X - Macau and Hong King: Anglo-Portuguese Relations on the South China Coast

Susan Henders
York University, Canada

> *The oldest alliance in the world is that between England and Portugal. It began in medieval crusading times. The two countries have usually had common enemies and seldom divergent interests, and their alliance, in spite of wars and revolutions, has therefore continued to the present. Resting on neither sentiment nor affection, it is based on community of fears: the most common root of alliances* (Grose 1930: 313).

How did Anglo-Portuguese relations,[1] including the long-standing if intermittent and often conflictual alliance between the two states,[2] shape events and policies with respect to Macau and Hong Kong, respectively, Portuguese and British territories on the south China coast? Was the relationship between the two European colonial authorities based on shared interests and a "community of fears", which Clyde Grose suggests in the quote above underlay Anglo-Portuguese relations?

The following research note takes these questions as a contested starting point. It does not offer new historical evidence about Anglo-Portuguese relations with respect to Hong Kong and Macau. Rather, based on a preliminary examination of some of the English-language secondary historical literature, this present analysis explores what events in Hong Kong and Macau might teach us about inter-state relationships, including alliances, understood as social practices.

---

[1] In keeping with a good deal of the literature on the alliance, this paper uses the terms "Anglo-Portuguese" to refer to relations between English authorities and, later, British authorities, and their Portuguese counterparts.

[2] On the intermittent often disrupted nature of the alliance, see Prestige (1934); Boxer (1986); Gallagher (1986).

The study of alliances has been central to international relations scholarship. This literature has focused on such topics as why states form alliances, the conditions that make them possible, and what happens to alliances when there is a major change in these conditions. There has been a good deal written about types of alliances and of alliance members, distinguished in terms of geopolitical and political economic position, and on the effects of alliances on conflict, economic relations, and security issues, including for different types of alliances members (see, for eg., Ligthart and Reitsma 1988; Sprecher and Krause 2006). The Anglo-Portuguese alliance, and Anglo-Portuguese relations more broadly, have been studied not only because of their extent, dating back to medieval times and extending into the post-World War II era, but also because of what the political and economic asymmetries between the two states and alliance partners suggest about the nature and political effects of alliances as social practices more generally.

By one reading of events, Anglo-Portuguese relations on the south China coast have been a microcosm of wider patterns of relations between the two states. Beyond its roots in European trade and military rivalries, a central purpose of the alliance was to give the rising commercial power of Britain access to Portuguese trading ports in exchange for providing the weakening Portuguese empire with military assistance against armed challengers. In this exchange of benefits, it was typically Portugal, as the weaker state, that gained less than the British. As the economically and militarily stronger partner, British authorities tended to invoke the alliance when it suited their interests and to define it narrowly or ignore it completely when they wanted to restrict or withhold assistance to Portuguese authorities in defending their far flung colonial territories. Both the Portuguese and British authorities engaged in this behaviour, at times rendering the treaty meaningless, but, as the stronger party, Britain did it more often and with more detrimental effect for the weaker alliance partner (Gallagher 1986: 39). This contributed to another result of the alliance, that after several centuries of this supposedly special relationship, “Britain’s historical ties with Portugal had not promoted mutual respect, but instead contempt on one side and bitterness on the other” (Gallagher 1986: 40).

As this research note will discuss, all of these patterns are evident in Macau. However, to see Anglo-Portuguese relations on the south China coast as no more than illustrations of wider patterns in the relationship is to miss a good deal of what is

interesting and significant and perhaps distinctive. To understand why it is helpful first to note that, at least in much of the international relations literature, alliances are understood to be social practices amongst states conceived of as unitary actors. The internal divisions and differences within the governmental apparatuses, societies, and economies of states are assumed to be largely irrelevant to alliance practices. The fact that, particularly in imperial states, it has been locally situated officials, military personnel, traders, and other state and non-state actors who have performed and interpreted alliances, giving meaning and substance to the words in founding treaties and directives emanating from often far away imperial political centres. It cannot be assumed—but should be empirically determined—that these locally situated actors necessarily had the same identities and understandings of state interests and threats as their counterparts elsewhere in the empire. Indeed, a good deal of the historical and, more recently, the social science scholarship on Macau suggests the strength and distinctiveness of the identities of local mainly creole Macanese Portuguese from the enclave's early days and, more recently, the longer establish Macau Chinese as well. However, the extent to which these individuals and identities determined the nature of Anglo-Portuguese relations appears to have varied over time (see, eg., Pina-Cabral 2002; Yee 2001). It may be that the lack of as similarly significant and locally rooted creole community in Hong Kong meant that local conditions did not as significantly constitute the identities and interests of those in Hong Kong who carried out Anglo-Portuguese relations and performed the alliance. This may have changed in recent decades, when the sense of belonging to Hong Kong amongst Hong Kong Chinese residents has been stronger, with implications for the identities and interests of ethnic Chinese Hong Kong government officials, for instance.

In short, this research note makes the case that inter-state relations, including alliances, are social practices performed in multiple localities by both state and non-state actors. These relationships may be characterized by spatial variation and internal tensions in part depending on local social, economic, and political contexts, including the identities of locally constituted state officials. With this conceptual starting point, it is no longer possible only to see Anglo-Portuguese relations on the south China coast as illustrations of the narratives of Anglo-Portuguese relations based on events in Europe and contexts of Portuguese-British interaction in other parts of the empires. Rather, the

stories of British and Portuguese interaction at Macau and Hong Kong also show how local factors sometimes determined the character of this relationship locally, at times trumping understandings and expectations set by officials and other actors and interests at the imperial centres.

Three local factors were particularly important in Anglo-Portuguese relations with respect to Macau and Hong Kong: Macau's status as a mixed Sino-Portuguese jurisdiction and Hong Kong's identity (in the eyes of Chinese authorities) as a symbol of Chinese humiliation at the hands of European mercantile imperialism; the policies of Chinese authorities, including, in recent decades, the reunification strategy of the People's Republic of China government; and, finally, the changing economic relationship amongst Hong Kong, Macau, and China. The latter are central to making sense of the social bases of political power in the two territories that helped shape conceptions of Anglo-Portuguese identities and interests on the south China coast. These economic relationships are not much explored in the present research note, but should be integral to future research on the topic of Anglo-Portuguese relations with respect to Hong Kong and Macau.

Meanwhile, the preliminary analysis below focuses mainly on Anglo-Chinese relations in the context of Macau as a mixed jurisdiction and in the context of Chinese government policies with respect to Macau and Hong Kong. It suggests several hypotheses about Anglo-Portuguese relations on the south China coast. Firstly, while for much of their history Hong Kong and Macau have been intimately connected economically, socially, politically, and diplomatically in terms of relations between official of the two territories, the Anglo-Portuguese alliance itself has been relatively unimportant, due significantly to local circumstances. Secondly, before the establishment of British Hong Kong, the main concern of British authorities was to use the facilities, know-how, and contacts of traders at Macau to establish trade with the Chinese and, later, to secure access to Macau as a retreat for their Guangzhou-based (Canton) traders—at times evoking the alliance. After the establishment of British Hong Kong, the aim of British evoking of alliance commitments with respect to Portuguese Macau was to prevent European and Japanese economic and political competitors from taking Macau or gaining advantages there. And, finally, for their part, prior to the establishment of British

Hong Kong, the Portuguese in Macau initially dodged treaty commitments with England made by the imperial centres, because they were fearful of provoking retaliation from Chinese officials. Following the Anglo-Chinese War (1839-42), the Portuguese Macau officials evoked the alliance to call for British aid in efforts to put Portuguese tenure in Macau on a more secure footing. However, when it came to Portuguese disputes with Chinese authorities, the British officials of Hong Kong effectively treated Macau as Chinese territory and, thus, not completely subject to the alliance.

It must be stressed that the following analysis is not intended as a comprehensive history of Anglo-Portuguese history on the south China coast, but is rather a limited account of a few key events from the seventeenth century to the current era with the aim of making the case for a more decentralized understanding of Anglo-Portuguese relations, one based on conceptualizing alliances as social practices performed by actors whose identities and understandings of interests and fears are at least partially constituted locally. The hypotheses suggested herein need to be explored through a wider and deeper survey of both the primary and secondary historical literature in both English and Portuguese and other relevant languages.

Distinctive Territories

Portuguese Macau first gained importance in the entrepot trade between China and Japan and as the base of Roman Catholic missions in the Far East. However, for the bulk of the history of both Macau and Hong Kong, the China trade with Europe and Asia was the *raison d'être* of the two territories. Despite this similarity and their geographic proximity to one another on either side of the Pearl River Delta, Macau and Hong Kong are very different from one another. They have distinctive histories and relationships with Chinese authorities; they have highly asymmetrical political and economic power positions. From the late seventeenth and eighteenth century, the Portuguese Macau intra-Asian carrying trade declined. The territory became dependent on the British, French, and American firms carrying out direct trade with China. With the founding of British Hong

Kong, this dependency increased and Macau became in large part an economic dependency of the Hong Kong economy. Politically, Macau was also distinctive from Hong Kong. It was established at a very different moment in the history of China's relations with European traders and political authorities. The Portuguese presence in Macau dates from the mid-sixteenth century. Its encounter with the Chinese authorities has been less violent and confrontational than those of its British counterpart. The Portuguese remained in Macau largely at the sufferance of Chinese officials, using bribery, ground rents, customs, and taxes to gain the support of local Chinese officials. At times the local accommodations and conventions between the two sides contradicted policies made by central Chinese imperial authorities. As a result, though its intensity varied, for much of its nearly four hundred and fifty year history, Macau was effectively a shared, or mixed, jurisdiction in which both Portuguese and Chinese authorities operated, their relative power varying over time. At times these authorities were closely connected to the imperial centres, but at other times they were largely autonomous. The upshot of this historical pattern is that Portuguese Macau provoked less resentment than did British Hong Kong. In this way, Macau survived changes of dynasty in China as well as the establishment of the republic and then the people's republic (see Chan 2003; Pina-Cabral 2002, Ch. 3, 4).

By contrast, the British not only ruled Hong Kong for a much shorter period, dating from the mid-nineteenth century, the territory's beginnings in gunboat diplomacy set the tone for Sino-British relations over the subsequent century and a half. To Chinese governments, Hong Kong and the three "unequal treaties" that legitimated the British presence on the south China coast were a festering sore. They symbolized China's "century of humiliation" at the hands of European and Japanese imperialists, sentiments Cold War politics helped to perpetuate (see Yee 2001: Ch. 1 and 2; Chan 2003; Hook and Neves 2002). Moreover, the aggressive rise of British mercantile imperialism on the China coast that resulted in the nineteenth-century Anglo-Chinese wars and the treaty port system of indirect colonialism in China was a reflection of wider changes in the European-centred geopolitical and economic order, changes that had been at work for nearly three centuries and that had brought about the 1661 Anglo-Portuguese treaty of alliance. The treaty, which reflected earlier commercial and political agreements between

the two states, gave the English an economically and politically privileged position in Portugal and trading rights in the Portuguese empire in exchange for their aid in Europe and the empire in Portugal's struggles against Spain and the Hollanders of the Dutch Republic (Boxer 1986: 24; Lighthart and Reitsma 1988: 357-8). The alliance reflected shifts in European great power politics, but also the decline of the Portuguese empire and the long rise to dominance of British commercial and military power globally. These changes were to have important consequences for Anglo-Portuguese relations in south China. However, their effects were refracted through distinctive local conditions, which contributed to constituting the identities and perceptions of the locally situated state, military, economic, and other actors who performed the alliance.

Anglo-Portuguese Relations on the South China Coast

Early Encounters

An Anglo-Portuguese encounter at Macau in the 1630s revealed the imperial and commercial competition between the two powers as much as any sense of shared interests or a common enemy in the years leading up to the 1661 treaty. An English trade expedition under John Weddell sailed for Macau, bearing the permission of King Charles I to trade with China and, if possible, find a north-east passage via California. Weddell thought the Macau Portuguese might offer assistance to his expedition because of the 1635 Convention of Goa. The Portuguese Viceroy of India and the English president of the Surat factory had signed the Convention to facilitate Anglo-Portuguese cooperation against Dutch attacks and help bring an end to 30 years of maritime conflicts between the two trading powers in the East. The truce was agreed in the context of the Dual Monarchy that Portugal formed with Spain from 1580-1640, as England and Spain had concluded a peace in 1630 (Boxer 1986: 23). However, when Weddell got to Macau, his expedition got little help in its efforts to establish trade with China. The local Portuguese not only had a tradition of autonomy from imperial authorities. They also saw the English

as commercial rivals rather than allies and feared the Chinese authorities would punish Macau for helping Weddell, closing the *Portas do Cerco* (Barrier Gate) that demarcated the tiny enclave, cutting off vital supplies of food and labour not to mention trade. Their fears proved well-founded (Gunn 1996: 27). Ultimately, Weddell sailed up the Pearl River and the Chinese detained six English traders until the expedition agreed to leave. Some accounts suggest that the outcome was determined by which group, the Macau Portuguese or English, bribed the Chinese officials more (Welsh 1997: 25). In the event, as Crisswell tells it, quoting an account by one of the merchants with Weddell: "they wailed away virtually empty-handed, having been expelled 'outt off the Citty and the Country, even by Fire and Sword as one May well say' " (Crisswell 1981: 12).

The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars

In the decades after these events, with the end of the Japan trade in 1639, Macau's economic fortunes rapidly declined. Portuguese Macau authorities had to balance the realities of the enclave's mixed Sino-Portuguese jurisdiction and economic dependence on China and the remaining inter-Asian trade with the rise of Dutch and British mercantilist power in the Far East. The emerging new global order was increasingly one determined by European as opposed to Chinese world views and interests (Gunn 1995: 30-31). By the eighteenth century, the situation in Macau was radically different from the days of the Weddell expedition. In those days, expedition members had only reluctantly been allowed ashore, despite the 1635 truce. With the establishment of British trade links with Guangzhou (Canton) in 1706, British ships began stopping in Macau regularly. The enclave gradually became a permanent residence for European and later also American traders and a seasonal retreat for those traders based in Guangzhou. In the 1770s, the British East Indian Company began permitting their supercargoes to stay in Macau between trading seasons, and the company opened its own premises on the Praia Grande. Macau people became increasingly dependent on salaried positions with European and

American firms, rental income from lease of properties to their traders, as well as the other economic spinoffs from the residence of so many relatively well off foreigners in the enclave. The challenge for Macau authorities was to secure these benefits without damaging the enclave's delicate relations with the Chinese. Increasingly, the ever more powerful and aggressive British traders became the focus of this difficult task, as events associated with the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars reveal.

These were the first of the European wars to have a significant direct impact on Anglo-Portuguese relations on the south China coast and on relations between European states and imperial China. The Anglo-Portuguese alliance, renewed to protect Portugal from the French, resulted outside of Europe in the British occupation of Goa from 1799 to 1815. In 1802, the British Governor of India, Lord Wellesley, ordered that Macau also be occupied, on the pretence that the enclave was similarly threatened by attack by the French or their Spanish allies at Manila. Wellesley withdrew under Portuguese protests and Chinese pressure. However, in 1809, the British tried again to occupy Macau, this time with the acquiescence of Portuguese authorities in Goa and sending Lord Admiral William Drury (Gunn 1995: 46-7).

The Portuguese in Macau again resisted. They saw a British occupation, and the likely hostile Chinese reaction to it, as more threatening to Macau than any potential French or Spanish attack. According to Austin Coates, locally, the fear was that a British occupation would end Portuguese rule in Macau, given commercial and political realities. Efforts by the British Macartney embassy to obtain by diplomatic means a secure British trading base in China had failed. The local perception was that the British wanted to takeover Macau for trading purposes and that the war in Europe and alliance were being evoked opportunistically. As had become the pattern, Macau authorities tried to navigate between their formal ally, Britain, whose associations with Macau were beneficial to the local economy, and the Chinese authorities, with whom they had close relations based on many conventions associated with the mixed Sino-Portuguese jurisdiction and who could easily shut off the *Portas do Cerco*. In this case, the Macau Governor and Senate appealed to the Chinese to protect the enclave. The Chinese only be threatened them with consequences should Macau authorities permit the British force to land. At one point Drury threatened to force his way ashore if the Portuguese did not respect the terms of the

Anglo-Portuguese alliance. In the end, the Macau authorities accepted British occupation on the condition that Portuguese as opposed to British flags were flown. However, in the end, the Chinese authorities forced the British to leave by stopping foreign trade at Guangzhou, withdrawing all servants from the factories, and stopping food supplies. As predicted, they also provoked the departure from Macau of Chinese servants, hawkers, skilled craftsmen, wet nurses, and coolies (Coates 1988: 96-99; 1966: 92-3). The Portuguese Macau authorities appeared not to entirely share the British or Portuguese imperial authorities' understandings of where immanent danger lay and resisted performing their alliance obligations. As H. B. Morse, historian of the East India Company, tells it:

> Admiral Drury in his encounter with Oriental passive resistance was defeated without the loss of a man on either side, and in the eyes of the Chinese he must have appeared to have saved all except honour. He had come to Macao with the most benevolent intentions: his object was to aid the Portuguese in defending Macao against the French—this aid was rejected both by the Portuguese, tenants of the port, and by the Chinese, lords of the soil (quoted in Coates 1988: 100).

According to Macanese historian, C. A. Monalto de Jesus, there was considerable local resentment towards the British as a result of these events. Not only did Macau people suffer economically due to the British "defence" of Macau, but, the British authorities later asked for the resignation of the Macau Portuguese *ouvidor,* or judge, Miguel de Arriaga. This was interpreted locally as especially insulting to Macau as Arriaga had not only negotiated with the Chinese authorities during the tense period of British occupation, but later had managed to re-establish British commerce on the same conditions as prior to the occupation (Monalto de Jesus 1990: 166).

The Anglo-Chinese Wars and Their Aftermath

During first Anglo-Chinese War, Macau again found itself threatened by Chinese sanctions because of the enclave's British residents, as Chinese officials tried to pressure the British by putting pressure on Macau. The British offered to defend Macau and contemplated taking it over (Endacott 1973: 13). In the now familiar pattern, Governor Silveira Pinto attempted to maintain neutrality between the warring sides and not to get drawn into the conflict. Finally, Macau authorities acquiesced when the Chinese authorities drove the British out of the enclave in 1839. The British, who took refuge on ships anchored off Hong Kong island, later returned to Macau. According to Coates, they found that their Macau neighbours had looked after their houses and that nothing had been stolen (Coates 1988: 194-6; see also Monalto de Jesus 1990: 210).

Following the war and with the establishment of British Hong Kong in 1842, the Portuguese imperial authorities determined to take advantage of the treaty port concessions European powers had extracted from China, tried to expand Macau territory and regularize Portugal's position in Macau, so as to end the centuries of mixed jurisdiction. The initiative was not fully supported by the local Portuguese, who did not at this time fully identify with Portuguese colonial ambitions (Pina-Cabral 2002: 62-3). The Chinese imperial authorities initially resisted these attempts—and the British at Hong Kong backed them up, despite its treaty obligation to protect Portuguese territories. The first statutes of Hong Kong state that Macau was to be treated as if it were part Chinese imperial territory. This was beneficial to Hong Kong as, with the Chinese in effective control of the port at Macau, the enclave would not compete economically with Hong Kong (Pina-Cabral 2002: 60). The argument that Macau was a dominion of the Chinese emperor was the stance that British authorities would take more than once to limit its own obligations to aid the enclave when it came into conflict with Chinese officials. The legalistic view at the centre was that Britain had no obligation unless China was the aggressor and the appeal for assistance came directly from the Portuguese to the British

government. Meanwhile, British officials in Hong Kong were reticent to see the alliance creating obligations for the British in Hong Kong with respect to the defence of Macau for reasons both practical and political. In a dispatch to Lord Aberdeen, the British official, Sir John Davis, in Hong Kong, wrote:

> I am desirous to express my entire concurrence in this (Sir H. Pottinger's) views and opinions concerning Macao, and the impolicy of regarding that place as any other than a portion of Chinese dominions, when the Portuguese are permitted to reside on mere sufferance. As the Chinese sovereignty there is acknowledged—they drove the English merchants away from that place in 1839, with or without the concurrence of the Portuguese, their vassals—it would be pregnant with the greatest inconvenience to admit the pretension of the Portuguese also, and so have to do with two masters of the same place. The Portuguese claim to allegiance to British residents might be answered at once by their avowed inability to afford protection (quoted in Gunn 1995: 59-60).

In these years, the British consul in Macau existed only intermittently and sometimes only when Chinese officials agreed to the appointment. This was partly out of British concern that diplomatic relations with the Portuguese at Macau not be seen as taking a position on the conflict between Portugal and China with respect to sovereignty in Macau (Gunn 1995: 62).

However, by contrast, when it came to stopping other European powers from gaining a foothold in Macau, the British authorities did evoke their alliance with Portugal in an attempt to stop it. This was an issue when the British became concerned about the aggressive intensions of the French in southern China, which resulted in the Franco-Chinese war of 1884-5 and French designs on Macau. The enclave's vulnerability and uncertain borders worried the British authorities. They not only were concerned that Macau would also prove a vulnerable point in the embargo that aimed to stop the flow of weapons and ammunition to rebels challenging the imperial Chinese government, but they needed the cooperation of Macau officials in their efforts, through the British-controlled Chinese Imperial Maritime Customs, to manage the import of opium into China (Gunn 1995: 62-5).

When the Portuguese finally did negotiate the 1887 Treaty of Amity and Commerce of 1887 recognizing its "perpetual occupation" of Macau, it did so only at British sufferance and in a way that reflected the key alliance obligations of Portugal with respect to its overseas dependencies. That is, the alliance obligation that required the Portuguese authorities not to grant major concessions in their colonies to any foreign company or group without the prior permission of the British authorities (Caldwell 1942). The 1887 Treaty required that Portugal cooperate in controlling the opium trade and remain neutral with respect to Franco-Chinese issues. A consequence of the latter was that Portuguese authorities had to refuse a French request to establish a coaling depot in Macau for the French fleet, because it was against British interests. Moreover, with Portugal on firmer footing in Macau, Britain could be less worried that the government in Lisbon might trade Macau with the French in exchange for African territory (Moseley 1959: 270). As Coates wrote, "It was a characteristic last touch to British relations with Macao that, even when the Portuguese settlement finally achieved the rights it demanded [with respect to China], it only did so when and because this suited British interests" (Coates 1978: 102).

This was part of a wider pattern. As the next section discusses, with respect to Portugal's African territories and ambitions in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, British imperial authorities proved themselves willing to use Portuguese territory as pawns in its negotiations with Germany. Yet, even while events in China exhibited these similar alliance dynamics, reflecting the broader asymmetries of power between the British and Portuguese, local context still mattered. Future research should assess the ways in which British Hong Kong policies towards Macau were influenced by the political power of British merchants in the territory. After all, trade was Hong Kong's *raison d'être.* It will also be important to assess whether and how differences in identity and interests between the local Macanese and Portuguese imperial authorities affected attitudes towards British Hong Kong and the Anglo-Portuguese alliance, especially as many Macanese were dependent upon being interpreters and intermediaries for British commercial interests. Some even joined the new Hong Kong administration or, in later years, took refuge in Hong Kong during conflicts between the Portuguese Macau and Chinese authorities (Pina-Cabral 2002: 66-7).

Imperial Competition, Revolutions, and World Wars

In the period from the late nineteenth century to 1945, an era of European imperial competition in Africa, of revolution in Portugal and civil war in Spain, and of two World Wars, the British authorities continued to use the alliance to protect Portugal's overseas dependencies from takeover by rival imperial states. According to West (1938: 218), "Portugal owed her existence solely to the rivalry between the great European Powers and was allowed to retain her overseas possessions only by the maintenance of the Anglo-Portuguese alliance". However, as alliance practices on the south China coast illustrate, British protection for Portugal's empire was far from unconditional. Its main concerns were territories had strategic value with respect to British economic and political imperial interests. British authorities were willing to challenge the imperial policies and tenure of their ally when necessary in terms of British interests, as the infamous ultimatum of 1890 and negotiations with Germany over Portugal's African territories made evident (see Stone 1975; West 1938; Gallagher 1986).

Thus, in this period, British authorities aimed to block its European and, later, Japanese rivals from gaining a foothold in or taking over Macau, but were unenthusiastic about protecting Portuguese tenure in Macau when it meant confronting Chinese authorities. The 1887 Treaty of Amity and Commerce had only formally solved the sovereignty issue. The Chinese government did not in practice accept the validity of the treaty, and the Portuguese in Macau had little with which to enforce it. The British authorities accepted the end result—an effective continuation of mixed jurisdiction. This is demonstrated by the British response to conflicts both before and after World War I.

In the years prior to WWI, not all British officials at the imperial centre thought Britain gained from the alliance. The administrative neglect and economic underdevelopment in Portugal's overseas colonies was a frequent theme in policy discussions. According to Vincent-Smith, for Sir Edward Grey, British Foreign Secretary (1905-16), the price of allying with Portugal was both material and a matter of reputation:

> For him the alliance could not be separated from the reprehensible aspects of Portuguese affairs, both domestic and foreign. In his opinion it seemed that too often, especially in their colonies, the Portuguese encouraged or condoned doubtful expedients, such as gambling and opium smuggling at Macao, which directly or indirectly provided the revenue to cover the administrative expenses not only of that remarkable outpost but of Timor and the Portuguese legation at Peking; and that these practices could only bring Britain into disrepute when she was in effect asked to associate herself with them (Vincent-Smith 1975: 718).

In British Hong Kong, the concerns additionally were that defending Portuguese Macau in its disputes with the Chinese would cost Hong Kong in terms of its own relationship with China and gain it little. Following World War I, an attempt to dredge the Macau harbours led to conflicts with China because Macau's maritime boundaries had not been delineated in the 1887 treaty. Portuguese Macau authorities invoked the Anglo-Portuguese alliance to ask for British help against what they saw as Chinese aggression. However, as historian Monalto de Jesus recounts, the British gave a "little convincing" diplomatic intervention, acting through its consul in Guangzhou as they lacked a representative in Macau (Monalto de Jesus 1990: 295 and n.307). In 1919, the British foreign office again determined that the alliance was not binding in a dispute between China and Portugal (Gunn 1995: 68), effectively affirming Chinese jurisdiction in the enclave. In 1927, when Anglo-Portuguese relations were strained at the imperial centres, Austen Chamberlain, then British foreign minister, advocated reassessing the alliance. He saw it costing Britain more than it gained, including by the defence of Macau:

> The Portuguese claim our support on all manner of occasions on the ground of our alliance, for example, for their candidature for the council [of the League of Nations] and at the other end of the world for the defense of Macao, and again in India for the maintenance of the authority in British India of the Portuguese Patriarchate. I can see what we stand to lose by the Treaty of Windsor [1899]; I cannot see what we gain (Stone 1975: 733).

In the end, the British assessment of the material costs of the alliance and the impact it would have on their reputation appear to have been overridden by the judgement that maintaining the alliance contributed to keeping Portuguese territories from falling into the hands of other powers. In 1935, the Portuguese authorities had to

consult with British counterparts when Pan American Airways petitioned to establish a radio and ground facility in Macau (Caldwell 1942). However, very soon more serious events caused the British to worry about the vulnerability of Macau and Portuguese Timor to takeover by a threatening state—the extension through the 1930s of the military power of imperial Japan across China and in southeast Asia.

With the onset of formal war, Portugal, under the terms of the alliance, was to adopt a position of benevolent neutral, enabling Britain to use Portuguese ports and cross Portuguese territories (Caldwell 1942). In the end, the tenuous neutrality of Macau proved a godsend to some 100,000 refugees from the anti-Japanese war that surrounded it. Encircled by Japanese-controlled territory, tiny Macau was isolated, overcrowded, desperately short of food and other supplies, and threatened by Japanese takeover, to which Timor was to succumb (Levi 1946). Nevertheless, the local authorities and many residents acted with great humanity and courage in providing for the refugees. Amongst the latter were many Chinese from across the *Porto do Cerco*, but also, particularly after the fall of Hong Kong in December 1941, many British subjects and other Hong Kong residents (see Teixeira n.d.).

In the war years, Portuguese Macau officials and other residents, as well as British officials, interpreted their obligations to one another in their own ways, sometimes paying a high price for doing so. Because of the vulnerability of Macau to Japanese pressures, Macau's Portuguese officials had to play both sides at times. Some concessions to the Japanese caused British officials to complain that Portugal was not conducting itself according to the rules of neutrality. At the same time, the enclave provided cover for Sino-British intelligence activities—Britain and China were wartime allies (Wilson 1990: 131). Wealthier local Chinese helped to finance anti-Japanese resistance across the border and at times organized armed expeditions into China to take money and goods to the Chinese forces (Pinto 1996: 89). Presumably Portuguese Macau officials had some knowledge of these activities. From 1943, several dozen Portuguese soldiers escaped Macau to join the allied troops in China. By one account, it was the British consul in Macau whose intervention stopped more from doing so (Ibid., 95), perhaps to prevent retaliatory action on the part of Japan. Pinto recounts that many of

these soldiers never came back to Macau or any Portuguese territory for fear of being prosecuted for desertion.

The 500th Anniversary of Macau, the 1966/67 Riots, and the 1974 Revolution

The post-war years were to bring new challenges to the legitimacy of European authority in both Macau and Hong Kong, partly due to the political forces unleashed by the Communist Revolution in China, which established the People's Republic in 1949, and later, in the case of Macau, because of Portugal's own democratization. Prior to the later process, the two colonial administrations had similar interests in adjusting their administration to the new political realities to forestall pressures for political reform, decolonization, if not outright annexation by the new China. The authorities of the two territories were not equally successful in doing so. Anglo-Portuguese relations at the local level had a role in the outcomes, albeit one secondary to those of Chinese officials and local Chinese residents of the two enclaves.

The period 1955 to 1957 marked five hundred years of Portuguese presence in Macau. The Portuguese Overseas Ministry in Lisbon put pressure on the Macau Governor, Marques Esparteiro, to commemorate the anniversary with special events. Realizing such an event could spark a local political backlash against Portuguese authority, the Governor was reluctant to act, and only began the preparations against his better judgement. In the end the plans were halted due to pressure from the Chinese leadership, signalled through local Macau Chinese newspapers, but also conveyed by Chinese Premier Zhou Anlai through the British Governor of Hong Kong, Sir Alexander Grantham, who passed the message on. Portugal and China had no diplomatic contact at the time (Pina-Cabral 2002: 132-33).

The anti-government riots that rocked both territories in 1966/67 were graver challenges, particularly for Macau. Locally known as the 1-2-3- Incident, the Macau riots were connected with the Cultural Revolution upheavals over the border in China, under

Communist government since 1949. However, they were most immediately triggered by the excessive use of violence by local Macau police in their attempt to stop the building of an unauthorized addition to a pro-Communist school on Taipa island. They resulted in the death of eight Macau Chinese residents and the injury of hundreds of other people. Even prior to the riots, the Portuguese and Chinese communists both had de facto jurisdiction in Macau, running the enclave through local business and communist middle men (Moseley 1959). As a result of the events, which eventually pushed the Portuguese governor to make a humiliating public apology, what remained of Portuguese control was undermined. The local Portuguese authorities were left politically dependent on local pro-PRC leaders.

Diplomatic contacts at the time of the riots suggest a continuation of the pattern of Anglo-Portuguese relations on the south China coast of previous decades. As the crisis heightened, the Portuguese authorities asked Britain for support if the evacuation of Macau became necessary, including for help with transport. However, while the British did accept the evacuees (more than 5,000), they would not allowed British-flagged vessels to assist, fearing clashes with PRC boats. The British also imposed other conditions on their aid, including that the Portuguese provide the evacuees with transfers out of Hong Kong as quickly as possible and that they only allow in Portuguese nationals (though they also allowed in individuals with Hong Kong connections (Castanheira 1999). According to José Pedro Castanheira (1999: 272), Portuguese officials expressed disappointment with the British response. This was not only because of the "friendship" between Portugal and Britain, but because of the generosity of so many in Macau during the war. For their part, British Hong Kong officials wanted to avoid any actions that might provoke riots in Hong Kong and were, as usual, anxious to avoid a confrontation with China. There would have been little Britain could do if the Chinese, provoked by the anti-imperialist fervour of the Red Guard, had determined they wanted to take back either Macau or Hong Kong. What saved both was only partly what the Portuguese and British officials did,[3] and it likely had nothing to do with their political support of each other

[3] Nevertheless, the British authorities in Hong Kong were much more effective in handling the much less serious disturbances related to the Cultural Revolution that hit the

during the crisis, such as it was. More critical was the view of the PRC leadership that the territories were useful to China left under European administration for the time being (Welsh 1994: 470-71). They were a means for Communist China—internationally isolated and subject to economic sanctions—to communicate and do business with the outside world.

The question of Macau's future arose again when, after the Portuguese Democratic Revolution of 1974, the Portuguese government moved to decolonize and offered to turn Macau over to China. However, Macau was useful to the PRC the way it was. It was a channel for acquiring strategic goods, for drug and gold smuggling, as well as for moving hard currency remittances. PRC officials were also concerned that taking back Macau would destabilize Hong Kong, which was even more economically and politically valuable. Again, the policies of the Chinese government determined the outcome—a secret Sino-Portuguese deal in 1979 confirming Macau was Chinese sovereign territory, but would continue to be administered by the Portuguese for the time being. At the same time, the outcome favoured the interests of the British authorities, who did not want outright decolonization in Macau to put pressure on China to take back Hong Kong. The question was all the more urgent as 1997 approached, the year the 99-year lease on Hong Kong's New Territories would run out. Because of the Anglo-Portuguese history of alliance and friendly relations, it seem probable that the British government also had been informed of the 1979 Sino–Portuguese agreement on Macau's status as a Chinese territory under Portuguese administration.

The Transitions to PRC Rule in Macau and Hong Kong

In recent decades, the Anglo-Portuguese alliance has become less important. As Tom Gallagher wrote, it "may still exist on paper but it has lost much of its earlier

---

territory five months after those in Macau, coming out of the crisis with more effective rule of law and administration (see Welsh 1994).

meaning now that both parties to the treaty have shed their empires and are grappling with an uncomfortable new role in the EEC" (Gallagher 1986: 45). However, the south China coast was an exception to this generalization in the sense that there, both states still had overseas territories for which they were responsible. Not that the treaty had any real meaning. However, no doubt the two governments and their Hong Kong and Macau maintained close contact during the process of negotiating and implementing the agreements with China by which Hong Kong and Macau would be turned over to the PRC in 1997 and 1999 respectively. Nevertheless, as during much of the history of the two territories, it was the policies of the Chinese government that determined the outcome and ensured that the ending of European rule in the two territories would be intimately intertwined processes. Yes, the PRC's relationships with the two territories and colonial governments were distinctive, as discussed earlier. At the same time, the post-Mao PRC authorities saw Macau and Hong Kong as part of the same problem. At some level, both territories symbolized China's humiliations at the hands of European imperialism. The PRC leadership was to use the same "one country, two systems" policy to reunify the enclaves with China, with the grand nationalist prize being the bringing of Taiwan back to the motherland.

This tendency to see the territories as part of the same historical problem was evident much earlier. Over the years, the CCP dealt with Macau and Hong Kong through a single office under the State Council, a single leading group under the Politburo and a single local organ of the CCP, known as the Hong Kong and Macau Work Committee. Hong Kong and Macau Chinese residents were given the special designation (which they note was normally preferential, but proved discriminatory during the Cultural Revolution) *Gang-Ao tongbao*, Hong Kong and Macau compatriots (Hook and Neves 2002: 112). What Zhou Anlai termed a policy of "long term calculation and full utilization" guided PRC treatment of the future of the two territories (Chan 2003). In March 1972, not long after taking the China seat in the United Nations, the PRC government had indicated that it unequivocally regarded Macau and Hong Kong as PRC sovereign territory. It told the UN Special Committee on Colonialism that the two territories should be removed from the list of colonial territories, as their future was not a matter of international concern but rather a decision to be taken by the Chinese

authorities alone. Accordingly, China would settle the question of Hong Kong and Macau at the correct moment and would meanwhile take advantage of the territories as much as possible. Consequently, when the PRC leadership chose to negotiate an end to Portuguese and British rule, it did so by allowing both territories a "high degree of autonomy" as Special Administrative Regions for 50 years.

In fact, if the long-term goal was to take back Taiwan with a similar policy, the short-term goal with this policy was to incorporate liberal capitalist Hong Kong into a communist China that was then only just beginning to marketize. The PRC would achieve national reunification, while preserving the economic prosperity and political stability of Hong Kong, whose capitalist investors were emerging as the motor of post-Mao China's economic modernization. That an almost identical autonomy arrangement was used to reincorporate Macau into the PRC was, again, a PRC decision, one that paid little regard for the distinctive attributes and problems of the Portuguese enclave.

Notably, given the above analysis of the high price Macau had sometimes paid historically for Britain's conflictual relations with China, in these final years the tables turned somewhat. The Portuguese authorities had not only already accepted Chinese sovereignty over Macau and had historically often had more cordial relations with the Chinese than had the British, the population of Macau was considerably more quiescent about the prospect of PRC administration than their Hong Kong counterparts. Thus, even though there were many areas of disagreement between the Chinese and Portuguese negotiators, the Portuguese did not draw the same public rebukes from China as the British. The latter continued to assert the validity of the nineteenth-century treaties establishing British rule in Hong Kong. Following the Tiananmen massacre of mostly student protestors in Beijing in 1989, Hong Kong people held massive street protests and the British and British Hong Kong governments publicly criticized China and attempted to speed up democratization and strengthen human rights protections in Hong Kong in anticipation of PRC rule. Pro-democratic candidates won most of the seats up for direct election in the Hong Kong legislature. Macau was comparatively quiescent, and the Portuguese government did not publicly condemn China's brutality (Hook and Neves 2002).

After the Tiananmen events, the Portuguese appear to have gained from the growing antagonism between China and Britain. The different approach of the British and Portuguese administrations gave the Chinese government more leeway publicly to play one government and policy off against the other (see Sandschneider 2002). China more aggressively and publicly drew attention to the differences between the Portuguese and British government approaches to the transition, painting one as cooperative the other not. Whether the Chinese actually treated Macau better in order to encourage the British to be more compliant is difficult to say. However, they did publicly demonstrate their willingness to be generous and benevolent towards those who accepted their wishes and acknowledged China's power and importance—a message not lost on the people of Hong Kong and Macau. In the event, the departing Portuguese authorities did make some gains as they moved to take advantage of the situation. China tolerated the Portuguese approach to localization of the Macau administration, even though it was half-hearted because the Portuguese wanted some Macanese and Portuguese to maintain positions so as to maintain influence after the 1999 handover (Chan 2003). Pro-China elites in Macau also went along with this. Chinese authorities also cooperated on major public works projects involving contracts to Portuguese consortia, such as a new airport and bridges, a marked contrast with Sino-British conflicts over contracts and financing related to the new airport in Hong Kong. Chinese authorities also cooperated with the use of Macau public funds to pay for Portuguese cultural monuments in Macau (Edmonds and Yee 1999). The Portuguese Macau government even built public monuments symbolizing the cordial and cooperative relations between China and Portugal: the second Macau-Taipa "Friendship" bridge (*Ponte de Amizade* or *Youyi Daquio)* and the Gate of Understanding monument in the outer harbour. In 1992, they even took down a prominent statute of the former Macau Governor Amaral, who had led the campaign to more firmly establish Portuguese tenure in Macau in the mid-nineteenth century (Cheng 1999: 209-210). That China's public charm offensive towards Portugal in Macau largely ended with the Hong Kong handover reveals its strategic motivation (Chan 2003).

With the end of empire on the south China coast and the Hong Kong and Macau Special Administrative Regions well-established, the British and Portuguese governments largely have similar interests in their former colonies and in China. As Brian Hook and

Miguel Santos Neves tell us, both want to expand trade and investment ties with China as well as with the two territories and to maintain good political relations with China, given its increasingly important international political role. Both want Hong Kong and Macau to be economically successful and politically stable. No doubt some in Britain and Portuguese would also like to see the two territories democratize and strengthen other human rights, but it is not clear under what conditions a British or Portuguese government would be willing to sacrifice relations with China or even anti-democratic Hong Kong and Macau capitalists, to achieve this. The Portuguese also want to protect Portuguese culture in Macau, not least of all for the sake of Macau's creole community, the Macanese. Meanwhile, both governments also have ongoing international legal obligations in their respective former territories. They are responsible to protect their nationals living there. They also must ensure that the PRC keeps its commitments under the Sino-Portuguese and Sino-British Joint Declarations. In the event of a serious problem in Hong Kong or Macau, such as the undermining of rights, freedoms, the application of laws prohibiting treason, secession, sedition and subversion, or the declaration of a state of emergency, the two European governments would be likely act in the context of a pan-European Union response (Hook and Neves 2002). The historical alliance between Portugal and Britain would have little significance, at least for the governments involved.

Future Research

In a good deal of the international relations literature about alliances, states—understood as unitary actors—are said to form alliances in response to shared interests or a community of fears. Similar interpretations have often been made of the Anglo-Portuguese alliance. At the same time, considerable attention has been paid by historians to the extent to which the power asymmetries between the two alliance partners meant that the Portuguese typically paid the higher price for any gains made through the relationship, and that the British side tended to set the terms of the alliance, narrowing or

broadening is applicability as interests and appropriateness dictated. The analysis in this research note suggests we see similar patterns with respect to Macau and Hong Kong. However, it also suggests that Anglo-Portuguese relations on the south China coast were more distinctive and complex than a unitary understanding of states allows. It suggests, as a conceptual starting point for future research, that alliances are social practices performed in multiple localities by both state as well as non-state actors, some of which are at least partly locally constituted. That is, the identities, perceptions, and interests of the political, economic, and military actors who perform alliances are in significant ways constituted through local social processes, including in the cases studied here, those involving Chinese authorities. The result of these local social processes may or may not accord with the interpretations of interests, threats, fears, and alliance obligations of actors of actors associated with the imperial centre. Consequently, alliance politics are partly about alliance members with unequal power—such as the Portuguese and British—trying to persuade each other to perform the alliance in ways deemed desirable way, whether in terms of interests or appropriateness.[4] However, alliance politics are also about imperial or other political centres persuading or controlling actors "within" the same member state who have contradictory understandings of how the relationship should be performed. Claims about shared identities, interests, and fears are central to this process and an essential part of alliance politics. It will be important for future research on Anglo-Chinese relations with respect to Hong Kong and Macau to pay attention to historical and contemporary narratives that make such claims and to analyse their political effects.

References

Boxer, C. R., 1986, "Second Thoughts on the Anglo-Portuguese Alliance, 1661-1808", *History Today* 36(June): 22-26.

Caldwell, R. G., 1942, "The Anglo-Portuguese Alliance Today", *Foreign Affairs* 21: 149-57.

Castanheira, José Pedro, 1999, *Os 58 Dias que Abalaram Macau*, Lisboa and Macau: Publicaçoes Dom Quixote/Livros do Oriente.

[4] For an example, focusing on the US-led Western alliance during the Cold War, see Klein (1994), esp. Ch. 5.

Chan, Ming K., 2003, "Different Roads to Home: The Retrocession of Hong Kong and Macau to Chinese Sovereignty", *Journal of Contemporary China* 12: 493-518.

Cheng, Christina Mui Bing, 1999, *Macau: A Cultural Janus,* Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Coates, Austin, 1988, *Macao and the British, 1637-1842,* Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Coates, Austin, 1978, *A Macao Narrative*, Hong Kong: Heinemann.

Coates, Austin, 1966, *Prelude to Hong Kong,* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Crisswell, Colin N., 1981, *The Taipans: Hong Kong's Merchant Princes,* Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Edmonds, Richard Louis and Herbert S. Yee, 1999, "Macau: From Portuguese Autonomous Territory to Chinese Special Administrative Region ", *China Quarterly* 160: 801-817.

Endacott, G. B., 1973, *A History of Hong Kong, Rev. edn.,* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gallagher, Tom, 1986, "Anglo-Portuguese Relations Since 1900", *History Today* 36(June): 39-45.

Grose, Clyde, 1930, "The Anglo-Portuguese Marriage of 1662", *The Hispanic American Historical Review* 10(3): 313-52.

Gunn, Geoffrey C., *Encountering Macau: A Portuguese City-State on the Periphery of China, 1557-1999,* Boulder: Westview, 1996.

Hook, Brian and Miguel Santos Neves, 2002, "The Role of Hong Kong and Macau in China's Relations with Europe", *China Quarterly* 169: 108-135.

Klein, Bradley S., 1994, *Strategic Studies and World Order: The Global Politics of Deterrence,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Levi, Werner, 1946, "Portuguese Timor and the War", *Far Eastern Economic Review* 15(14)(July 17): 221-23.

Ligthart, Henk and Henk Reitsma, 1988, "Portugal's Semi-Peripheral Middleman Role in its Relations With England, 1640-1760", *Political Geography Quarterly* 7(4): 353-62.

Moller, Kay, 2002, "Diplomatic Relations and Mutual Strategic Perceptions: China and the European Union," *China Quarterly* 169: 10-32.

Monalto de Jesus, C.A.,1990, *Macau Historico,* Macau: Livros do Oriente.

Moseley, George V. H., 1959, "New China and Old Macao", *Pacific Affairs* 32: 268-76.

Pina-Cabral, João de, 2002, *Between China and Europe: Person, Culture and Emotion in Macao,* London: Continuum.

Pinto, Ricardo, 1996, "War in Peace", *Macau,* 70-103.

Porter, Jonathan, 1996, *Macau: The Imaginary City, Culture and Society 1557 to the Present,* Boulder: Westview.

Prestige, Edgar, "The Anglo-Portuguese Alliance", *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 4th Ser., Vol. 17: 69-100.

Sandschneider, Eberhard, 2002, "China's Diplomatic Relations with the States of Europe", *China Quarterly* 169: 33-44.

Sprecher, Christopher and Volker Krause, 2006 "Alliances, Armed Conflict, and Cooperation: Theoretical Approaches and Empirical Evidence," *Journal of Peace Research* 43(4): 363–369.

Stone, Glyn A., 1975, "The Official British Attitude to the Anglo-Portuguese Alliance, 1910-45", *Journal of Contemporary History* 10(4): 729-46.

Teixeira, Manual, n.d., *Macau Durante a Guerra*, Macau: n.p.

Vincent –Smith, J. D., 1975, "The Portuguese Republic and Britain: 1910-1914", *Journal of Contemporary History* 10(4): 707-27.

Welsh, Frank, 1997, *A History of Hong Kong*, rev. edn., London: HarperCollins.

West, S. George, 1938, "The Present Situation in Portugal", *International Affairs* 17(2): 211-32.

Wilson, Dick, 1990, *Hong Kong! Hong Kong!* London: Unwin Hyman.

Yee, Herbert S., 2001, *Macau in Transition: From Colony to Autonomous Region*, London: Palgrave.