded thinker in Russia to appreciate the significance of Malthus the economist. Already in a 1818 review of the *Essay*, it was noticed that, "many critics give to his book the same rank as to the famous writing of Adam Smith." But for a long time, Malthus's contributions — as well as that of British political economy in general — were seen as abstract theories, irrelevant to Russia's problems. Only since the 1860s, when the abolition of serfdom and other reforms paved the way for Russian capitalism, the legacy of Malthus was actualised and enlarged beyond the principle of population, including his theory of rent, and were judged topical. But that trend in the reception of Malthus has remained almost lost to subsequent historiography dominated by the Marxist approach.

7. Spain and Spanish Latin America

The first decades of the 19th century witnessed a decline in the influence of Smith in Spain, it being overcome by the more convincing style of application of economic doctrines to particular national environments exhibited in J.-B. Say's works. Nevertheless British classical political economy still had a noteworthy diffusion, albeit less widely, perhaps with the sole exception of Bentham's widespread philosophical and political works. It is within this context that Robert Malthus entered Spain — and first and foremost his theory of population. The first chapters (or summaries of them) of the *Essay on the Principle of Population* were translated as early as 1808, and Malthus's ideas circulated the following years in

The reception of Malthus in Europe, America and Japan

newspapers. It is also known that French versions of the *Essay* circulated among educated people, and references on Malthus's ideas on population, such as comments or summaries contained in works by Sismondi, Destutt de Tracy, Droz or Blanqui might also have served as instruments for their early diffusion. Besides, the Say-Malthus controversy was well known among the literate elite thanks to the spread of the translation of Say's letters to Malthus. It is also possible that part of Malthusian ideas were transmitted through Say's works, whose *Traité* had several editions in Spanish, starting as early as 1804. But, while Malthus's theory of population became widely known in Spain, it did not alter the long-term populationist tradition of Spanish economic and political writers, who believed that the problem in Spain was that of depopulation.

It seems that in the central decades of the 19th century, the interest for Malthusian ideas increased, especially because of the attention paid to the theory of population in later editions of the *Curso de economía política* by Flórez Estrada (1835), probably the most celebrated Spanish economic work of the century. Other authors also mentioned some aspects of this theory, such as Mora (1843), Borrego (1844) or Colmeiro (1845), although they were on the whole quite critical. The first Spanish translation of the *Essay* — in its second edition, and from the French translation of 1845, with an introduction by Rossi — was published by Eusebio M. del Valle in 1846. Not differently from his colleagues, Valle was very critical towards Malthus's ideas, for the “dangerous consequences” which could be deducted therefrom. However, it was only Flórez, who, in the 7th edition of his *Curso*, endeavoured to make a careful analysis of Malthusian principles. Apart from the mentioned economic books and the press, Malthus's theory of population benefited from other channels to get introduced into Spain, like the debating societies such as the Athenaeum of Madrid or the Royal Academy of Moral and Political Sciences. In this regard, it can be said that the introduction of Malthus in Spain — at least his population theory — was encompassing, as it pervaded all the usual channels for the spread of economic ideas.

While this chapter revisits the influence of the theory of population, it also explores the reception in Spain of some of Malthus's other ideas. The developments contained in his *Principles of political economy* were however confined to a handful of intellectuals, who acceded them through translations in other languages — the first Spanish translation of the *Principles of political economy* was published in Mexico in 1946. Flórez Estrada (1835), for example, made slight references to the Malthusian theory of capital. Finally, this chapter ends with an introduction to the spread of Malthus in Latin American Spanish speaking countries.

8. United Kingdom

Malthus should be identified with the rational wing of Protestantism, and with the dispersed project to develop a “science of politics”, which ran from at least David Hume to John Stuart Mill. In Malthus's work, the two currents of thought combined to produce a powerful theodicy that identified the horizon at which rational reform ought to aim. The reception of Malthus's work, however, revealed tensions between the two traditions, and hostility to the very idea of a theoretical science of politics. Hostility to the science of politics was typically expressed with the combat terms “practice”, “experience”, and “enthusiasm”, which were highly energised following Edmund Burke's account of the French Revolution as an outbreak of theoretical enthusiasm that destroyed institutions built on centuries of practice and experience. Malthus was partially insulated from these attacks because he, too, was defending the established order against utopian projectors, but his *Essay on Population*

The reception of Malthus in Europe, America and Japan

was nevertheless attacked as theoretical sophistry, by Robert Southey in particular. The results of national censuses that clearly showed sustained population growth were also occasions for questions regarding Malthus's empirical credentials.

On the other hand, Malthus was received sympathetically by those who were also committed to theoretical styles of inquiry, such as Dugald Stewart, James Mill, and David Ricardo, albeit not without reservation. Here Malthus's arguments regarding wage-population dynamics were abstracted from their moorings in natural theology and recombined with rival moral anthropologies, although the work of Thomas Chalmers acted to keep Malthus's writings connected with their original context.

The paper concludes by looking forward to the dissolution of the project for a "science of politics" that included political economy as one of its sub-branches, with telling implications for the way that Malthus was read in the second half of the century.

9. United States of America

Economic thought in the United States in the nineteenth century was deeply influenced by British classical political economy and by Malthus's *Essay on the Principle of Population* in particular. This is not surprising, for, as Malthus recognized, America served as a vast testing ground for Enlightenment social theories. But Malthus's influence was expressed in a number of different ways. The anti-utopian pessimism deriving from Malthus's emphasis on the burden of an overgrowing population pressed against the margin of subsistence could easily be rejected, failing to resonate in a country with labour shortages and correspondingly high wages. More subtle thinkers, however, appreciated that this did not necessitate a wholesale rejection of Malthus's theory.

The theory pointed to the future, to a possible future for the U.S., one that might or might not be avoidable. The problem for writers concerned with the future was to discover which, if any, of the valid underlying principles of Malthus's theory could be abstracted from the European context in which they were developed and directed them toward a vastly different set of historical circumstances in which the point of diminishing returns had not been reached. This led to a variety of different outcomes as writers disagreed over which principles were valid as well as over how they might be relevant in the rapidly changing North American environment. Most importantly, perhaps, the Malthusian theory played a significant role in the key debates during the period leading up to the Civil War. Most notably, Malthusian arguments were used on both sides of the slavery debate in a variety of subtle and changing ways.

