Introduction

THE DOCUMENTS

THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPHS explain the origins of this, no doubt idiosyncratic, collection. The general section tries to give the overall flavour of all the ports, and is followed by material on individual places. There is an abundance of such matter for Kobe, Nagasaki and Yokohama but beyond that, what is available is very limited. Shimoda, briefly an open port between 1853 and 1859, had no foreign population, apart from the American consul, Townsend Harris, and is not represented here. There is some material on Hakodate and a tiny amount relating to Niigata. A few items deal with the afterlife of the treaty ports, which is also included in the plate selection. Taken altogether, the collection should be a useful adjunct to monographs and other works on Japan's modern history and specifically on its foreign relations.

The documents that make up this collection are an attempt to flesh out the outline given above. They represent but a small fraction of the available material, which could probably fill several more volumes. (To the publisher's horror, the first selection was exactly double what is included here, and was in itself but a fraction of the material I had collected over the years.) When I first started putting together the original collection, it was as an aid to writing my PhD 1971 thesis, described more fully in the 'Retrospective' section that follows this Introduction. In those days before the internet, collecting such material was largely a question of physically transcribing it, which I did with a number of the shorter pieces, or paying for very expensive photocopying. The latter has now become very cheap, with most home printers able to provide reasonable copies, while the availability of material on the internet has also made collecting easier.

I suspect that the first item that I consciously kept for future reference was the pamphlet by the supposed 'Bishop of Homoco' on *Exercises in the Yokohama Dialect*, published in Yokohama in 1879 (no. 57), but how or where I acquired it, I have long since forgotten. While some scholars have taken this seriously (see Professor F. J. Daniels' paper on 'The Vocabulary of the Japanese Ports Lingo,' no. 48), I have always been convinced that it was a spoof, given that there was no such bishop, while 'Homoco' apparently refers to the district of Honmoku, now a respectable part of Yokohama but with an ill–reputation in the treaty-port days. Later additions included examples of treaty-port poetry: see *Residential Rhymes* (no. 17) and *Yokohama Ballads* (no. 59). The poems are perhaps a somewhat acquired taste and

often need knowledge of long–forgotten incidents to be understood. But they help to lighten the tone a little and to bring out the more playful side of treaty-port life, ponderous though they may sometimes seem.

Beyond these relatively light–hearted inclusions, are serious materials such as treaties and land and other regulations (see nos 1–5). Some of these are to be found scattered among various historical studies of Japan, others, such as the 1869 Austro–Hungarian Treaty, and regulations, matters governing municipal affairs and such like matters, are very difficult to find outside the archives. Yet they mattered at the time. The Austro–Hungarian Treaty (no. 4), for example, was the last treaty with a Western power and there is more to it than at first meets the eye. Although nominally Austro–Hungarian, it was in fact largely negotiated by the British Minister, Sir Harry Parkes. Parkes used it as a means, he hoped, of tidying up loose ends in matters such as extraterritoriality, the legal system under which foreigners lived in Japan in this period, in earlier treaties. Then, through the use of the 'most–favoured nation' principle, it would apply to all countries that had signed treaties. This material is complemented by several papers dealing with extraterritoriality (nos 6, 8, 14, 16, 19, 25, 26).

Contemporary sources have provided many extracts, often quite short. They include extracts from Bishop Smith, the Anglican (Episcopalian) Bishop of Hong Kong, whose *Ten Weeks in Japan* (nos 36, 43, 46) was mocked at the time for being the worst sort of 'globetrotter's' writing, but which often contains useful comments about the new ports and the people in them. The great compendium on the *Treaty Ports of China and Japan* (nos 33, 41, 50), compiled by two British consular officers and a lieutenant in the Royal Marines, published in 1867, devotes most of its attention to China but the shorter section on Japan contains much of interest. The same can be said of Basil Hall Chamberlain's *Things Japanese* (nos 18, 19), which has gone through many editions since its original publication in 1890. Chamberlain was a man of strong, and some contrary, views who did not hesitate to express them as those who read the extracts here will find. Another contemporary piece that still retains interest is the essay by Matsuyama Makoto (no. 8), published in 1876 in *The North American Review.* Like his fellow Japanese Babu Tatsui, he was not impressed by the foreigners of the treaty ports or the policies of their countries.

The bulk of the material is drawn from the scholarship of more recent years. It attempts to cover all aspects of the ports, both at work and play. It also includes some forgotten aspects of treaty-port life, such as the missionaries, including the non–Anglo–Saxon missionaries such as Roman Catholic nuns – see no. 11. An example of the role of churches in the foreign communities is covered by *The Story of Yokohama Union Church* (no. 55).

Harold S. Williams, an Australian devotee of the treaty ports was a charming man, who wrote many anecdotal accounts of treaty-port life. These are generally available (see *Bibliography*). His style and his interests is shown by one paper from the *Transactions* of the Asiatic Society of Japan, no. 23. Williams was also an assiduous collector of treaty-port related materials. His collection, now housed in the National Library of Australia,[1] has provided the basis for a number interesting studies by Darren Swanson, represented here by his essay on the role of the club in

the ports (no. 12). Several contributions are drawn from the papers of the Asiatic Society of Japan, since 1872 one of Japan's main intellectual organizations that brings together Japanese and foreign scholars. While few of its early papers were concerned with the treaty ports, there has been a marked change since the Pacific War, with numerous papers relating to the subject. Two are included: Paul Blum's *Yokohama in 1872*, published as a separate pamphlet to mark the Society's centenary (no. 56), and Douglas Moore Kendrick's *The First Six Months of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, in 1975 (no. 51).

The largest group of foreigners in the treaty ports were the Chinese, whose presence was often neglected in early accounts. In recent years, however, the community has received more attention from scholars and this is reflected in several of the papers (but see especially no.27). The British were the next largest group, and therefore figure prominently in this collection, as do Americans, the third largest group. But smaller communities are not neglected. Readers will find papers on Australians (then, of course, seen as British) (no.23), Italians (no.44) and a Swede (no 40).

Some papers throw light on the less serious side of treaty-port life. They include Neil Pedlar on the famous (or notorious?) Gankiro Teahouse in Yokohama (no.53), Harold Williams on the introduction of baseball (no. 29), which proved to be a far more successful implant than cricket, and Aaron Cohen on theatrical and musical entertainment (no. 28). Horse racing, promoted by the British as early as 1860 and destined to become one of the most popular forms of entertainment at Yokohama (and post-war a multi-billion Yen enterprise), has been well researched by Roger Buckley (no.30).

Finally, there is what I have called below the 'afterlife' of the Japanese treaty ports, a theme that I examine in more detail in a forthcoming paper.[2] By this I mean the way in which the Japanese people appear to have happily taken the treaty-port period into their historical narrative. There is none of the ambivalence that prevails in China over the role of the ports and their communities.[3]

THE BACKGROUND

I. The origins and establishment of the Japanese treaty-port system

The origins of Japan's treaty ports and open cities owed very little to Japan. While in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, foreigners, including Westerners, had traded extensively with Japan, the bulk of such contacts had been in the far southwest of the country. When Japan's rulers turned against the outsiders in the years after 1603, trading contracts were increasingly concentrated at Nagasaki, a long way from the centre of government in Edo (now Tokyo). Here, the two outside groups allowed to trade, the Dutch and the Chinese, were corralled and prevented from penetrating further into the country. As the pressure from Western countries to open links with Japan built up in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, the ruling Bakufu tried to push all contacts to Nagasaki, but were increasingly unsuc-

cessful. The foreign ships again and again appeared near the capital or arrived in other sensitive areas.

By the time that the 'opening of Japan' took place in the 1850s, a blueprint had emerged in China for how to treat Westerners. China, too, had tried to keep foreigners well away from the capital, confining them to the port of Guangzhou (Canton) far to the south. This failed to satisfy the foreigners, and eventually led to war with Britain, in 1839. From that conflict emerged a new way of handling foreigners, the treaty-port system. This bore some resemblance to the Guangzhou arrangements and also drew on Western practices in India and South-East Asia. Foreigners would be allowed to settle at other ports apart from Guangzhou – although not in the capital – and would be protected from Chinese law and control by 'extraterritoriality', a concept derived from the protection accorded to diplomatic envoys. Under the Treaty of Nanjing (Nanking) signed in 1842, several coastal cities were open to foreign residence and a system of consular courts began to operate. By the time of the Japanese treaties, just ten years after the Nanjing treaty, the system was bedded down, helped by the weakness of the Chinese empire in the face of both the Western onslaught and internal rebellions.[4]

The first Japanese treaties, made by naval officers, were not generally concerned with trade but with the needs of military vessels and other shipping for refuge and supplies at time of need. Two ports were opened, Hakodate in the far north of Japan, and Shimoda, some 190 kilometres south-west of Edo. These treaties were soon replaced by those negotiated in 1858, which were to form the real basis of the treaty-port system in Japan. The approach of both the American consul, Townsend Harris, who negotiated the US Treaty of 1858 and the British envoy, Lord Elgin, responsible for the British treaty later the same year, drew on the China experience.

The new treaties formally opened Nagasaki, Hakodate and Kanagawa to foreign trade from July 1859, though a semi-clandestine trade began earlier. The ports of Hyogo and Niigata, and the cities of Osaka and Edo, were to be opened by 1863. In the event, this was postponed to 1869 at Japan's request. Nagasaki and Hakodate opened with no difficulty but Kanagawa proved more of a problem. Kanagawa was on the Tokaido, the main east-west highway and the busiest road in the country, along which passed many daimyo and samurai. Fearing that this would lead to confrontations if foreigners were also using it, the Japanese built a whole new town at the village of Yokohama. Diplomats protested that the treaty named Kanagawa as the foreign settlement but foreign merchants ignored the protests and were happy to take up what the Japanese offered.

In the expectation that Nagasaki would continue to be a major centre for foreign trade, many merchants and others settled there in the beginning, yet it was soon seen as a backwater. A small Western community was there, as well as a large Chinese one, but many of the early arrivals moved to Yokohama. Hakodate, too, remained small, the haunt of North Pacific whalers and some distinctly eccentric characters. Both ports had small Russian communities, adding to the sense of difference.

As a mercantile centre, Yokohama thrived. Within a few years, it had newspapers, a theatre, clubs, a racecourse and other features of a modern city. Through firms using employees brought from the China coast and a growing number of Japanese, it quickly became the centre for foreign trade. Large numbers of seamen

and foreign troops added to its population. What it did not have was a working system of municipal government. To attract settlers, the Japanese government had made no charge for the lots created at Yokohama, and had only charged ground rent. Most early inhabitants of the foreign settlements did not see themselves as long-term sojourners and had little interest in anything but the short term. That would change over time but by then it was too late. Despite several valiant attempts, municipal affairs at Yokohama passed into the hands of the Japanese authorities and remained there.

There were other tensions. Most foreigners made little effort to learn Japanese or the ways of the Japanese. A curious pidgin developed that, like its counterpart in China, persisted well into the twentieth century. Mutual suspicions over trading methods caused much friction and demands for consular action, while at the same time, merchants and other residents were often resentful of what they saw as the privileged position of consular and diplomatic officers. In turn, some of the latter became exasperated at what they saw as the unreasoning intransigence of their fellow countrymen over issues such as how to treat Japanese officials and, later, the vexed issue of treaty revision.

But until the middle of the 1860s, the greatest cause of tension was fear of the Japanese and especially of the samurai, the 'two-sworded men'. Yokohama, still near enough to the Tokaido to bring foreigners and Japanese into close contact, suffered most. As horrific as the attacks themselves were, the frightful wounds inflicted were recorded in ghoulish detail in the photographs that quickly circulated among the foreign community and further afield. Together with pictures of executed attackers, these added to the sense of danger.[5] Gradually, the danger died away especially after the Meiji Restoration and the abolition of the samurai class. The memory lingered on, however, and revived in the 1890s when anti-foreignism appeared again. But it never reached anything like the peak years before the Restoration.

II. The Treaty Ports 1868–1899

Hyogo, Niigata, Edo (soon to be renamed Tokyo) and Osaka were opened to foreign residence in 1868, just as Japan plunged into the turmoil of the Restoration. Of these, only Hyogo – or rather the nearby village of Kobe, which soon became the treaty port – prospered. The development of the Tokyo foreign settlement at Tsukiji was undermined by the willingness of the Japanese government to allow its foreign employees to live anywhere in the city. Tsukiji became a backwater, home mainly to a small number of missionaries. Osaka should have been an important settlement, given the city's role as Japan's main commercial centre. But few foreigners wanted to live there, preferring Kobe with its easy access to the sea. As in Tokyo, the foreign settlement did not disappear but it was mainly home to missionaries. Niigata, which the British minister, Sir Harry Parkes was keen to see opened, proved a total failure. A sandbar across the harbour entrance prevented ships coming close inshore. During the early 1870s, a few foreigners gravitated to the city and there were even consular officers appointed to serve it. But early enthusiasm faded in the face of the difficulties and it had effectively ceased to function by 1880.

Hyogo–Kobe was, by contrast, a success story. Here Parkes' interest proved more fruitful. Having seen the problems at Yokohama, he set out to make sure that they would not be repeated. So the new port had proper land regulations and a municipal fund to pay for community needs such as clean water and street lighting. The tensions between consular officers and the local foreign community that had marked Yokohama's early days were absent. There might be occasional run–ins between local Japanese officials and foreigners, especially over trade issues, but Kobe seems on the whole to have been less prone to them than Yokohama. In the 1880s, it became the first foreign settlement to honour the Emperor Meiji during a visit to the city.

By then, the foreign communities had become more settled. The air of 'ruffianism' that some had detected in the early days dissipated as foreign residents stayed longer and began to regard the ports as home. Only Hakodate retained something of a frontier air, with whalers and seal hunters regularly using it as a base. It also witnessed heavy fighting during the civil war that followed the Meiji Restoration, although foreigners were little affected. Generally, the state of fear that had been evident among the small foreign communities in the earlier days largely evaporated. The disarming of the samurai soon after the Restoration helped, as did limited concessions for recreational travel outside the treaty limits. Direct trade outside those limits continued to be barred despite foreign efforts. No doubt some of the scientific or recreational trips allowed by the Japanese were in fact covers for trade. The Japanese largely ignored such infringements but they would make no general concession on the issue of access to the interior. This was an important bargaining chip in the treaty revision negotiations that would eventually lead to the end of the foreign settlements altogether.

The treaties had contained provisions for revision. To most foreigners in Japan, this meant that improvements could be negotiated over issues such as travel in the interior or tariffs. As we have seen, a few minor adjustments did take place, including, the postponement of the opening of certain ports and cities. But as the Japanese realized the restrictions imposed upon them, they began to think in terms of a major revision of the treaties in order to regain full sovereignty rather than tinkering at the margins. The difficulties of doing this were brought home to senior Japanese at the time of the Iwakura Mission to the United States and Europe in 1872–1873. Japanese hopes of an early resumption of full control over their foreign relations foundered in the face of Western opposition.[6] The Japanese learnt the lesson that the process would be a long one and that there would need to be changes in law and attitudes before they could expect to succeed.

So began a programme of legal reform designed to bring Japanese law up to a standard that foreign powers would find acceptable. Foreign legal advisers provided assistance and new laws began to appear. Foreigners remained sceptical and noted that old practices such as the use of torture did not disappear. But the Japanese pressed on. For some time, hopes were pinned on the United States, generally regarded as the most friendly country to Japan. A revised treaty was concluded in 1878 but it only covered commercial matters, not the end of extraterritoriality that had been hoped for. In any case, its implementation

was dependent on other countries reaching similar agreements. This failed to happen and it remained a dead letter. At the same time, the 1870s saw the Japanese sending out mixed signals. They concluded a treaty with China in 1871, which provided for mutual extraterritoriality. When they negotiated a treaty with Korea in 1876, it followed the lines of Western treaties. The irony of this was not lost on the foreign language press in Japan, which loudly accused the Japanese of hypocrisy in perpetuating a system in another Asian country that they wanted to end for themselves.

Such criticism did nothing to shift the Japanese from their chosen course of ending extraterritoriality, which took on a new intensity after Inoue Kaoru became foreign minister in 1880. Inoue's suggestions for minor modifications to allow the Japanese jurisdiction in lesser cases met a stony reception. The ideas were revived for the first major conference on treaty revision, held in 1882, but the Japanese were by then pushing for further concessions. Over the next twelve years, a variety of proposals were put forward. There would be mixed courts, or there might be foreign judges. But by the late 1880s, the Japanese government had not only to contend with the conflicting demands of the foreign powers but also had to take account of a developing Japanese public opinion that was unhappy at the compromises that such proposals entailed. There were vociferous protests from the treaty ports, whose inhabitants seemed to prefer to continue in their restricted enclaves rather than to seize the opportunities offered by access to the interior. The Japanese persisted, using a system of divide and rule among the powers to end the old treaties. Instead of conferences involving all foreign powers, they engaged in bilateral negotiations with the most important one, Great Britain, which ultimately agreed to give up extraterritoriality and other privileges in 1894. Other countries followed the British lead and the old treaties came to an end in 1899, although it was not until 1910 that Japan regained full tariff autonomy. There had been much trepidation at the prospect, with rumours of special jails being prepared for foreigners but they all proved unfounded. Foreigners found the new system worked without discrimination.

III. The afterlife of the treaty ports

In an illuminating essay on a fictitious Chinese treaty port, Robert Bickers and Isabella Jackson have described how the Chinese treaty ports and settlements developed and declined, in the process fading from foreign memory but recently coming to the fore in Chinese minds as part of their country's own history, rather than just a manifestation of imperialism.[7] Japan was not like that. In the beginning, alongside the hostility that led to numerous foreign deaths, there was also a fascination with these new aliens, just as there had long been with the Chinese and the Dutch at Nagasaki. The traditional woodblock prints that showed scenes in Nagasaki were quickly adapted to show Yokohama. They depicted all aspects of foreign life, from the ships in the harbour, to the new buildings and the daily activities of foreigners. Carriages rolled forth along the streets of the foreign settlement, while foreign troops with bands and flags paraded on a Sunday. From the mid-1870s or thereabouts, scenes of foreign activity tended to give way to more Japanese developments but the fascination with the foreign communities was clear. The fascination did not disappear with the passage of time but showed in new ways as photographs, and later picture postcards, replaced the prints of the early

years. While it was foreigners who first developed this trade, the Japanese took to it with alacrity, and Japanese photographers and their products soon rivalled Western practitioners not only in Japan but in China and Korea as well. And as well as scenes of Japanese life and scenery, the treaty ports remained a popular theme.[8]

The settlements caught the Japanese imagination in other ways as well. The first substantial history of any of the ports was a two-volume account of Kobe published in Japanese in 1897 to mark the thirtieth anniversary of the port opening.[9] Yokohama seems to have ignored its fortieth anniversary in 1899 – perhaps the onset of the new treaties was too traumatic – but a commemorative volume appeared in 1908 for the fiftieth anniversary, published in English by the city authorities.[10] Such works continued to appear until the 1930s; Yokohama city published a collection of original documents in 1931, for example. The destruction of much of the original settlement of Yokohama in the 1923 earthquake did not stop the nostalgic portrayal of the area as part of Japan's history, but as Japan moved to a war-footing, and into conflict with the West, it was no doubt deemed not wise to refer back to the earlier period.

Post-war, it was different. With destruction all about, the Japanese seem to have seized upon what had survived with enthusiasm. New histories appeared. To mark its centenary, Yokohama city began a multi-volume history in 1958. Parts of Nagasaki that escaped the atomic bomb included several buildings from treaty-port days which were gathered together in Glover Park, named after the British businessman sometimes wrongly identified as connected with the 'Madam Butterfly' story. Changing circumstances led post-war Britain to abandon most of its consular buildings in Japan. Some of these were taken over as local history centres. At Yokohama, the former British consulate general, which dated from the late 1920s, became the site of the Yokohama Archives of History. This was founded in 1981 to mark the city as 'the frontier between Japan and the world'. It has extensive archives relating to treaty-port days and mounts regular exhibitions. Hakodate, too, has turned the former British consulate into a commemorative site, as has Shimonoseki. This last city was not a treaty port but opened following the end of the old treaties, yet has capitalized on the nostalgia for the period. Tokyo also makes much of the few buildings that have survived from the early days.

As well as marking the Western presence, the Chinese role has also become part of the treaty-port heritage, and today there are Chinatowns in Nagasaki, Kobe, Tokyo and Yokohama. Much is made of the long Chinese presence at Nagasaki, dating back to the around 1600 but all the Chinatowns are modern constructions, albeit on old sites since not much survived the earthquakes and wars of the last 100 years. Yet the continuity is stressed and they are popular destinations for local and international visitors, particularly because of the great variety of restaurants and the colourful parades that regularly take place.[11]

IV. Treaty Ports: Key to modern Japan?

There has long been a debate over the role that the treaty ports and settlements played in China and Japan; while there were similar places elsewhere, none matched those in these two countries. It is possible to argue that in the Chinese case, where some of the ports existed for a hundred years, especially since they became centres of foreign

manufacturing after 1895, they were instrumental in creating the basis on which modern China developed. They were the source of knowledge of the trappings of modernity such as newspapers, street lighting, department stores and services such as police and fire brigades. Yet even the largest of them, Shanghai, numbered its foreign population (Westerners and Japanese) only in the tens of thousands compared with the millions of Chinese.[12]

The Japanese settlements were far smaller. The total number of foreign residents in Japan in 1894, as the new treaties were being negotiated, was a mere 9,800, of whom some 5000 were Chinese. The Chinese numbers dropped heavily as a result of the 1894–95 Sino–Japanese War. By 1896, the foreigners numbered 4,700, with the British the largest single group. Chinese figures began to pick up by 1899. It is a moot point whether these small numbers really had a great deal of influence over how Japan developed, especially given the Japanese government's determination not to allow parts of government machinery to slip out of its control as had happened in China with the Customs' Service. The squabbling merchants of Yokohama intrigued Japanese but it is hard to see them as a major role model. Nostalgia and the needs of the tourist industry have perhaps given them a larger profile than they really deserve.

However, one group of foreigners that did make an impact on Japan was the foreign employees – the *yatoi*. They included teachers at all levels, medical staff, administrators, lawyers, naval and military experts, engineers, architects and many others. Their numbers ran into hundreds, employed by the government and by private organizations. They included representatives from many nationalities, including Chinese, who were important in the tea trade. Their influence lingers on in buildings, such as the lighthouses erected under the supervision of the British engineer Henry Brunton, and the traditions of the Japanese Navy (Maritime Self–Defence Force), which reflects British training.

Some of these employees lived in the foreign settlements, especially in the years before the Meiji Restoration. But as the country settled down after the turmoil of 1868–69, the foreign employees fanned out across the country, often living in very remote parts. Many missionaries, usually working as teachers, welcomed the ability to get away from the foreign communities, since it gave them access to a wider Japanese audience. A few employees always remained within the settlements, including people with families or who found the company of other foreigners more congenial than living in an all-Japanese environment. One such was J. F. Lowder, former British consular officer who became legal adviser to the Japanese Customs' Service and later a strong opponent of treaty revision. Others, especially those living in Tokyo, where the Japanese authorities made no attempt to confine foreigners to the settlement at Tsukiji, could enjoy the benefits of both the capital and of the Yokohama settlement, after 1872 only a short rail journey away. This clearly suited a man such as Basil Hall Chamberlain, professor at the Imperial University, who seems to have retained a strong affection for Yokohama, although he did not live there. Quotations from Chamberlain, and others of the *yatoi*, are quoted in the documents in this selection

but as a group, their story belongs to the wider history of Japan, not the narrow world of the foreign settlements.

RETROSPECTIVE

IT IS OVER fifty years since I started the study of Japan's treaty ports and foreign settlements, longer than the treaty ports existed. My research took place under the auspices of Professor W. G. Beasley, then Professor of the History of the Far East at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

I came by a curious route to the study of Japan, about which I scarcely knew anything in 1964. A vague knowledge of the Pacific War had been supplemented by a single lecture on Japan as part of a course on world history since c.1600 to 1919, where history stopped in those days. But Professor S. T. Bindoff of Queen Mary College, where I did my first degree, persuaded two of us that there was a wider world out there, worth studying. So I abandoned American history and moved to what I was assured was the expanding world of Japanese studies in the wake of the 1961 Hayter report on Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African Studies.[13] In those far-off days, there seemed no difficulties about finance, and Bindoff and Beasley undertook to find alternative funds should I decide to go back to American studies after trying 'things Japanese' for a year. That did not happen.

Beasley was then working on his major study of the Meiji Restoration.[14] What he wanted was an account of the ports in order to see how, if at all, they influenced the developments during the Restoration period. He was of course, very familiar with the background. His own thesis was on Britain's role in the 'opening' of Japan,[15] and he had written other studies relating to this early experience. He had also recently supervised a thesis that dealt with the first years after the opening of the ports.[16] I was given to understand that what he wanted was a study of what happened to the foreign settlements in and after the Restoration. There was at that stage no academic study of the subject. The role of the ports and the foreigners in nineteenth-century Japan was of course touched upon in many works. These included that of Sir Rutherford Alcock, Britain's first minister in 1863 and the one-time student interpreter and later minister, Sir Ernest Satow, plus numerous guidebooks and travellers' tales, all highly selective and limited in what they wrote about the treaty ports.[17] In addition, the Australian Harold S. Williams (1898–1987) had produced three books about the doings of foreigners in Japan. Fortunately for me, these were entertaining but not academic, though they remain good reads.[18]

For me, Beasley proved the ideal supervisor. He calmed me down when I panicked as a result of discovering an advertisement from Pat Barr asking for any original material for a book she planned on the Japanese treaty ports and similarly when Grace Fox's study of Britain and Japan appeared in 1969.[19] In addition, he gave me guidance on sources, arranged Japanese-language training and for me to spend six months in Japan. While he was prepared to read anything that I submitted to him, he did not insist on seeing the whole text before it was submitted. In those days, there was little pressure to finish

quickly and it was not until the end of 1970 that the text finally went in. The viva was held early in 1971. It was far less fraught than I had expected – wild rumours regularly seized the postgraduate community about hostile viva examinations but mine, conducted by Professors Ian Nish of the LSE and Richard Storry of St. Antony's, Oxford, was without incident. A few challenges about references were easily handled and once we began discussing brothels in Hakodate, I knew I was home and dry.

By then, I was working in the Research Department of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, not having got the hoped-for academic post. I had every intention of turning my thesis into a book, and Ian Nish even arranged an interview for me with Faber and Faber on a possible book on all the East Asian treaty ports. I fear that I did not come up to their expectations; one remarked in my hearing about a sample chapter that I had submitted: 'He is no Maurice Collis, is he?'[20] But work and marriage proved too much of a distraction from Japan's treaty ports. I wrote one academic paper for *Modern Asian Studies*[21] and had others published in a variety of outlets and various conference collections. But working on China and later South and South East Asia, plus a second marriage, meant that the treaty ports got pushed back in my list of priorities.

Then in 1981, I was posted to the British Embassy in Seoul. Thinking that I would have plenty of leisure time, I packed my thesis manuscript to work on while away. This proved to be a false dawn. The thesis sat in a box in my office and the expected leisure time never materialised as work on Korea proved all embracing and fascinating, while leisure writing was concerned with Korea rather than Japan. The nearest I got to working on the thesis was to have numerous copies made, thanks to the cheap photocopying facilities available, and to spend some time examining what remained of Korea's own treaty-port tradition. Alas, it was not a lot. Also, through the good offices of Sir Hugh Cortazzi, then HM ambassador in Tokyo, I was invited to make a presentation to the Asiatic Society of Japan on 'Extraterritoriality in Japan', which was duly published.[22]

On our return to London in 1985, I fear that things Korean took over from things Japanese, as my wife and I produced a general introduction to that country. Work was also busy. Japan was only one preoccupation. The next posting, to Beijing in 1988, coincided with the publication of *Korea: an Introduction*, but Beijing was a bigger and busier post than Seoul and while the photocopied volume came with me, it remained untouched. Finally, on return to London and on secondment to the International Institute of Strategic Studies, I turned once again to treaty ports. Encouraged by the late Gerry Segal of IISS and Paul Norbury of the Japan Library, I finally produced the book of the thesis, only twenty-three years after my thesis was accepted. It was, perhaps a little like *Punch*'s famous curate's egg – 'good in parts'. I have not been an assiduous collector of reviews but those I did see were mixed.

By that stage, I had become involved in the Japan Society's *Britian & Japan: Biographical Portraits* series, prompted by Hugh Cortazzi, the originator of the concept, and Ian Nish, editor of the volume in which my first contribution appeared. The treaty ports were not going to disappear! I had also to decide what to do with the articles, transcribed extracts and other material relating to the ports that I had been

steadily accumulating since the 1960s, which now filled several boxes. So like many others, I thought of a collection of treaty-port-related material and submitted it to Paul Norbury for consideration. Paul, who had published other similar collections, proved keen and by mid-2000, I was ready to go. Unfortunately – the attentive reader will discern a pattern – before I could get properly started, I was asked to be the first British representative to the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK–North Korea). Thoughts of treaty-port collections had to be put aside while I was in Pyongyang. Even after I returned to London in December 2002, things Korean tended to dominate. Only in 2015 did I again take up the idea of a collection.

Beasley once said to me that I would not be a treaty-port man all my life. In one sense, he was right. I have done much besides, both in the FCO and outside. My only teaching has been about Korea, for example, rather than, as I had expected, about Japan. Most of my published output has been the same. But a part of me always looked at the treaty ports with affectionate nostalgia and I am glad that this collection has finally appeared.

ENDNOTES

1 See below, n.18.

2 J. E. Hoare, 'Memories of times past: the legacy of Japan's treaty ports', in Donna Brunero and Stephanie Villalta Puig, eds. *Life in Treaty Port China and Japan*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, forthcoming.

3 Robert Bickers and Isabella Jackson, 'Introduction: law, land and power: treaty ports and concessions in modern China', in Robert Bickers and Isabella Jackson, eds., *Treaty Ports in Modern China: Law, land and power*. (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2016), pp. 1–22.

4 The standard work is still John King Fairbank, *Trade and Diplomacy on the China Coast: The Opening of the Treaty Ports, 1843–1854*, (Stanford CA: 1969, originally published in two volumes in 1953). More recently, Professor Robert Bickers of the University of Bristol has published much on the Chinese treaty-port system, including *The Scramble for China: Foreign Devils in the Qing Empire 1832–1914* (London: Penguin 2012). On extraterritoriality, the standard work is G. W. Keeton, *The Development of Extraterritoriality in China* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 2 vols. 1928). Again there are many new studies. See, for example, Cassell, Pär Kristoffer, *Grounds of Judgement: Extraterritoriality and Imperial Power in Nineteenth-Century China and Japan* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012).

5 For the development of photography in Japan, see Terry Bennett, *Photography in Japan 1853–1912,* (Tokyo: Tuttle Publishing, 2006).

6 A recent study of the Iwakura Mission is Ian Nish, ed. *The Iwakura Mission in America and Europe: A New Assessment* (Richmond, Surrey: Japan Library, 1998).

7 Bickers and Jackson, 'Introduction: law, land and power: treaty ports and concessions in modern China', pp. 1–22.

8 A useful collection of such early postcards can be found at http://www.oldtokyo.com/

9 *Kobe kaiko sanjunenshi* (The 30–Year History of Kobe Open Port), 2 vols. Kobe 1897, reprinted in a facsimile edition, Kobe: Chugai Publishers, 1966).

10 Yokohama-shi, *The city of Yokohama, past and present.* Yokohama: Yokohama Publishing Office. 1908.

11 A useful recent study of the Yokohama Chinatown is Eric C. Han, *Rise of a Japanese Chinatown: Yokohama 1894–1972*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.

12 See the essay by Bickers and Jackson, passim. The most dismissive view of the Chinese experience appeared in Rhoads Murphey, *The Chinese Treaty Ports and Chinese Modernization: What Went Wrong.* Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Chinese Studies, 1970. See also Nicholas Clifford, *Spoilt Children of Empire: Westerners in Shanghai and the Chinese Revolution of the 1920s,* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 1991), especially pp. 1–15.

13 *Report of the Sub-Committee on Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African Studies*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1961. For Japanese studies and the Hayter Report, see Peter Kornicki, 'A Brief History of Japanese Studies in Britain - from the 1860s to the Twenty-first Century,' in Hugh Cortazzi and Peter Kornicki, eds. *Japanese Studies in Britain: A Survey and History,* Folkestone, Kent: Renaissance Books, 2016, pp. 26 et. seq.

14 W. G. Beasley, *The Meiji Restoration* (Stanford CA: Stanford University Press, 1972).

15 W. G. Beasley, *Great Britain and the Opening of Japan, 1834–1858.* London: Luzac, 1951.

16 This was John McMaster's 'British trade and traders to Japan 1859–1869', unpub. PhD thesis, University of London, 1962. Curiously, Beasley never suggested that McMaster and I should meet, and we never have done.

17 Sir Rutherford Alcock, *The Capital of the Tycoon: A Narrative of a Three Years Residence in Japan.* London: Longmans, 2 vols. 1863, Sir Ernest Satow, *A Diplomat in Japan.* London: Seeley Service and Co., 1921. Many of the guidebooks and travellers' tales are listed in the bibliography of my thesis and in the printed version that eventually appeared in 1994 – see below.

18 These were *Tales of the Foreign Settlements in Japan* (1958), *Shades of the Past: Indiscreet Tales of Japan* (!959), and *Foreigners in Mikadoland* (1963), all published by Charles E. Tuttle Company of Rutland, Vermont and Tokyo, (now Tuttle Publishing). He also wrote an account of the Kobe Regatta and Athletic Club, while a two-volume posthumous collection of other writings, with sketches by his wife, appeared as *West meets East: the foreign experience of Japan* (Rushcutters Bay, NSW: Hallstead Press, 1996. His collected papers and books now form the Harold S. Williams Collection in the National Library of Australia – see https://www.nla.gov.au/selected-library-collections/harold-s-williams-collection

He was a charming man, and we exchanged occasional letters after I met him in Tokyo in 1976.

19 Pat Barr, *The Coming of the Barbarians: A Story of Western Settlement in Japan 1853–1970.* London: Macmillan, 1967 and *The Deer Cry Pavilion: A Story of Westerners in Japan 1868–1905*. London: Macmillan, 1968, She later wrote a life of Isabella Bird Bishop. We met a few times and talked about sources. I realized that our purposes differed when she complained about how dirty archive material was. Grace Fox, *Britain and Japan 1858–1883.* London: Clarendon Press, 1969, was much more of a challenge but was less than feared because of her chosen time span.

20 Author of *Foreign Mud* (London: Faber and Faber 1946). In this study of the Opium War, apparently without making clear to the company, Collis had used the Jardine Matheson papers as the basis for a condemnatory account of the lead-up to the war. Jardines were not best pleased, and introduced stricter controls on access to the papers.

21 J. E. Hoare, 'The "Bankoku Shimbun" Affair: Foreigners, the Press and Extraterritoriality in Early Modern Japan', *Modern Asian Studies*, vol. 9, no. 3 (1975), pp. 289–302.

22 J. E. Hoare, 'Extraterritoriality in Japan 1858–1899', *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, 3rd series, XVIII (1983), 71–97.