

**PROPOSAL FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY  
HISTORY FSP 2012**

**Britain's Shanghai Policy in the Second Sino-Japanese War, 1937-1943**

Faculty Advisor: Pamela Crossley

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

*[Professor Crossley is on leave, so she will email Ms. Vernazza her approval]*

**PRIMARY GOAL:**

My chief goal for my Independent Field Project is to address the changes in Britain's Shanghai Policy in response to an increasing series of Japanese aggression from 1937-43. Despite British policy's historical significance in slowing Japanese aggression in China during the Second Sino-Japanese War, there is currently no literature that specifically addresses this topic without taking into consideration the Allies' involvement in the Pacific War and World War II as a whole.

**BRIEF HISTORY:**

After British victory in the First Opium War, China settled to cede Shanghai to Britain under the Treaty of Nanking in 1842. America and France quickly followed in suit by brokering their own Shanghai concessions, along with provisions for fixed tariffs and extraterritoriality. In 1862, the British and American concessions merged to form the Shanghai International Settlement. However, following the break of the Second Sino-Japanese War in 1937, the status of Shanghai's International Settlement was jeopardized due to clashes between Japanese occupiers and Chinese revolutionaries in greater Shanghai.

Following the onset of the Second Sino-Japanese War, Britain declared neutrality, and foreign nationals more-or-less attempted to continue with their lives despite a severe economic turnover and heightened political instability. To deal with such spillover conflict and issues regarding violence, refugees, and the like, the Shanghai Municipal Council and British government were forced to formulate policies in reaction to Japan's increasingly aggressive actions. Finally, in the wake of the attack on Pearl Harbor, the Imperial Japanese Army entered and occupied the International Settlement, effectively ending Anglo-American influence in December 1941 albeit a majority of European nationals remained in their jobs until 1943. In February of that year, as part of the Treaty for the Relinquishment of Extra-Territorial Rights in China, Britain decided to retrocede its Shanghai concessions back to China.

## **PROPOSAL:**

I aim to focus my research on Britain's responses to the events of the Second Sino-Japanese War. I aim to pay especial attention to the progression of British policy (e.g., from Britain's initial declaration of neutrality to its declaration of war and eventual retrocession of its Shanghai concessions).

I intend to address questions such as:

How did British policy deal with issues regarding European nationals' collaboration with the Japanese? Why did only one Royal Navy vessel refuse to surrender to the Japanese Imperial Navy in 1941? How did the British react to the internment of European nationals after February 1943, and why did Britain choose to cede back its International Settlement holdings to China?

Additionally, to supplement my focus on British policy, I will research individual foreign nationals' changing evaluations of business, of public policy, and in their personal lives amidst Japan's increasing influence on the Shanghai International Settlement, or "island Shanghai."

## **SOURCES:**

### **A. Locations:**

#### **Main:**

#### **Imperial War Museum**

Lambeth Road, London SE1 6HZ

Contains a vast array of private Papers, interviews, and original documents pertaining to British nationals, public officials, and military officers regarding the Shanghai International Settlement.

#### **The National Archives, or the Public Record Office**

Kew, Richmond, Surrey, TW9 4DU

Holds a wide scope of papers and memorandum on a variety of content, ranging from finance to policy measures.

For instance, memorandums like "Situation in the Far East" or "Question of Withdrawal of British Troops" on issues ranging from "The effect of entry of Italy into war against the Allies in Shanghai International Settlement" to "Measures to prevent Japan from obtaining full control of the International Settlement at the Election, Shanghai 1940."

**Also:**

**School of Oriental and African Studies Library**

University of London  
Vernon Square, London, WC1X 9EW

One of the world's most important academic libraries for the study of Africa, Asia and the Middle East, this library holds over 1,400 references on Shanghai.

**Bodleian Library**

Oxford University  
Parks Road, Oxford, OX1 3BG

Has several dependent libraries including the Oriental Institute Library and the Bodleian Japanese Library and holds a sizeable quantity of books and periodicals on Shanghai during the 1937-43 timeframe.

**The London Library**

14 Saint James's Square, Westminster, London SW1Y 4LG

Contains most of the following published sources, in addition to an assortment of archives and collections.

**B. Published:**

Dong, Stella. Shanghai : The Rise and Fall of a Decadent City 1842-1949. 2001.

Fu, Poshek. Passivity, Resistance, and Collaboration: Intellectual Choices in Occupied Shanghai, 1937-1945. 1993.

Heppner, Ernest G. Shanghai Refuge: A Memoir of the World War II Jewish Ghetto. 1995.

Kranzler, David. Japanese, Nazis & Jews: The Jewish refugee community of Shanghai, 1938-1945. 1976.

Levine, Steven I. China's Bitter Victory: The War with Japan, 1937-1945. 1993.  
Occupation, In the Shadow of the Rising Sun: Shanghai under Japanese. Ed. Christian Henrit and Wen-hsin Yeh. 2004.

Sergeant, Harriet. Shanghai: Collision Point of Cultures, 1918-1939. 1990.

Wakeman Jr., Frederic. Policing Shanghai, 1927-1937. n.d.  
—. The Shanghai Badlands: Wartime Terrorism and Urban Crime, 1937-1941. 2002.

Wettern, Desmond. The Lonely Battle. 1960.

Wilson, Dick. When Tigers Fight: The Story of the Sino-Japanese War, 1937-1945. 1983.

Yeh, Wen-hsin, ed. Wartime Shanghai. 1998.

**C. Primary Sources:**

Private papers, audio interviews, and original documents

Examples:

Private Papers – Location: Imperial War Museum

In two bound volumes (1942-1945), O D Ganger details Japanese occupation of the International settlement, the conditions, the question of repatriation, etc.

Audio Interview – Location: Imperial War Museum

Lieutenant-Colonel Otway details his recollections as an intelligence officer, of his defense of the International Settlement, and on the general situation from 1937-1939.

Original Documents – Location: The National Archives

The Foreign Office holds inherited files of the Shanghai Embassy (1940).

## History FSP Proposal

The National Gallery, London

Faculty Advisor: Professor M. Darrow

### General Background:

On April 2, 1824 Parliament formed the National Gallery collection. The museum is the first truly "national" gallery because it is the result of Parliament's will and public funds rather than private funds. By 1831, the collection consisted of works by Rubens, Rembrandt, Lorrain, and several Italian Renaissance masters. There was, however, little public interest at the time.

Public interest in the museum developed in the 1850's. The Gallery was run by a Board of Trustees at the time. Newspapers' voiced the public's criticisms of the trustees' policies and the complaints of the dirty, cramped conditions in the building on Trafalgar Square led to the appointment of Charles Eastlake as the Gallery's director in 1853. Under Eastlake's direction, the Gallery grew in size and status. He created a more balanced collection based on historical principles which included works of the "primitives", 14th and 15th century artists. This differed from previous acquisitions which were based on the masters of the 16th and 17th centuries.

### Proposal:

My paper could take one of several courses depending on the information I find in London. One focus could be the circumstances of the establishment of the National Gallery. What debate occurred as a result of the gallery? Why was it established? Who supported and who opposed it? What were the positions of both groups? This information would be based on Parliamentary records.

Another direction would focus on the appointment of Charles Eastlake as director in 1855. After his appointment, the Gallery flourished. What were Eastlake's main contributions? How did Eastlake's policy on acquisitions differ from the original policy? How was his plan for the museum different from Parliament's original vision? Eastlake's papers and the National Gallery's Archives would be sources for this focus.

The format of my paper will depend on the information I find in London. If I choose the first focus from above then the paper will be based chiefly on primary sources. I would mainly base a paper dealing with focus two on the primary sources as well as Eastlake's biography (as a secondary source).

### Primary Sources:

#### 1. National Gallery Archives:

Trafalgar Square

London WC2N 5DN

Mon.-Fri. 10-6, by appointment

need to be approved to read, on written application

National Gallery catalogues and National Gallery reports can be found [here](#) and contain historical information of the Gallery.

#### 2. Public Records Office

Parliamentary papers concerning the foundation of the Gallery

#### 3. British Library Newspaper Library at Colindale

Any articles from the time concerning the National Gallery, Eastlake, and the people and Parliament's opinion, etc. will be helpful.

### Secondary Sources:

#### 1. Oral Research

I intend to speak with historians who work in the National Gallery and historians at University College London.

## 2. Books

There are many different books compiled with brief histories of the museum and examples of the collections that I intend to study as well.

Examples:

Hendy, P., *The National Gallery, London*, New York, 1960.

Potterton, H., *The National Gallery, London*, London, 1977.

Regoli, G., et al., *National Gallery, London*, New York, 1976.

Museum publications:

*The Working of the National Gallery*, 1974 and catalogues

Background Information:

Horne, Donald. *The Great Museum*. London, 1984.

Hudson, Kenineth. *Museums of Influence*. Cambridge, 1987.

Minihan, Janet. *The Nationalization of Culture*. New York, 1976.

Robertson, David. *Sir Charles Eastlake and the Victorian Art World*. Princeton, 1978.

read and approved:

Margaret D. Dow  
Aug 19, 1994



PROPOSAL FOR INDEPENDENT STUDY  
HISTORY FSP 1998  
(REVISED -- 7/14/98)

*Sir Herbert Louis Samuel,  
First High Commissioner of the British Mandate in Palestine:  
Civil Servant and Jew*

Faculty Advisors: Walter P. Simons and Gene R. Garthwaite

Signatures: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Brief History:**

One of the key figures behind Lord Arthur James Balfour's bold and precedent setting endorsement of a Jewish national homeland in Palestine was Viscount Herbert Louis Samuel. On November 2, 1917, the British government went public with the "Balfour Declaration," and a crucial step towards the creation of the state of Israel had been taken. In May of 1920, at the San Remo conference, Great Britain was awarded the mandate for Palestine, and in the following month, in a controversial decision, Sir Herbert Louis Samuel became its first High Commissioner. An upstanding Liberal politician, he was Oxford educated, a member of the Cabinet (ultimately taking the position of Home Secretary) and yet what ultimately proved to be his defining characteristic is the fact that he was a Jew. Viewed as a hero by Palestinian Jews and feared as a conqueror by the Arabs, Samuel was caught in the difficult position of striving to maintain both the image as well as the reality of good government. Yet, when these two became irreconcilable, he would generally opt for the former.

## **The Balfour Declaration:**

*His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object: it being clearly understood that nothing should be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country.*

## **My Proposal:**

I intend to focus my research upon Sir Herbert Samuel's tenure as High Commissioner in Palestine from its founding in 1920 to his departure in 1925. As an adjunct to the primary purpose of this independent study project, as well as to lend perspective to the primary goal, I will study his involvement in British policy-making towards Palestine in the pre-Mandate years. How did Samuel's status as an observant Jew affect his competency and/or will to govern the Mandate with impartiality? Samuel did not call himself a Zionist, yet he was in personal contact with Theodore Herzl, Chiam Weizmann, Leopold de Rothschild, and Claude Montefiore. How did this affect his decision-making as High Commissioner?

1) When Samuel was named High Commissioner of the Mandate, a position that he held from 1920-1925, the announcement intensified the feelings of antagonism between the Jews and Arabs of Palestine. Yet, despite the fact (or perhaps because of the fact) that the Jews saw the new High Commissioner as "one of them," Samuel often sided with the Arabs, for the simple reason that he saw that as the only real way to keep the peace. To what extent did Samuel serve Great Britain as a dispassionate leader in Palestine?

2) In 1916, Samuel was appointed Home Secretary in the British Cabinet. Given his influence as a prominent politician as well as a

prominent Jew, how was his influence manifested in the pronouncement of the "Balfour Declaration?" The facts indicate that he was sympathetic to the Zionist movement, but to what extent did he take part in it?

3) As a prelude to a study of Lord Samuel's role as High Commissioner, I would like to study his background and what sympathies he held in his earlier years. How did his role as the first Jew to sit in the British Cabinet affect his mentality? How did he reconcile himself to the fact that despite his service to his nation in the highest circles of government, many of his colleagues saw him as "not English" by virtue of his religion?

London offers unique resources regarding Palestine insofar as it was the capital of the empire that ruled in that territory during the relevant timeframe. To attain access to the best records regarding him, both those that I have listed below and those that I have yet to discover, the resources of London are essential.

## **SOURCES:**

### **A. Locations:**

#### **House of Lords Record Office**

House of Lords, London SW1A 0PW

Most records over 30 years old are open to the public.

Parliamentary diaries available. Sir Herbert Samuel was a member of the House of Lords from 1937-1939. This is the location of Viscount Samuel's personal papers, one of my most important resources.

#### **Institute of Contemporary History and Weiner Library**

4 Devonshire Street, London W1N 2BH

Focus is on Jewish history, and although much of the collection has been transferred to Tel Aviv University, the material is still available on microfilm.

#### **The Jewish Museum**

129/131 Albert Street, London NW1 7NB

The museum has a limited quantity of archival material, although much has been transferred to the University College of London.

#### **Public Record Office**

Ruskin Ave, Kew, Richmond, Surrey, TW9 4DU

This source is likely to house a great collection of papers by Lord Samuel and his colleagues.

#### **Royal Institute of International Affairs**

Chatham House, 10 St James's Square, London SW1Y 4LE

This library owns a considerable collection on most aspects of international affairs from 1924 onward, therefore pertaining to the final years of my area of interest.

**University College of London**

University of London  
Gower Street, London WC1E 6BT

In 1993, the Library of the Jewish Historical Society of England (or Mocatta Library) was incorporated into the University College of London. This library houses one of the foremost collections on Jewish History in the world.

**B. Published:**

Bowle, John Edward. Viscount Samuel: A Biography. 1957.

Caplan, Neil. Britain, Zionism and the Arabs, 1917-1925. 1978.

Caplan, Neil. Futile Diplomacy. Vol. I: Early Arab-Zionist Negotiation Attempts 1913-1931. 1983.

Friedman, Isaiah. The Question of Palestine, 1918: British-Jewish-Arab Relations. 1973.

Hardie and Herrman. Britain and Zion: The Fateful Entanglement. Belf. 1980.

Hyamson, A.M. Palestine Under the Mandate 1920-1948. 1950.

Ingrams, Doreen. Palestine Papers, 1917-1922: Seeds of Conflict. 1972.

Jones, Phillip. Britain and Palestine, 1914-1948: Archival Sources for the History of the British Mandate. 1979.

Kedourie, Elie. "Sir Herbert Samuel and the Government of Palestine." *Mid. East Studs* 5 (1969), 44-68.

Koestler, Arthur. Promise and Fulfilment: Palestine, 1917-1949. 1949.

Marlowe, John. The Seat of Pilate: An Account of the Palestine Mandate. 1962.

Mctague, J.J. Zionist-British Negotiations Over the Draft Mandate for Palestine, 1920. 1980.

Royal Institute of International Affairs. Great Britain and Palestine, 1915-1945. 1946.

Samuel, Herbert Louis, Viscount Samuel. Memoirs. 1945.

Sanders, Ronald, The High Walls of Jerusalem. 1983.

Sherman, A.J., Mandate Days: British Lives in Palestine 1918-1948. 1998.

Sidebotham, Herbert. British Policy and the Palestine Mandate. 1929.

Stein, Leonard. The Balfour Declaration. 1961.

Taylor, Alan R. Prelude to Israel: An Analysis of Zionist Diplomacy 1897-1947. 1961.

Verété, Mayir. "The Balfour Declaration and its Makers." *Mid. East Studs* vi (1970), 48-76.

Wasserstein, Bernard. The British in Palestine: The Mandatory Government and the Arab-Jewish Conflict, 1917-1929. 1978.

Wasserstein, Bernard. "Herbert Samuel and the Palestine Problem." *Eng. Hist. Rev.* xci (1976), 753-75.

### **C. Primary Sources:**

If at all possible, I intend to interview descendents of the Viscount in the hopes of unearthing some interesting and perhaps historically significant anecdotes and family stories.

