

"Japanese Southward Expansion in the South Seas and its Relations with Japanese Settlers in Papua and New Guinea, 1919-1940"

著者	"IWAMOTO Hiromitsu"
journal or publication title	南太平洋研究=South Pacific Study
volume	17
number	1
page range	29-81
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/10232/55

Japanese Southward Expansion in the South Seas and its Relations with Japanese Settlers in Papua and New Guinea, 1919-1940

Hiromitsu IWAMOTO¹⁾

Abstract

Japanese policies toward *nan'yō* (the South Seas) developed rapidly in the inter-war period (1919-1940). After the invasion in China in the early 1930s, trade-oriented *nanshin* (southward advancement) policies gradually gained aggressiveness, as the military began to influence making foreign policies. Behind this change, *nanshin-ron* (southward advancement theory) advocates provided ideological justification for the Japanese territorial expansion in the South Seas. In these circumstances, Japanese settlers in Papua and New Guinea were put in a peculiar position: the emergence of militaristic Japan probably stimulated their patriotism but it also endangered their presence because they were in the colony of Australia - the nation that traditionally feared invasion from the north. However, as the Australian government continued to restrict Japanese migration, numerically their presence became marginal. But, unproportional to their population, economically they prospered and consolidated their status as 'masters' (although not quite equal to their white counterparts) in the Australian colonial apparatus. In this paper, I shall analyse how this unique presence of the Japanese settlers developed, examining its relations with the Japanese expansion in the South Seas and the Australian policies that tried to counter the expansion.

Key words: inter-war period, Japanese settlers, Papua and New Guinea, *nanshin*, Australia

Introduction

The Australian civil administration was established in 1921 and inherited policies established during the military period. The administration continued to restrict Japanese migration to New Guinea and also trading for several years. Consequently Japanese influence became marginal: by 1940 their population had shrunk to about 40. Besides, Komine Isokichi (the leader of the Japanese community in New Guinea)⁽¹⁾ died in 1934. The nature of the community also changed. They were mostly businessmen, unlike the earlier period when most Japanese were artisans or labourers.

1) Collaborative researcher. Kagoshima University Research Center for the South Pacific, Kagoshima 890, Japan

1. Japan, Australia and New Guinea in international politics

The international situation changed rapidly in the interwar period. Bargaining and appeasement were arrayed in the process of constructing and de-constructing the international collective security systems. Imperial powers' struggle continued to secure their colonies. Australia recognised the increasing strategic value of New Guinea, while Japan was Japanising Micronesia.

At the Paris Peace Conference (1919-1921), the victors of World War I bargained to divide German colonies, and tried to secure their spoils through the League of Nations. A new colonial map was drawn in the Pacific-Asia region - German colonies vanished but more colonies accrued to Japan and Australia.

To Japan, the Conference was a milestone, in that the western powers accepted her as a major colonial power: she was counted as one of the Five Powers (with Britain, France, the US and Italy). In Japan newspapers reported daily discussions of Japanese delegates with their western counterparts and excited the public. Similarly, the Conference was significant to Australia: her representation as a Dominion represented the acknowledgment of nationhood.⁽²⁾ As a result, discussions concerning Japan and Australia were affected by the pride and prestige as young modern nations. This reinforced their mutual perceptions: the image of racist Australians was imprinted on Japanese memories, while Australians increased their suspicion of expansionist Japanese looking at every opportunity to take white men's lands.

Although silent on European affairs, the Japanese were vocal on Pacific-Asia matters: especially the cession of German rights in Shantung Province, their claim to German Micronesia and the abolition of racial discrimination. Of those three, the Shantung Province was the issue of which they were most determined not to compromise. The province was a gateway to Japanese expansion in East Asia and a shield against the Russian southward expansion. The government instructed its delegates not to sign the treaty if their claim was rejected.⁽³⁾ The Japanese also had a strong claim to German colonies north of the equator, reinforced by a secret treaty made with Britain during the war. The Japanese insistence on the insertion of a racial equality clause in the charter of the League of Nations was weaker than those two claims. It was a matter of prestige that: they saw the discriminatory treatment of Japanese in the US, Canada and Australia as a disgrace; and that they should be treated equally as their western counterparts, as citizens of a modern independent nation, not like other Asians colonised by western powers.⁽⁴⁾

Against those claims, the leading Australian delegate, William Hughes, strongly opposed the last two, because both challenged the essence of Australian defence and foreign policy - the White Australia Policy. However, his main opponent in the German territory issue was not the Japanese but the US President, Woodrow Wilson, who proposed the mandatory system in which all countries should have the same right of access. Wilson's proposal was based on his idealistic Fourteen Points, but in effect it was also aimed at countering other colonial powers' expansion in the Pacific. Hughes thought that this proposal would threaten Australia's exclusive right to German New Guinea, as it would allow Japanese access. To

Hughes, New Guinea was a buffer against Japan's southward expansion: 'The ring of these South Pacific islands encompasses Australia like a chain of fortresses..... and any Power which controls New Guinea, controls Australia.'⁽⁵⁾ He vigorously resisted Wilson's proposal. The Japanese also objected, although less vigorously, being concerned about their commercial rights in New Guinea. After lengthy discussions and compromise, agreement was reached finally: Class 'C' Mandates - virtually exclusive colonies - were applied to all German Pacific territories.

In the eyes of Hughes, the Japanese proposal of racial equality was closely associated with the mandate issue. He thought that the Japanese were trying to manipulate in order to send migrants to New Guinea as well as to Australia.⁽⁶⁾ Hughes frantically opposed it, because he thought that 'to allow coloured immigration was to risk social suicide, to jeopardise a society.'⁽⁷⁾ Although the Japanese 'had no wish to dispatch immigrants' to Australia and their proposal was 'essentially a matter of prestige',⁽⁸⁾ Hughes was relentless despite the objection of Edmund Piesse, the Director of the Pacific Branch in the Prime Minister's Department. Piesse suggested that:

But even if there are reasons for maintaining racial discriminations against Asiatics, we must face the facts that these discriminations give great offence in Japan, and to a less extent in other Asiatic countries, that they contribute to the maintenance of strained relations between Japan and the white races, and they are used in Japan as a justification for armaments - the existence of which contribute in turn to the maintenance of armaments in Australia and other white countries. Are racial discriminations so vital to us that it is worthwhile to maintain them when they produce these results? Surely the answer is that they are not.⁽⁹⁾

However, the White Australia Policy was a sacred cow which most Australians would not sacrifice for anything. John Latham, one of the delegates, wrote:

The principle of White Australia is almost a religion in Australia. Upon it depends the possibility of the continuance of white democracy - indeed, of any democracy, in a real sense - in this continent. Any surrender of the policy is inconceivable - it rests upon the right of every self-governing community to determine the ingredients of its own population. If that right is surrendered, the essence of self-government disappears.⁽¹⁰⁾

It was a 'moral imperative' for Hughes to scrap the Japanese proposal, even if it was watered down eliminating any reference to migration.⁽¹¹⁾ Finally, the Japanese gave up their proposal, and used it only as a bargaining chip for western acknowledgment of Japanese rights in Shantung.⁽¹²⁾ Thus the Australian objection facilitated the Japanese expansion in China. Similarly, the Australian objection consolidated Japanese exclusive control of Micronesia, as the Japanese could use the same argument to prevent non-Japanese from entering. As

Nelson rightly argues, it was a dilemma for Australians that 'every time they asserted the right to keep what they held and to impose their unfettered right on their new possessions, they were by implication strengthening the case of the Japanese to have their way in Micronesia.'⁽¹³⁾

The Paris Conference led to the establishment of the so-called 'Washington System' in which major western powers and Japan concluded several treaties at Washington in 1921 and 1922. It reinforced the 'Pax Anglo-Saxonica', establishing a collective security system to maintain the status quo set at the Paris Conference.⁽¹⁴⁾ Limitations on naval armaments were agreed, although they in reality gave Japan naval superiority against the US in the Pacific. And the Four-Power Pact was concluded among the US, Britain, France and Japan, replacing the Anglo-Japanese Alliance which had been antagonising the US.

In concluding the treaties, Japan was obliged to cooperate with the western powers because of the 'dual' nature of the development of her imperialism: militarily Japan was catching up with the west but economically she was still heavily dependent on the US and Britain for raw materials and markets.⁽¹⁵⁾ At this stage Japan needed to avoid conflict with the western powers in order to develop its economy.

On the abolition of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, Australia (although not represented at the Conference) initially objected, fearing that Britain would not be able to restrain Japanese from expanding in the Pacific. However, seeing the collective security system established, Hughes (then the Prime Minister) ratified the treaties, saying,

This Treaty establishes an equilibrium in the Pacific. As far as any action of man can do so, it insures peace for the next ten years for Australia.⁽¹⁶⁾

Hughes's optimism proved right. In the 1920s Japan and Australia enjoyed relatively relaxed relations. Their trade steadily grew and the shift of the destination of Japanese emigration to South America mitigated the Australian fear of the 'Yellow Peril'. Piesse observed that 'the danger to Australia from an increase of population in Japan seems remote, and should not affect Australia's attitude toward her'.⁽¹⁷⁾ Indeed the mid-1920s was a temporary 'golden period' in Japan-Australia relations.⁽¹⁸⁾

However, the Great Depression of 1929 initiated the collapse of the Washington System. 'Have not' nations such as Japan, Germany and Italy began to challenge the System set up by 'have' nations such as Britain, the US and France. Those 'have not' nations sought opportunities to expand their colonies in order to overcome their economic stagnation. In the 1930s, Japan sent troops to Manchuria. So did Germany to the Rhineland. And Italy invaded Ethiopia. But until the end of the decade, Britain, the US and France exercised 'appeasement' policies against those aggressive actions, attempting to maintain the colonial map drawn in Paris.

The London Naval Treaty of 1930, which aimed at balancing the naval strength of major powers (including Japan), resulted in a vain attempt to keep international peace. In the following year, Japan began to invade Manchuria and set up a puppet government. The

League of Nations, which was supposed to assure collective security, was useless to stop Japanese aggression: it did not take any concrete measures except condemning the action and recommending withdrawal from China. In Japan, some navy and army staff and right wingers expressed their indignation against the western objection to Japanese rule in Manchuria. They began to gain public support and gradually influenced foreign policy. Consequently Japan left the League of Nations in 1933 and the London Naval Treaty in 1936, demonstrating her apparent denial of the Pax Anglo-Saxonica.

In Australia, fear of Japan increased and was manifested in her foreign policies. First, Australians followed Britain's appeasement policy toward German aggression in Europe, presuming that open hostility, which might result in a British pact with Russia against German aggression in Poland, would make Japan cooperate closely with Germany, because Japan had been perceiving Russia as her most likely enemy in northeast Asia. In the Australian view, appeasement would prevent 'a war in the Pacific simultaneously with one in Europe - a situation in which Britain could not send sufficient strength to Singapore, and Australia would be left to defend itself.'⁽¹⁹⁾

Australians applied a similar appeasement policy against Japanese aggression in China, based on the optimistic assumption that so long as Japan was occupied in China, she would not advance south and would not threaten Australian security.⁽²⁰⁾ But the situation changed when the Washington System collapsed in 1936 by the Japanese abrogation of the London Naval Treaty. Then Australians attempted to neutralise the Japanese threat by establishing a collective security pact in the Pacific.⁽²¹⁾ They proposed the 'Pacific Pact' in 1937 and lobbied Russian, Chinese, French, Dutch, American and Japanese ambassadors in London and their governments to no avail.

In the late 1930s, the Australians desperately began to pressure Britain to reinforce the garrison at Singapore, seeing her defence capability as insufficient against possible Japanese invasion in the South Pacific. The government also adopted the 'trade diversion policy' which favoured British textile manufacturers and impeded Australia-Japan trade in wool and textiles. It was in an attempt to cajole Britain into diverting its military strength to the Pacific. But the policy was an 'irrational exercise in economic nationalism', as Australia-Japan trade was growing and was substantially in Australia's favour.⁽²²⁾ More significantly, the policy undermined Japanese good feelings towards Australia and 'revived anti-Australian sentiment in Japan where feelings bred of hostility to Hughes had apparently been softening.'⁽²³⁾

In 1938 the Japanese government declared the *Tōa shin chitsujo* [New Order in East Asia] to find a solution to the prolonged war in China, but the declaration failed to alleviate Chinese resistance and invited US economic sanctions. And Japanese isolation intensified. Then the government concluded the Tripartite Pact with Germany and Italy in 1940. The pact was aimed at facilitating southward aggression in Southeast Asia, presuming that the US would diminish her desire to be involved in Asian affairs and thereby Japan could avoid a head-on collision with the US.⁽²⁴⁾ The Japanese military also predicted that German victories in Europe would prevent Britain, France and Netherlands from being involved in

conflicts in Pacific-Asia if Japan invaded their colonies.

Micronesia was another reason for Japan to conclude the Tripartite Pact. Germany in the late 1930s, under Hitler's dictatorship, began to reclaim territorial rights in former colonies. At that time the strategic importance of Micronesia to Japan was increasing because of the possibility of naval operations in the south-west Pacific: Japan was building bases on the islands. The Japanese secretly negotiated with the Germans on a 'scheme for a public Japanese acknowledgment of the right of Germany to her former colonies accompanied by an agreement on Germany's part to sell her former Pacific islands mandated to Japan to the latter power.'⁽²⁵⁾ In later negotiations, the Japanese insisted upon their exclusive control of the South Seas and even proposed the division of Australian territories - Papua to Japan and New Guinea to Germany.⁽²⁶⁾ In the end, although excluded from the clauses of the Pact, verbal agreement was made: Japan would retain Micronesia; other former German Pacific territories would be returned to Germany after the war; and then Germany would sell some territories to Japan.⁽²⁷⁾

Meanwhile the Australians rebuffed the German claim. Pearce, then the Minister for External Affairs, said:

British policy, including Australian policy, is based on peace and international law and order, for which the League [of Nations] offers the only safe foundation. Therefore, any re-adjustment or general settlement in the interests of world peace must be within the framework of international justice and order, and not the result of a demand of right.....In effect, it [re-adjustment] amounts to a submission to blackmail - the temporary buying-off of any aggressive nation. For this reason alone, it is unthinkable that Australia should even consider the handing over of any territory.⁽²⁸⁾

The Australians faithfully adhered to the non-militarisation clause set to the mandate territory.

By contrast, the Japanese military was planning operations from Southeast Asia to the South Pacific. In Micronesia they secretly built bases. At the same time the government was making last ditch efforts to derive US concessions over China. However, the Tripartite Pact hardened US attitudes contrary to Japanese expectation, and the US reinforced its embargo on oil and froze Japanese assets. That was a severe blow to Japan which was heavily dependent on the US for oil supplies - essential fuel for naval operations. Thus, Japan had to find alternative sources of oil and other raw materials. Resource-rich Southeast Asia became a primary target. Consequently, shortly after the declaration of the *Dai tōa kyōei ken* (Greater East Asia Co-prosperity Sphere), Japan launched her attack against Pearl Harbour.

2. Maturation of *nanshin*

The acquisition of German Micronesia made *nanshin* no longer a mere theory and it gave a new concept to intellectuals, policy makers and businessmen: 'Micronesia and Taiwan would function as bases for the advance to Southeast Asia.'⁽²⁹⁾ A new geographical concept - 'Southeast'⁽³⁰⁾ - also appeared in a school text book in 1919, reflecting increased attention to Southeast Asia. Similarly new terms - *uchi* or *ura-nan'yō* (inner or back south Seas: Taiwan and Micronesia) and *soto* or *omote-nan'yō* (outer or front South Seas: India, Southeast Asia, Australia, Melanesia and Polynesia) - emerged around this time, showing the development of the Japanese conception of the South Seas that placed Japan in the centre of the south-west Pacific.

Numerous intellectuals advocated Japan's southward advance and the military joined their advocacy in the late 1930s. The military had to gain natural resources in Southeast Asia (particularly oil in Dutch East Indies) in order to continue their war in China, as the US and Britain imposed embargoes, responding to the Japanese aggression in China. At the same time the government introduced policies to facilitate Japanese trade with Southeast Asia, and included *nanshin* in the national policy in the late 1930s. Private companies and migrants followed this southward tide. The public was agitated by the bombardment of *nan'yō* literature, which increased drastically: even for general references, the number increased fourfold from 99 in 1920-29 to 405 in 1930-39.⁽³¹⁾

The main reason for the upsurge of Japanese interest in *nan'yō*, particularly Southeast Asia, was economic: new sources of raw materials and markets were needed for the development of heavy industry in order to catch up with western economies, and to diversify export markets to rectify heavy dependence on US and Chinese markets.⁽³²⁾ The government led the commercial promotion, which was demonstrated in the number of government publications. Taiwan *sōtoku kanbō chōsa ka* (Research Section of the Chief Secretary of Taiwan Governor-General), the leading government research institution of the South Seas, published about a hundred reports (*Minami-shina oyobi nan'yō chō sa* [Survey of South China and the South Seas] series) on trading, investment, management of plantations, fishery, mining and so on.

In the mid-1920s the Department of Foreign Affairs took an initiative. In 1926 the Department held the *Nan'yō Bōeki Kaigi* (South Seas Trade Conference), inviting officials of other departments and representatives of various industries, to promote South Seas trade. The main items on the agenda at the Conference were investment, trade, transport, customs and commercial treaties. It was a significant milestone showing the beginning of the government's involvement in that it was the Department of Foreign Affairs not private organisations such as the South Seas Society or the Chamber of Commerce and Industry that took the lead.⁽³³⁾

In 1928 the Department of Foreign Affairs presented a report entitled *Bōeki, kigyō oyobi imin yori mitaru nan'yō* [The South Seas in view of trade, companies and emigration], in which the Department proposed policies to promote trade, establish

organisations to facilitate export and investment, and a special fund to assist emigration. Although none of the proposals were put into practice, the report was significant.⁽³⁴⁾ The necessity for national commitment was acknowledged, as the Department used the term 'nan'yō kokusaku' (national policy towards the South Seas) for the first time in official reports.⁽³⁵⁾

Nanshin-ron advocates raised their voices in the early 1930s, responding to the collapse of the Washington System. They began to focus on the strategic argument, that *nan'yō* was Japan's life line, although carefully emphasising the necessity to avoid conflict with western colonial powers. Fujiyama Raita, Vice-President of the Nan'yō Kyōkai (South Seas Society), argued:

Nan'yō is our life line. It is at the forefront of our national defence. We should always consider this concept in our southward advance. However, we should not misunderstand. The Omote-*nan'yō* is all western colonies.....The western rule of Southeast Asia assures our national defence, and the development of their economies and relations with us facilitates the security of our life line and thereby our national defence.⁽³⁶⁾

The mid-1930s was the most significant period for the development of *nanshin-ron*. It began to turn militaristic, as the navy set out with a concrete *nanshin* plan. In 1935 the aggressive group, 'han-jōyaku ha' (anti-[London] Treaty faction), set up the Tai Nan'yō Hōsaku Kenkyū-kai (Study Committee for Policies towards the South Seas). The Committee studied both economic and military expansion; it advocated the promotion of trade and emigration through the Takumu shō (Department of Colonial Affairs) and the Nan'yō Kōhatsu Kaisha (South Seas Development Company) and emphasised the military role of Taiwan and Micronesia as advance bases.⁽³⁷⁾

The navy was already militarising Micronesia. In the early 1930s, after the western powers restricted Japanese naval capability at the London Treaty of 1930, the navy secretly started building bases in Palau, Tinian and Saipan. In order to evade the western powers' monitoring, they were camouflaged as places to dry fishing nets or farms, and the South Seas Development Company assumed the responsibility for construction.⁽³⁸⁾ Although the Study Committee at this stage avoided to express outright hostility against western powers, it strongly argued for the opening of markets and natural resources in Southeast Asia, particularly in the oil-rich Netherlands East Indies.⁽³⁹⁾

In 1936 the government took a crucial step. It integrated the *nanshin* in the national policy. After abrogating the London Naval Treaty in January, the government held the Five Ministers Conference (attended by the ministers of the departments of Prime Minister, Foreign Affairs, Finance, Navy and Army) in August and announced 'the Guidelines for National Policy' that included resolution to advance south 'peacefully':

The government will pursue national and economic development in the South Seas,

particularly in the outer South Seas, avoiding threats to other nations, and will expand our influence progressively by peaceful measures in order to reinforce national strength with the construction of Manchukuo.⁽⁴⁰⁾

In November the policy was executed. The Nan'yō Takushoku Kabushiki Kaisha (South Seas Colonisation Company), a giant national company comparable to the Taiwan Colonisation Company, was established. The company's main venture was the development of phosphate mining on Angaur and Fais.

Coinciding with the government declaration, some intellectuals began to focus on Japan's long historical connection with *nan'yō*, starting from the 17th century's trading, called *Goshuinsen bō eki*,⁽⁴¹⁾ to the Meiji explorer-traders. Iwao Seiichi, a historian and professor of the Taipei University (the leading academic institution in South Seas studies), played a central role. In 1936, he wrote *Kinsei shoki nihonjin nan'yō hatten no rekishi* [History of Japanese development in the South Seas in early modern times].⁽⁴²⁾ In 1939, he published an article 'Nan'yō ni okeru nichī-ō kankei no sui' [The change of Japan-European relations in the South Seas]' in which he contrasted western colonisation, which was strongly backed up by their governments, with Japanese emigration which had no government support.⁽⁴³⁾ Then in 1940, Iwao published the best-known book in the study of Japan-South Seas relations, *Nan'yō nihon machi no kenkyū* [Study on Japanese towns in the South Seas]. He wrote in the introduction:

Japanese development in the South Seas, which started in early modern times, is an epochal phenomenon in our national history.....It is a topic to be examined thoroughly to understand the current international relations in the South Seas where Occidentals and Orientals are in conflict.⁽⁴⁴⁾

Other historian-writers are Irie Toraji and Kakei Kiyosumi. Irie, a former archivist of the Foreign Ministry, wrote two volumes of *Hōjin kaigai hatten shi* [History of Japanese overseas development] about Japanese emigration since 1868, in which he devoted a considerable section to the South Seas.⁽⁴⁵⁾ Kakei, although not a well-known writer, wrote *Nanpō shohō ni okeru ō seki nihon jin no katsuyaku* [Japanese activities in the southern area in old times].⁽⁴⁶⁾ Although all those pieces are purely academic and have few references to government policies, the timing of their publication precisely coincides with the beginning of Japanese military actions in the late 1930s.

The navy initiated the military *nanshin*. In February 1939, naval forces occupied Hainan Island, an iron ore-rich island, on the pretext to cut off the southern support route to Chiang Kai-shek, then in March the Spratly Islands. Both islands were strategic bases for the advance to Southeast Asia. The navy's actions were quickly followed by the cabinet's policy statement: the Konoe cabinet expressed 'the Outline of the Basic National Policy', declaring 'the construction of the New Order in Greater East Asia based on the solid consolidation of Japan, Manchuria and China' on 26 July in 1940.⁽⁴⁷⁾ This 'New Order', being modified from

the 'New Order in East Asia' of 1938, included the South Seas.⁽⁴⁸⁾

Shortly after the cabinet decision, the Imperial Headquarters announced *nanshin* by force. On 27 July, it produced 'the outline of measures taken in response to changing international situation.' Under the clause of 'the use of force against southern area', it stipulated that 'in case China problem cannot be solved,the use of force is possible in order to solve the problem in the southern area.'⁽⁴⁹⁾ The outline was the unambiguous endorsement of the military invasion of Southeast Asia.

The army saw its best opportunity when Germany defeated France and Netherlands in Europe in mid-1940. In September the army quickly sent forces to occupy the northern French Indochina in order to secure the naval base in Camranh Bay and the airfield at Pnompenh. Thus the army, the traditional advocate of the northward advance, finally joined *nanshin*.

In the last year before the outbreak of the war, intellectuals completed the justification for *nanshin* on three main grounds: independence from the western economies, national defence and nationalism. Iizawa Shōji explained in *Nanpōkyō ei ken* [South Co-Prosperity Sphere] in 1940 on the economic independence:

Because there are correlations and interdependency between the continental policy and southward advancement policy, it would be impossible to implement both policies simultaneously if we attempted to achieve each policy individually. Japan has been deploying forces on the continent and their military supplies come from Japan: they are not available locally as expected initially. And most supplies are dependent on imports from the US and Britain. We have been clearly shown that this is a grave obstacle to our war efforts. If we were freed from this dependency, we would be able to complete our continental policy. The reason why people look at the south is that the region is rich in the resources which are in short supply on the continent. Therefore, the policy to gain those resource must be considered an essential matter to implementing the continental policy.⁽⁵⁰⁾

The Nihon Keizai KenkyūKai (Japanese Society of Economic Studies) emphasised national defence:

Colonisation by western countries was motivated mainly by territorial desire or by the desire to acquire precious metals and pepper. They did not hesitate to go to war to gain territories. On the contrary, Japanese expansionism was based entirely on national defence not on such purposes as territorial expansion or acquisition of economic interests. Japanese southward advancement was indeed the manifestation of this kind of [defensive] expansionist policy.⁽⁵¹⁾

Some nationalists stimulated anti-western feelings in their publications. Gotō wrote in the introduction titled 'For the freedom of the South Seas':

A new stage of the century is set up on the land of the South Seas, being spotlighted from the East. The stage that the Western Imperialists tried to achieve world hegemony is now going to show their fall. This is nothing but historical inevitability.⁽⁵²⁾

In Gotō's view, the liberator from the western imperialism would, of course, be the Japanese. Thus *nanshin-ron* matured ideologically, integrating a basic premise - economic development - to nationalism. However, it was a different form of *nanshin-ron* from the one that Enomoto and other Meiji *nanshin-ron* advocates asserted about half a century earlier: they were fundamentally non-militaristic free-trade advocates. But those Meiji *nanshin-ron* advocates were exploited by their later counterparts. The new *nanshin-ron* advocates 'deformed' the Meiji *nanshin-ron*, by exalting the Meiji advocates as national heroes despite the fact that the *nanshin-ron* had attracted far less attention in the Meiji period, and created the image that the Japanese had had long-term interaction with the South Seas.⁽⁵³⁾

Meanwhile, Japan's economic relations with the South Seas developed steadily. The growth of the overall Japanese economy, government promotion of South Seas trade and the international situation facilitated Japanese investment in the South Seas. As Table 1 shows, between 1919 and 1941, 78 companies were established. It was a remarkable increase, compared to only 32 companies established between 1870 and 1918. Most companies were in Southeast Asia and directed toward resource-development such as minerals, oil, rubber, lumber, jute, cotton, copra and fishery, reflecting the general focus of interest of *nanshin-ron* advocates and the government.

The timing of the investment, which concentrated in the 1930s, shows the association with the international situation: the US and Britain raised tariffs against Japanese products in the early 1930s; China, the second largest trading partner after the US, began to boycott Japanese products after the Japanese invasion in 1931; and the prolonged war in China forced Japan to find alternative sources of raw materials to meet increasing military demands.

Consequently Japan-South Seas trade increased dramatically. As Table 2 shows, total exports increased from 252.5 million yen in 1920 to 474.2 million yen in 1937 and imports from 188.3 million to 540.4 million. Southeast Asia was the largest trading area, followed

Table 1. The number of Japanese companies established in the South Seas, 1919-1941

	Micronesia	Southeast Asia	South Pacific	Taiwan	unknown	total
1919	1	4	0	1	-	6
1920-29	2	11	-	-	1	14
1930-39	21	23	3	3	3	53
1940-41	-	5	-	-	-	5
total	24	43	3	4	4	78

Source: 南洋団体連合会 1942. 『大南洋年鑑』. 797～828頁, 東京. [The Federation of South Seas Organisations (ed.) 1942. *Year book of the South Seas*. p.p.797-828, Tokyo.]

Table 2. Japanese trade with the South Seas from 1920 to 1937 (million yen)

	Micronesia		Southeast Asia*		Australia & New Zealand		total	
	export	import	export	import	export	import	export	import
1920	0.03	0.09	184.8	125.9	67.7	62.4	252.5	188.3
1930	0.06	0.2	133.0	130.4	28.6	94.6	161.6	225.2
1937	0.3	1.2	382.6	325.4	91.3	213.8	474.2	540.4

n.a. no data available

*The countries of Southeast Asia varied by year due to the availability of statistics:

1920: British Malaya, Dutch East Indies, French Indochina, the Philippines and Thailand

1930, 1937: British Malaya and Borneo, Dutch East Indies, French Indochina, the Philippines and Thailand

Source: data from 内閣統計局 1931. 『大日本帝国統計年鑑』. 168頁, 東京; 1938, 204~209頁. Naikakuōtkei-kyoku 1931: 168, 1938: 204-209, Kokusei-in 1921: 142 [Statistical Bureau of the Cabinet 1931. *Statistical yearbook of the Great Japan Empire*. p.168; 1938. p.p.204-209] 国勢院 1921. 『大日本帝国統計年鑑』. 142頁, 東京. [Statistical Bureau 1921. *Statistical yearbook of the Great Japan Empire*. p.142]

Table 3. Japanese population in the South Seas, 1919 to 1941

	Southeast Asia*	Micronesia	Australia, New Zealand & South Pacific Islands	Total
1919	23,740	1,791	6,280	31,811
1925	21,359	7,331	3,883	32,573
1930	35,240	19,835	3,984	59,059
1936	36,375	55,948	3,205	95,528

*Southeast Asia includes British Malaya, Borneo, Sarawak, India, Burma, Sri Lanka, Netherlands East Indies, the Philippines, and Guam

Source: 1919-1925: 石川 友紀 1972. 『統計よりみた日本出移民史 3』 『地理科学』. 27~28頁, 地理科学学会, 広島. [Data from ISHIKAWA T. 1972. 'Emigration history in the view from statistics', *Geographic Science*. p.p.27-28, Vol.16, Chiri kagaku gakkai, Hiroshima.]

by Australia and New Zealand, while Micronesia remained marginal. However, the proportion of the South Seas trade in the total Japanese trade remained small; it only increased from 10.2 percent in 1920 to 14.5 percent in 1937.⁽⁵⁴⁾

Similarly, the position of Japan in the total South Seas economy remained marginal. In 1939, the proportion of the trade with Japan was only 6.7 percent, while the US, Britain, China, and Netherlands occupied about 90 percent.⁽⁵⁵⁾ The Mitsubishi Research Institute of Economies admitted: 'the fundamental reason [for the low profile in South Seas economy] is....the result of our [underdeveloped] industrial strength' compared to western economies.⁽⁵⁶⁾

Emigration to the South Seas increased more than threefold from 31,811 in 1919 to 95,528 in 1936 (Table 3), although the proportion in the total Japanese emigration

remained marginal: it was only 8 percent in 1936.⁽⁵⁷⁾ The increase was mainly due to emigration to Micronesia that drastically increased in the 1930s. The government assisted the emigration: the Nan'yō chō (South Seas Government), the Japanese colonial administration in Micronesia, leased land and the Nan'yō Kōhatsu Kaisha (South Seas Development Company), the private company part-funded by the government, recruited thousands of labourers for its sugar plantations. Emigration increased especially after Japan resigned from the League of Nations in 1933.

Emigration to Southeast Asia remained largely static in the 1920s, because the government adopted a foreign policy to cooperate with other powers in the framework of the Washington System and discouraged emigration to Southeast Asia, which might cause friction with the western powers. This attitude was articulated in the statement of the Foreign Minister, Shidehara Kijūrō, at the South Seas Trade Conference of 1926. He stated, 'the agenda of this conference does not include immigration issues.'⁽⁵⁸⁾ Although emigration began to increase in the 1930s, the increase was far less dramatic than in Micronesia. The main reason was that there was little demand for Japanese labourers unlike in Micronesia, as cheap labour was locally available. As a result, migrants were mainly company employees and their numbers were subject to fluctuations of economy.⁽⁵⁹⁾ Also the Dutch administration applied restrictions on foreign labourers from 1935. The Japanese population in Australia, New Zealand and South Pacific islands declined, as Australia continued to restrict Asian migration and this affected most Japanese in this region.

3. Japanese perceptions of Papua and New Guinea

Corresponding to the rise of the militaristic *nanshin-ron*, Japanese interest in Papua and New Guinea increased in the late 1930s. The number of publications demonstrates this. As Table 4 shows, most publications appeared in the same period. Only one book was published before 1923, according to *Zōho nanpō bunken mokuroku* [Biography of the South

Table 4. The number of South Seas publications, 1923 to 1941

number		number	
1923	3	1938	10
1924	1	1939	7
1932	1	1940	4
1933	3	1941	9
1937	4	total	42

Source: 日本拓殖協会編 1944. 『増補南方文献目録』. p.p.233-235, 大同書院, 東京. [Japan Colonisation Society (ed.) 1944. *Bibliography of the South Literature*, revised edition. p.p.233-235, Daidō-shoin, Tokyo]

Literature, revised edition]. However, interest in Papua and New Guinea was merely a trickle compared to Southeast Asia. In *Zōho nanpō bunken mokuroku*, the list of publications on Southeast Asia occupies 144 pages, while that of Papua and New Guinea occupies only 3.

Although marginal, the increase of the information on Papua and New Guinea was dramatic. The government was the initiator. In 1938 the Department of Foreign Affairs published *Eiryō papua* [British Territory of Papua] and *Gōshū inin tōchi ryō nyūginia* [Australian Mandated Territory New Guinea], and the Department of Colonisation published a book with the same title.⁽⁶⁰⁾ Then in 1939 the administration in Micronesia published two massive volumes - 400-pages long *Nyūginia jijō (gōshū inin tōchi ryō)* [The situation in New Guinea (Australian Mandated Territory)] and 145-pages long *Nyūginia jijō (papua ryō hen)* [The situation in New Guinea (Territory of Papua)].⁽⁶¹⁾ Those books introduced history, population, religion, education, climate, hygiene, geography, politics, etc. And they were based on information from English sources such as *New Guinea Handbook*, *Pacific Island Year Book*, *Pacific Islands Monthly*, *Rabaul Times*, *Gazette of Papua*, *Annual Report of Papua*, *Papuan Courier* and the ordinances of the Australian administrations.

A sharp contrast to Japanese interests in Southeast Asia can be seen in the contents of the publications. The Japanese were not so interested in the economy of Papua and New Guinea. Table 5 shows that almost half of the publications were about the general situation and travel, and only 8 out of 42 were on industry and natural resources.

Until the early 1930s, Japanese perceptions of Papuans and New Guineans remained the same. Tatsue Yoshinobu, who travelled with Komine in the early 1900s, wrote that 'fierce natives' were impeding development,⁽⁶²⁾ and Miyoshi Hōjū called New Guinean women the ugliest in the world.⁽⁶³⁾ However, in the late 1930s perceptions sharpened. The government

Table 5. Classification of publications on Papua and New Guinea, 1923 to 1941

	number
Biography	1
General situation and travel account	23
Geography	8
Race and culture	1
Politics and foreign relations	1
Industry and economy	4
Fishery	2
Mining	2
total	42

Source: 日本拓殖協会編 1944. 『増補南方文献目録』. p.p.233-235, 大同書院, 東京. [Japan Colonisation Society (ed.) 1944. *Bibliography of the South Literature*, revised edition. p.p.233-235, Daidō-shoin, Tokyo]

publications presented the 'tribal' diversity (e.g. coastal people were peaceful but inland people were still rebellious),⁽⁶⁴⁾ and the effectiveness of Australian rule through administration and missions which produced some educated Christian natives.⁽⁶⁵⁾

The introduction of New Guinean artefacts also improved the stereotyped perceptions. The Minami no kai (Society of the South) published *Nyūginia dozoku hin zushū* [Illustrated New Guinean artefacts] which introduced collections of artefacts and their relations with native religions and customs. Interestingly Matsue Haruji, the Directing-Manager of the South Seas Developing Company, was the owner of the collections in the book, and he had bought them from Komine.⁽⁶⁶⁾ A similar book was written by Fujiki Yoshihiro, an anthropologist. His book, *Nyūginia sono fukin tō sho no dozoku hin* [Artefacts of New Guinea and adjacent islands], had introductory sections written by artists and anthropologists who appreciated the high quality of the artefacts and commented favourably such as 'New Guinean artefacts are excellent' or 'New Guineans are artists.'⁽⁶⁷⁾

Although weak, there was some government interest in the economy. Muramatsu Kaoru, an official of the Research Section of the Department of Foreign Affairs, compared the economic potential of Australian New Guinea with Dutch New Guinea, and pointed out that 'Australian New Guinea was superior to Dutch New Guinea in various points' such as in copra planting and coastal shipping.⁽⁶⁸⁾ The Nan'yō Keizai Kenkyū Sho (Research Institute of the South Seas Economy), a government research organ specialising in the economy of the South Seas, reported the oil search in Papua.⁽⁶⁹⁾ The Institute also reported the shortage of labour, industries and the Australian exploration in the highlands.⁽⁷⁰⁾ But all those publications seem to be mere translations from English sources.

The government was also aware that Australians placed great strategic importance on Papua and New Guinea. Nagatsuka Jirō argued that Australians had always regarded Papua and New Guinea as an important defence line, pointing out that their attempt to annex Papua and New Guinea was the manifestation of this recognition.⁽⁷¹⁾

The increase in references to Japanese migrants was an important trend from the mid-1930s. It stressed the fact that Japanese had had a long linkage with New Guinea. It was a significant change because until then nobody had demonstrated much interest. Government publications, such as the ones of the Department of Colonisation and the South Seas Government, devoted many pages to the history of Japanese migration (mainly about Komine) and commercial activities.⁽⁷²⁾ Although the information was a plain description of events and accounts of the migrants, it was the first time that the migrants were taken up by officials with such intensity.

Nanshin-ron advocates played a more important role. They exalted Komine as a national hero. In 1935 *Sandē mainichi* [Sunday Everyday], a popular weekly magazine, published an article titled 'Shōwa no Yamada Nagamasa, Nihon-to o sasagete tanshin doku-kan o ikedoru: Nan'yō no kaitaku-sha Komine Isokichi' [Yamada Nagamasa of the Showa period captured a German ship alone with a Japanese sword: a pioneer of the South Seas, Komine

Isokichi].⁽⁷³⁾ The article began with a comment: 'This is the story that impressed Debuchi Gen, a special envoy to Australia, who said "This is the most appropriate episode to promote Japan-Australia relations."' The article emphasised Komine's relations with Germans and Australians dramatically. It described how bravely he rescued the German governor who was being attacked by natives on a jungle track: 'Mr Komine jumped off a seven-meter high cliff like a bird into the fighting and saved the life of the governor by a close shave.' The article said that the capture of the *Komet* was proposed by frustrated Komine who saw the Australians unable to do anything because they were unfamiliar with the local geography, and that Komine organised the expedition and when he found the *Komet*, he climbed onto the deck by himself just carrying a Japanese sword and successfully persuaded the German commander to surrender. Because of this feat, he was given the compass of the *Komet* and a title of both naval and army captain. The article also emphasised that Komine was a good friend of the German captain and looked after his family at Rabaul while the captain was imprisoned by Australians, and later the captain thanked Komine, saying 'Now I have learnt the greatness of the Japanese.' Most accounts in the article were exaggerated.⁽⁷⁴⁾ No other written records and oral evidence can confirm that Komine carried a sword or the German captain thanked him (generally the Germans resented Komine's action). At the time of writing the article, Komine was already dead and nobody (except for those who actually knew about Komine) could challenge the accuracy of the accounts. Thus the writer could say almost anything to dramatise the events.

More significantly, the article was reintroduced in April 1941. Captain Kamijō Fukashi wrote *Sensen ichi-man kairi: zen taisen ji nan'yō no rekishi* [The war front of ten thousand miles: the history of the South Seas during World War I] and inserted the article fully in his book.⁽⁷⁵⁾ Kamijō added a detailed account of the capture of the *Komet*, although the addition seems to be his translation from MacKenzie's *The Australians at Rabaul* which had been published in 1927. Similarly, in August 1941 the Nanpō sangyō chōsa kai (Society of the South Seas Industry Research) published *Nyūginia*, a book introducing general information on Papua, Australian New Guinea and Dutch New Guinea, and repeated the story about Komine's feat, although briefly.⁽⁷⁶⁾ Thus just before the outbreak of the Pacific War, the government and nanshin-ron advocates began to popularise the Japanese in New Guinea, obviously intending to propagate and justify the *nanshin*. The Japanese in New Guinea, who had attracted little public attention in Japan, were suddenly and comprehensively integrated into the vast scheme of Japanese expansionism.

4. Japanese in Papua

Australians scarcely noticed the small number of Japanese. An official report in the late 1930s stated that 'with regard to the Territory of Papua, there are no Japanese.'⁽⁷⁷⁾ The smallness of the Japanese population was one reason. The limited activities of the Japanese was another. Japanese business operations were too small to threaten Australian interests, and they were confined in Milne Bay and had little interaction with the Japanese in New Guinea.⁽⁷⁸⁾ Consequently no reports about the Japanese appeared in the *Papua Annual Report* or the *Government Gazette* between the two wars.

However, Australians were concerned about the Japanese who attempted to enter the territory. In 1939 Nan'yō Bōeki Kaisha (South Seas Company) sent trade envoys to Samarai and Port Moresby and entertained the residents with films of Japanese industries and tourist attractions. The *Pacific Islands Monthly* reported the visit uneasily: 'in spite of wars and the echoes of wars, and the manifest distrust of all British communities in the Central and South Pacific, the Japanese continue with their program of commercial penetration - part of their campaign to secure economic domination of the Pacific.'⁽⁷⁹⁾

There was another incident involving Nan'yō Bōeki. The company purchased the steamer *Papuan Chief*, wrecked and lying on a reef near Port Moresby, and sent Japanese crew to salvage it. The entry of the crew to Port Moresby was granted in July 1941, but the Department of Defence Co-Ordination had strongly objected, insisting that: 'the view of the Department of the Army is that it is undesirable for Japanese at Port Moresby, particularly having regard to movement of troops and other defence measures now taking place'.⁽⁸⁰⁾ However, the Department of Foreign Affairs supported admission provided that the crew stay at Port Moresby for a limited period. Finally the Prime Minister decided to grant entry and advised the Administrator, Murray: 'No doubt you will be able to restrict movement of crew at Port Moresby to a minimum, without this being obvious to the crew.'⁽⁸¹⁾

It was a delicate time just before the outbreak of the war. Prior to that, there was an incident which embarrassed the Australian government and could have worsened its relations with Japan. In June 1937, the Australian patrol boat *Larrakia* 'wrongfully and without lawful authority, and by force of arms seized and took possession' of the Japanese fishing vessel *New Guinea Maru* on the high seas in the Arafura Sea and imprisoned the captain and the crew.⁽⁸²⁾ The Japanese appealed to the Supreme Court of the Northern Territory, which ordered the Australian government to pay compensation.⁽⁸³⁾ Possibly the incident affected the attitude of the Department of Foreign Affairs and made it more diffident in the case of the *Papuan Chief*.

Australians were concerned about the possible effect of the war on Papuans. Australians feared that their authority would be undermined by war against a non-white race. Just one month before the war, the government anthropologist, F.E. Williams, wrote explicitly anti-Japanese articles in his newspaper *The Papuan Villager* which circulated among Australian-educated Papuans. The article introduced the Japanese as 'not white men...[and]

very warlike people...[who] have made a number of cruel wars against their neighbour, China,' and concluded that:

Japan is like a very snappy little dog, barking at three big dogs that just lie down and look at her. The three big dogs are Great Britain, America and Russia. If this little dog ever begins to bite, then the three big dogs will jump at her and tear her to pieces.⁽⁸⁴⁾

The pre-war Japanese population was last recorded by the administration in 1920: six lived in the Eastern Division and one in the South-Eastern Division.⁽⁸⁵⁾ From 1921 to 1948, the administration did not record the non-Papuan coloured population. Although the 1947-48 *Annual Report* (published in 1949) listed the coloured population, statistics were only for 1921 and 1933 and no Japanese were recorded in either years.⁽⁸⁶⁾ The only available data are the 1933 census by the Australian government that listed two Japanese in the category of 'not able to read and write English, but able to read and write a foreign language' and 14 Japanese 'classified according to race.'⁽⁸⁷⁾ The two Japanese are undoubtedly Tanaka and Murakami. The 14 Japanese were most likely mixed-race Japanese.

Information about the Japanese in this period can also be derived from oral evidence. According to them, most of early Japanese settlers died between the two wars, and their mixed-race children took over their trade. The children continued to keep Japanese names and their businesses and mostly prospered.

Jimmy Koto died at an unknown date in the inter-war period. His son George inherited Jimmy's trade and became a trader, boat builder and planter. He was the only boat builder on Misima Island and had large plantations (Palanean plantation in Motorina island and another in Kimuta Island). He started boat building on Motorina. He also dived for trochus shells, sea cucumber and turtle. His trading covered Milne Bay, having a business partnership with Tanaka Taichirō.⁽⁸⁸⁾ Jimmy's good relations with Mrs Mahoney seem to have been continued by his daughter, Florence. Mrs Mahoney once took her for a trip to Sydney.⁽⁸⁹⁾ Tanaka Taichirō made a success of his trading business and owned six luggers by the outbreak of the war.⁽⁹⁰⁾

Murakami Heijirō moved from Naiwara, a village at the end of Milne Bay, to Kuyaro, a village opposite Samarai to work in the plantation owned by Whitten Brothers before 1927. In 1927, his son Kalo left Kuyaro to attend the mission school at Dogura in Goodenough Bay. Honor, a daughter of Tanaka Shigematsu, was in the same school. After schooling, Kalo came back to Kuyaro then went to Samarai to work for a freezing company. In 1939 he went to Misima to look for a job in the gold mine.⁽⁹¹⁾

Tamiya Mabe tried to return to Japan by himself some time before the Pacific War, but died on the way. His three sons - Tetu, Hagani and Namari - all became boat builders. Tetu worked with Hagani in Kanamadawa village on Basilaki Island, and they also dived for shell and traded. Tetu married a Basilaki woman and Hagani married a woman from East

Cape.⁽⁹²⁾ Namari married a woman from Wagofufu village on East Cape and stayed there and built boats by himself. He owned a sailing boat and named it *Papua*. Later he returned to Basilaki and died there around 1930.⁽⁹³⁾

All informants (including local elders who are not related to the Japanese) relate that the Japanese kept amicable relations with Australians, Papuans and other Asians. Kalo Murakami recalls that Charley Wisdel (an Australian), who also worked for Whitten brothers in Samarai, was a good friend of his father. Also a Chinese cook called Maxim, and some Filipinos, were good friends of Japanese. But no informants suggest that the Japanese kept a high profile in the community.

5. Japanese in New Guinea

Officials in Melbourne perceived the Japanese in New Guinea very explicitly as part of Japanese expansionism. Atlee Hunt, a member of the Royal Commission on Late German New Guinea (and the Secretary of the Department of Territories), regarded the development of Japanese commercial activities in Taiwan, India, Dutch East Indies and the Philippines as 'no doubt part of a vast system'.⁽⁹⁴⁾ At this time there was a diplomatic dispute about the Australian restriction on direct trade between Rabaul and Japan. The Australian government stopped the Japanese trading in New Guinea from 1919 to 1920 on two grounds - to retaliate against Japanese restriction on Burns Philp's trade in Micronesia and to monopolise trade in New Guinea. In 1919, the government refused to grant permission to the Japanese vessel *Nanking Maru* to ship copra, discharge and load cargo at Rabaul. Similarly in 1920, the government refused the application of the *Madras Maru* to discharge cargo at Rabaul. The Japanese government protested and the Japanese press condemned the Australian actions.⁽⁹⁵⁾

As a result, diplomatic relations were strained, and rude behaviour by the Australian military staff at Rabaul who received the Japanese crew of *Madras Maru* added to the tension. It was alleged that Australian soldiers, under the influence of alcohol, abused and used violence against the Japanese returning to the ship.⁽⁹⁶⁾ Hearing of the incident, the administrator immediately reported to the Prime Minister, who quickly expressed regret to the Japanese Consul-General in Sydney, saying 'I shall be obliged if you will be good enough to inform the Japanese Government of the regret of the Commonwealth Government at this occurrence.'⁽⁹⁷⁾ The soldiers were punished and the Japanese government did not take up the matter publicly.

Nevertheless the Australian government kept a firm attitude on the trade issue, in spite of Piesse's suggestion that hard-line policies would affect diplomatic relations:

I would suggest for consideration that the Commonwealth might suffer no serious loss, if, in the period before the mandate is issued, during which our legal right to restrict trade is doubtful, we ceased to hinder Japanese ships from engaging in this trade. Such

a policy would avoid our getting deeper into a position which we have difficulty in making good, diplomatically; it might be regarded by Japan as a friendly act, and it might even make easier the securing of Japan's concurrence in the issue of the mandate.⁽⁹⁸⁾

However, Hughes bluntly replied to the Japanese official protest:

Although there is no intention on the part of Commonwealth Government to exclude Japanese vessels from having access to the port of Rabaul, any more than there is any intention to exclude British, French, or American vessels, we claim the right to make such laws in respect to trade as we please, and trade includes navigation; therefore cannot give undertaking in this respect.⁽⁹⁹⁾

And Hunt thought that all those Japanese activities were 'calculated to bring about one result i.e. grave embarrassment to Australia...[by] making Australia's position as difficult as possible.'⁽¹⁰⁰⁾

Japanese traders sought in vain for a loophole. The Osaka Shōsen Kaisha (Osaka Merchant Ship Company) applied for permission to open trade with the Solomons. Probably the company planned to purchase copra from a Japanese trader, Okaji, in Bougainville, thinking that he would act as a middle man between Rabaul and Japan. But the application was refused, for Australian officials thought that 'it seems obvious that Japanese frequentation of ports in the British Solomons is as dangerous to Australian interests as Japanese trade with Rabaul.'⁽¹⁰¹⁾

Regarding the Japanese residents in New Guinea, the Royal Commission recognised 'the desirability of adopting any policy which would free the Territory from Japanese influence' and considered MacKenzie's proposal to purchase all Japanese properties.⁽¹⁰²⁾ However, the Commission turned down that proposal on the ground that:

The result of the sale of Komine's properties to the Government would simply be that he would part his present interests and would be provided with capital which, after liquidating his liabilities to the Japanese Company named or otherwise, would be available for the purchase of other interests, so that the general situation would be left much as it was before.⁽¹⁰³⁾

From the late 1920s, officials in Canberra began to consolidate their perceptions of fear of Japanese attack. They suspected that Japanese migrants in the South Pacific and Southeast Asia were part of government-organised Japanese expansionism. The Australian Navy was monitoring the activities of the Japanese in New Guinea, Netherlands East Indies and Thursday Island intensively.⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ Similarly, Australian officials thought that Japanese fishing vessels operating illegally in waters north of Australia had some connection with espionage. Naval Intelligence collected detailed reports of Japanese poaching in the Gulf of Carpentaria, Ninigo Group, Solomon Islands, and so on.⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ The Commander of the Royal

Australian Navy predicted 'the landing of the [Japanese] armed force somewhere on Cape York Peninsula' in the event of war.⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ And a naval expert pointed out the significance of Micronesia as Japanese advanced bases and emphasised the vulnerability of Rabaul, comparing the distance:

Rabaul to Sydney - 1850 miles.

Rabaul to Darwin - 1736 miles.

Rabaul to Singapore - 3186 miles.

The proximity of the Japanese Mandated islands - which can be used by the Japanese as an intermediate base - to the Australian Mandated Islands is not generally realised. The distance from Truk, in the Caroline Islands, to Rabaul is only a matter of 800 miles.⁽¹⁰⁷⁾

Australian fear increased towards the end of the 1930s. The Prime Minister's Department studied Japan's southward advancement policy.⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ The Department monitored the entry of every agent of Japanese companies in New Guinea, when the giant Nippon Mining Co. sent a geologist to investigate the copper ore deposit in the Nakanai District on north-west coast of New Britain in 1937 and the Nanyō Bōeki Kaisha sent four Japanese to investigate the goldfields at Wau in 1939. Their activities were thoroughly reported to the Department by the administration at Rabaul, although none of those activities could not be substantiated as spying.⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ The acting administrator reported: 'It is believed that every Japanese is a potential intelligence officer for Japan, but unfortunately it is not practicable to substantiate that belief by quoting incidents in support.'⁽¹¹⁰⁾

The Australians at Rabaul were also alarmed by the development of Japanese Micronesia. The secrecy of the Japanese administration aroused their suspicion. The seriousness of their concerns was illustrated by a long report in the *Rabaul Times* by Gordon Green, an Australian traveller who made a trip to Japan via Micronesia in 1929.⁽¹¹¹⁾ He reported in detail high tariffs imposed on imported goods and strict restrictions on his travel by the police.

The Australian concerns turned to fear in the 1930s, when they learnt that the Japanese population in Micronesia was increasing rapidly, and when militarisation was rumoured. Numerous articles about Japanese Micronesia in *The Rabaul Times*, which were mostly long and detailed, indicate their fear. In 1932, the newspaper reported:

Japanese had fortified the more strategic points in the Carolines, and was also Japanising the natives of her mandated territory in a wholesale manner by inter-marriage with the women of the islands. In 1920 there were some 3,600 Japanese; when the 1930 census was taken the number increased to nearly 20,000!⁽¹¹²⁾

When another Australian traveller reported Japanese naval exercises in Micronesian

waters,⁽¹¹³⁾ the editor immediately wrote an alarming article:

The ever-smiling little Jap has become a force in the Pacific with whom the nations of the world must reckon at present time.....The once urbane Jap-man, now that he has thoroughly mastered the intricacies of western civilisation by out-westerning the West, resembles nothing so much as a youth strutting about with his first loaded revolver eager to display his prowess with his instrument of slaughter.⁽¹¹⁴⁾

A month later, the editor repeated the alarm: 'Japan is endeavouring to present an amicably-inclined face to the nations of the world', and criticised the inability of the League of Nations to keep Japan and Germany in the League.⁽¹¹⁵⁾ Rabaul's anxiety increased when a well-known German journalist, Herbert Rittlinger, stopped at Rabaul from his trip to Micronesia but declined to comment about the fortifications. *The Rabaul Times* reported, 'Perhaps he has seen things, and has given his word not to divulge the information which he has collected'.⁽¹¹⁶⁾ Their anti-Japanese feelings were heightened by anger against the frequent appearances of Japanese poachers in New Guinea waters. At the same time they felt that Canberra was neglecting to protect them, and condemned the Federal Government.⁽¹¹⁷⁾

However, Rabaul's fear seems to have been directed mainly towards Japanese in Micronesia and Japanese poachers (not to the local Japanese residents). Economically the local Japanese hardly threatened Australian interests. Griffiths reported to Melbourne:

There [sic] businesses are so small compared with the large Companies here, and they are so few in numbers that they are not seriously considered as business competitors. They have been most successful against all competition in shell-fishing, because they bring skilled divers to carry on the work, and give the work their close personal attention.⁽¹¹⁹⁾

The Rabaul Times did not express any hostility against the local Japanese except for one article about the death of a Japanese suspected of spying. The article was very brief (one paragraph) compared to the articles about Japanese Micronesia or poachers. The whole article says:

A prominent Japanese merchant by the name of Y. Nishimura, died here suddenly whilst in a detective's office undergoing questioning. Other prominent Japanese have been questioned and later deported. Many documents have been seized and it is rumoured that a gigantic espionage system has been discovered.⁽¹¹⁹⁾

But it is doubtful that Nishimura was a spy. If any gigantic espionage system had existed, the incident must have attracted the attention of Canberra or Naval Intelligence, but there

was no official record in Australian sources.⁽¹²⁰⁾ The name of Nishimura cannot be found in the list of passports issued for travellers bound for New Guinea in the Japanese Foreign Ministry record or Japanese literature. Oral evidence have no information, either. This suggests that he was a merchant based outside New Guinea. Possibly he acted somehow suspiciously in the eyes of some Australians and was caught by the police, then his sudden death provoked a rumour that he was a spy. The incident may simply show the nervousness of Australians in Rabaul against non-local Japanese.

Despite its anxiety about Japanese expansion, *The Rabaul Times* wrote about the local Japanese in a respectful and friendly way. The editor praised Komine's carpenters' 'very clever piece of work' to shift Burns Philp's bungalow without causing much disturbance.⁽¹²¹⁾ When the arrest of a New Guinean called 'Komini' for stealing was in the news, the editor noted 'not our esteemed Japanese fellow townsman'.⁽¹²²⁾ At the death of Komine in 1934 he was written about as one held in high esteem: he was 'one of the oldest and best-known identities in the Territory' and 'the whole [Rabaul] community extends its deep sympathy' to his widow.⁽¹²³⁾

The Rabaul Times' warm comments on the film show held by the Rabaul branch of Nan'yō Bōeki suggest that personally Australians remained friendly to the local Japanese even after the outbreak of war in Europe. The branch was run by Tashiro Tsunesuke, a long time resident. The show was held twice in October and December 1939. The newspaper reported that the 'films showing the industrial and agricultural life [of Japan] were exceedingly interesting' and that 'a crowded house fully appreciated the interesting portrayal of Japanese social and industrial life.' The second show was even combined with fund raising by local white women (Ethel Smith and Tootsie Hamilton) for the Red Cross.⁽¹²⁴⁾ The absence of hostility was probably because of the smallness of the local Japanese population and their long personal acquaintance with white residents.

The Japanese population declined gradually under Australian migration regulations, particularly due to the clause that: unless Japanese men were married when they first came to New Guinea, they could not bring their wives.⁽¹²⁵⁾ This regulation effectively reduced the number of Japanese who were mostly single males on two-to-three year contract. Also the restriction not to allow the population to increase higher than the number in 1914 stopped new Japanese from migrating. Some left New Guinea and even fewer came in. As Table 6 shows, the number decreased by about half from 87 in 1921 to 38 in 1940. The decline of the female population was high, suggesting that quite a few married couples left New Guinea.

Consequently, in terms of numbers, the Japanese became an extremely marginal group. As Table 7 shows, they were far fewer than other non-indigenous groups and their proportion among these groups declined from 2.7 percent in 1921 to 0.5 percent in 1940.

The occupational composition also changed. As Table 8 shows, by 1938 artisans (carpenters and sawyers) and labourers disappeared, whereas the number of traders and trading

Table 6. Population of Japanese by gender in New Guinea, 1921-1940

	male	female	total		male	female	total
1921	69	18	87	1932	29	6	35
1923	59	14	73	1933	38	6	44
1924	51	8	59	1934	37	7	44
1925	46	8	54	1935	38	7	45
1926	40	6	46	1936	33	6	39
1927	41	6	47	1937	38	2	40
1928	42	7	49	1938	35	3	38
1929	37	8	45	1939	36	4	40
1930	38	7	45	1940	36	2	38
1931	33	7	40				

Source: *Report to the League of Nations on the Administration of the Territory of New Guinea*, 1922, p.139; 1924, p.94; 1925, p.68; 1926, p.54; 1927, p.40; 1928, p.90; 1929, p.69; 1930, p.98; 1931, p.108; 1932, p.106; 1933, p.96; 1934, p.116; 1935, p.104; 1936, p.98; 1937, p.101; 1938, p.128; 1939, p.131; 1940, p.129; 1941, p.131

Table 7. Population of Japanese and other non-indigenous groups in New Guinea, 1921-1940

	Japanese	Chinese	British	German	other	total
1921	87	1,402	715	579	390	3,173
1923	73	1,365	765	325	399	3,927
1924	59	1,330	824	316	465	2,994
1925	54	1,303	944	310	434	3,045
1926	46	1,279	1,086	299	422	3,132
1927	47	1,254	1,341	293	464	3,399
1928	49	1,259	1,629	332	482	3,751
1929	45	1,253	1,808	328	494	3,928
1930	45	1,238	1,992	348	532	4,155
1931	40	1,179	1,992	370	561	4,142
1932	35	1,215	2,140	402	574	4,366
1933	44	1,353	2,594	379	845	5,215
1934	44	1,399	2,847	377	549	5,216
1935	45	1,424	3,026	404	554	5,453
1936	39	1,448	3,288	442	471	5,688
1937	40	1,525	3,329	469	534	5,897
1938	38	1,737	3,472	473	563	6,283
1939	40	1,890	3,547	473	588	6,538
1940	38	2,064	3,345	439	615	6,498

Source: *Report to the League of Nations on the Administration of the Territory of New Guinea*, 1922, p.139; 1924, p.94; 1925, p.68; 1926, p.54; 1927, p.40; 1928, p.90; 1929, p.69; 1930, p.98; 1931, p.108; 1932, p.106; 1933, p.96; 1934, p.116; 1935, p.104; 1936, p.98; 1937, p.101; 1938, p.128; 1939, p.131; 1940, p.129; 1941, p.131

Table 8. Occupation of the Japanese in New Guinea, 1921 and 1938 (number and percentage)

	trader & trading company's agent	planter & plantation manager	boat builder	carpen- ter	sawyer	fisher- man	barber	factory hand*	other	total
1921										
no.	4	27	10	12	3	8	3	11	25**	103***
%	3.8	26.2	9.7	11.6	2.9	7.7	2.9	10.6	24.2	100.0
1938										
no.	6	13	7	0	0	10	3	0	4	43
%	13.9	30.2	16.2	0	0	23.2	6.9	0	9.3	100.0

* This seems to be labourers in boat building yard.

** This includes 13 accompanied family members (mostly wives and children).

*** These figure from the Japanese source contradicts those from the Australian source in Table 6. The Japanese figures seem to be accurate, because they are more detailed about the occupational classification than the Australian ones.

Source: 南洋庁長官官房調査課 1939. p.p.318-319, 『ニューギニア事情 (濠洲委任統治領)』. コロール [Research Section of the Secretary-General of the South Seas Government 1939. *The situation in New Guinea (Australian Mandated Territory)*. p.p.318-319, Koror.]

Table 9. Japanese businesses in New Guinea in 1919

<i>name of businessmen</i>	<i>company name</i>	<i>type of business</i>	<i>capital (yen)</i>
1. Komine Isokichi	Nan'yō Sangyō	general store, boatbuilding, fishery, copra planting	1,000,000
2. Okaji Santarō	Okaji Company	general store, copra planting	15,000

Source: 外務省通商局 1919. 『在外本邦実業者調』. p.213, 東京. 外交史料館所蔵文書, 通189 「在外本邦実業者調, 大正8年」 [Bureau of Commerce, Department of Foreign Affairs 1919. *Zaigai honpō jitsugyō sha shirabe*. p.213, Tokyo. In: Japanese Diplomatic Record (hereafter JDR), Tsū189, 'Report on overseas Japanese businessmen 1919']

company agents and fishermen increased. The increase of those two occupations is important when the total population decreased by more than half. As a result, the proportions of traders and trading company agents and fishermen increased respectively from 3.8 percent in 1921 to 13.9 percent in 1938 and from 7.7 percent to 23.2 percent.

The change in the occupational structure was caused by the emergence of new small businessmen. The largest company, Komine's Nan'yō Sangyō, was liquidated in 1931 and some of his business was bought by Nagahama. At the same time, small fishing companies and a new branch of a trading company were established. Consequently, as Table 9 and 10 show, the number of businesses increased from 2 in 1919 to 12 in 1940. Those new companies did not require many employees, except for Nagahama's plantations, because they were

Table 10. Japanese businesses in New Guinea in 1940

<i>name of businessmen</i>	<i>company name</i>	<i>type of business</i>	<i>capital (yen)</i>
1. Nakamura Sōshichi	Nakamura Company	fishery	3,000
2. Kimura Hideichiro	Kimura Company	fishery	8,000
3. Kikuchi Ichisuke	Kikuchi Company	fishery	10,000
4. Tsujii Shigeru Mano Kisaburō	Tsujii Mano Company	fishery	10,000
5. Ikeda Kunizō	Ikeda Company	fishery	7,000
6. Ishibashi Umakichi	Ishibashi Company	fishery	7,000
7. Tsurushima Sōkichi	Tsurushima Company	general store, retailer wholesaler, trader of marine products and trochus shell	100,000
8. Ishimoto Terunari (representative)*	South Seas Trading Company, Rabaul branch	trading	15,000
9. Asanuma Ichimatsu	Asanuma Factory	ship repair	10,000
10. Izumi Eikichi	Izumi shipyard	shipbuilding	50,000
11. Nagahama Taichi (with Ah Tam)	Kali plantation	copra planting	180,000
	Sau plantation	copra planting	39,000
	Rambutjo plantation	copra planting	85,000
	Papitelai plantation	copra planting	65,000
	Papitelai plantation	copra planting	140,000
12. Nagahama Taichi (with Shin Loon)	Uraputor plantation	copra planting	25,000
	Kabil plantation	copra planting	25,000

*Tashiro Tsunesuke was a local agent.

Source: 外交史料館所蔵文書, E.4.0.0.11. 「外南洋及南太平洋ニ於イテノ邦人ノ営ム農企業個人並商工業者査報一件」[JDR, E.4.0.0.11, 'Report on Japanese agricultural enterprises and individuals and merchants operating in the outer South Seas and South Pacific']

mostly run by family members.⁽¹²⁶⁾ Simultaneously the scale of shipbuilding was reduced, so the demands for artisans declined, and the costly Japanese employees were replaced with cheap New Guinean ones.

Although the population had declined and a large company disappeared, Japanese trade with New Guinea increased. After the restriction on trade was lifted, exports increased rapidly from £ 458 in 1923 to £ 34,921 in 1939 and imports from £ 525 in 1925 to £ 7,266 in 1939 (Table 11). The total trade (exports and imports) increased from £ 3,373 in 1925 to £ 42,187 in 1939, at a rate of 1,000 percent. However, this increase was not so astonishing in the total New Guinean trade which increased by 820 percent in the same period.⁽¹²⁷⁾ The proportion of Japanese trade remained extremely marginal in the total New Guinea trade, although it increased very slightly from 0.6 percent in 1925 to 0.9 percent in 1939 (even at its peak in 1937 the proportion was only 2.3 percent).⁽¹²⁸⁾

Although the total trade was slight, it was lucrative and the balance always greatly

Table 11. Japanese trade with New Guinea, 1919-1939 (£)

	export	import	total
1923	458	-	-
1924	194	-	-
1925	2,848	525	3,373
1926	-	-	-
1927	10,303	-	10,303
1928	18,805	-	18,805
1929	23,103	-	23,103
1930	27,050	4,065	31,115
1931	13,947	3,633	17,580
1932	22,046	4,243	26,289
1933	25,369	7,783	33,152
1934	42,757	9,839	52,596
1935	76,030	12,035	88,065
1936	73,747	10,027	83,774
1937	98,585	8,620	107,205
1938	46,627	7,445	54,072
1939	34,921	7,266	42,187

Source: *Report to the League of Nations on the Administration of the Territory of New Guinea*, 1926, p.p.60-61; 1927, p.p.47-48, 1927, p.p.54-56; 1928, p.p.39-40; 1929, p.p.53-62; 1930, p.p.63-73; 1931, p.p.60-70; 1932, p.p.59-68; 1933, p.p.77-86; 1934, p.p.69-79; 1935, p.p.66-75; 1936, p.p.67-77; 1937, p.p.91-100; 1938, p.p.94-103; 1939, p.p.93-102; 1940, p.p.85-101

favoured Japan. A typical Japanese trade pattern developed - exporters of light manufactured goods and importers of raw materials. Their major exports were tinned fish, clothes and textiles (Table 12) - common Japanese exports in the pre-war period. Tsurushima and Nan'yō Bōeki, retailers of Japanese goods at Rabaul, used to advertise the sale of kimono, silk underwear and even Sapporo beer.⁽¹²⁹⁾ The major Japanese imports were shell (mainly trochus), followed by copra and bêche-de-mer (Table 13), reflecting the increase of the businesses engaged in those industries (Table 9 and 10). The demands for those products were, however, slight in Japan: even copra, one of the major exports from the South Seas, occupied less than one percent in 1937 in the total imports of Japan.⁽¹³⁰⁾

The trade and investment pattern also shows a classic pattern of colonial trade. The Japanese invested capital in primary industries and used New Guinean labour for production, while expanding the local market for their manufactured goods. In the plantations and shipyards, the Japanese used New Guinean labourers. As Table 14 shows, all fishermen employed New Guinean crews; all plantations had New Guinean labourers; and the shipyard and even general store had New Guinean employees. In total 324 New Guineans were employed by about 40 Japanese. The Japanese recruited New Guineans widely from Manus,

Table 12. Major items of Japanese exports to New Guinea, 1928-1939 (£)

	tinned fish	apparel & attire	textiles	cement	matches	other	total
1928	2,606	3,475	9,196	1,199	479	1,850	18,805
1929	762	1,915	5,045	2,473	493	12,415	23,103
1930	2,807	818	8,772	454	260	13,393	27,050
1931	496	319	8,505	1,284	7	3,336	13,947
1932	2,307	1,047	14,418	1,456	33	2,785	22,046
1933	2,789	3,082	11,379	1,090	304	6,725	25,369
1934	2,935	4,150	21,791	1,569	531	11,781	42,757
1935	7,325	6,580	39,083	2,704	868	19,470	76,030
1936	11,426	5,487	26,641	2,962	621	26,610	73,747
1937	12,008	6,959	50,526	1,377	894	26,821	98,585
1938	7,002	3,370	22,024	1,563	1,160	11,508	46,627
1939	13,256	3,659	3,352	995	3,018	10,641	34,921

Source: *Report to the League of Nations on the Administration of the Territory of New Guinea*, 1926, p.p.60-61; 1927, p.p.47-48, 1927, p.p.54-56; 1928, p.p.39-40; 1929, p.p.53-62; 1930, p.p.63-73; 1931, p.p.60-70; 1932, p.p.59-68; 1933, p.p.77-86; 1934, p.p.69-79; 1935, p.p.66-75; 1936, p.p.67-77; 1937, p.p.91-100; 1938, p.p.94-103; 1939, p.p.93-102; 1940, p.p.85-101

Table 13. Major items of Japanese imports from New Guinea, 1931-1939 (£)

	copra	shell	bêche-de-mer	other	total
1931	-	3,620	-	13	3,633
1932	-	4,215	-	28	4,243
1933	-	7,595	150	38	7,783
1934	-	9,816	-	23	9,839
1935	662	11,340	-	33	12,035
1936	359	9,520	-	148	10,027
1937	4,232	4,340	-	48	8,620
1938	2,690	2,880	1,875	-	7,445
1939	-	7,040	-	226	7,266

Source: *Report to the League of Nations on the Administration of the Territory of New Guinea*, 1926, p.p.60-61; 1927, p.p.47-48, 1927, p.p.54-56; 1928, p.p.39-40; 1929, p.p.53-62; 1930, p.p.63-73; 1931, p.p.60-70; 1932, p.p.59-68; 1933, p.p.77-86; 1934, p.p.69-79; 1935, p.p.66-75; 1936, p.p.67-77; 1937, p.p.91-100; 1938, p.p.94-103; 1939, p.p.93-102; 1940, p.p.85-101

New Ireland, New Britain and Bougainville.⁽¹³¹⁾ Like white settlers, the Japanese also suffered from the shortage of labour and even went to the area along the Ramu River in mainland New Guinea to recruit.⁽¹³²⁾

Japanese settlers were, as the Australians in Rabaul perceived, no menace to the security of New Guinea. They lived their day to day life like other ordinary townfolk. Unlike in

Table 14. New Guinean labourers in Japanese businesses, 1940

<i>company name</i>	<i>no. of New Guinean employees</i>	<i>no. of other non-Japanese employees</i>
Nakamura Company	8	-
Kimura Company	25	-
Kikuchi Company	25	-
Tsujii Mano Company	20	-
Ikeda Company	22	-
Ishibashi Company	20	-
Tsurushima Company	3	2 (Malays)
South Seas Trading Company	8	1 (Filipino)
Asanuma Factory	-	-
Izumi Shipyard	20	4 (Chinese)
Kali plantation	30	-
Sau plantation	8	-
Rambutjo plantation	28	-
Pitelu plantation	25	-
Papitelai plantation	40	-
Uraputor plantation	22	-
Kabil plantation	20	-
total	324	7

Source: 外交史料館所蔵文書, E.4.0.0.11. 「外南洋及南太平洋ニ於イテノ邦人ノ営ム農企業個人並商工業者査報一件」 [JDR, E.4.0.0.11, 'Report on Japanese agricultural enterprises and individuals and merchants operating in the outer South Seas and South Pacific']

Micronesia or Southeast Asia, they formed no political organisations or religious groups. They formed the Japanese Society in 1932, but it was a social club used only by the Japanese. They knew the Australian fear of Japanese development in Micronesia, as it was often rumoured and reported in the newspaper. And they knew about developments in Micronesia because Nan'yō Bōeki's liner came regularly to Rabaul from Ponape bringing news. Probably they felt neglected by their own government, knowing of the 'Japanisation' of Micronesia: the establishment of schools, shrines, temples and even education of Micronesians. However, they also knew that any public expression of admiration for development in Micronesia was detrimental to good relations with the Australians. What they could do was just hide their patriotism and concentrate on their daily business, hoping that one day their government would praise their development of New Guinea.⁽¹³³⁾

The Japanese divided into three groups - businessmen at Rabaul, plantation managers and planters on Manus, New Ireland and Bougainville, and mobile fishermen. Most lived in Rabaul and others often visited there. Rabaul was a meeting place for business transactions, socialisation and gathering precious information about Japan. In Rabaul, the Japanese community, although small, was well known. They had stores, a garage, shipyard and

barber's shop, most of which advertised in the local newspaper.⁽¹³⁴⁾ Although the precise number of the Japanese in Rabaul throughout the period is unknown because of the lack of a local population census except for 1933 and 1940, on average about 20 Japanese seem to have resided in the town. In 1933 the Commonwealth census recorded 17 according to nationality (i.e., allegiance) and 29 according to race.⁽¹³⁵⁾ The first figure is very likely the actual number of the Japanese and the latter seems to be mixed-race Japanese. In 1940 when all Japanese were interned, 16 out of total 29 internees were arrested in Rabaul.⁽¹³⁶⁾

Their material possessions made them visible, out of proportion to their numbers. They had nine motor vessels, three motor cars (two latest model Plymouth sedans and one Ford V-8 sedan 1938 model), two trucks and one motor cycle, and most owned houses.⁽¹³⁷⁾ However, their social status did not equal that of white residents. They were still not accepted in European quarters as in the German period. Most Japanese lived in the area now called Malaytown and Malaguna, and Japanese stores and Imaizumi's cinema were in Chinatown.⁽¹³⁸⁾ The Japanese quarters in Malaytown were sometimes called 'Japantown'.⁽¹³⁹⁾

Komine remained a leader of the community. He acted like a lobbyist when Australia restricted Japan-New Guinea trade. In 1920, he visited Sydney to petition the Australian government to lift trade restriction.⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ He also unsuccessfully sought permission from the Prime Minister to raise £ 10,000 to £ 15,000 by mortgaging his plantations to a Sydney company, George Morgan & Co. Ltd.⁽¹⁴¹⁾ At Sydney he was interviewed by the *Daily Telegraph*. A short article appeared with a photograph. Probably Komine exaggerated his experiences in New Guinea deliberately in order to impress Australians. The article said that he was a 'Pacific Pioneer' and 'built a row-boat....to navigate 360 miles of the Fly River.... by permission of Sir William MacGregor'. His assistance to the Australian forces at World War I was admirably reported and the article concluded that 'he did a heap of service generally, for which the [British] Empire stands in his debt.'⁽¹⁴²⁾

As on his visit to Sydney, Komine sometimes acted like an official to represent the Japanese in New Guinea. Some Australians in fact thought that he was an official. An Australian traveller, Lilian Overell, mistakenly thought him a consul:

Farther on [from Malaytown] is the Japanese quarter. The Japanese Consul is said by some to be the richest man in Rabaul. When Lord Jellicoe arrived here, he called at Government House and then at the Japanese Consul's, where he left a present to smooth someone's ruffled feathers.⁽¹⁴³⁾

Similarly, Manus people thought he was a Japanese *kiap*.⁽¹⁴⁴⁾

Komine led the Japanese economic activities until just before the Great Depression. In 1929, his company made £ 26,000 profits and employed 14 Japanese and 362 New Guineans, while Nagahama, who had the second largest business among the Japanese, made only £ 3,000 and employed one Japanese and 10 New Guineans.⁽¹⁴⁵⁾

However, Komine's status began to decline when the Great Depression savaged all planters in New Guinea:

By 1931, the price of copra had fallen to £ 11.10s. a ton, half of what it had been in 1925-6. It was to fall much further in the next three years, reaching £ 4.11s. a ton in 1934.....Within five years the value of copra exports fell from £ 1,176,040 in 1928 to £ 618,298 in 1932. The new owners, who had expected to live in a style appropriate to men who control the wealth of a country, found themselves with an intolerable burden of debt and no prospect of discharging that debt. The properties were unsalable.⁽¹⁴⁶⁾

Komine was no exception. His businesses made large losses and his debt to Burns Philp increased to the extent that he could not pay wages for his employees. In this crisis he asked the Consul-General, Inoue Kōjirō, in Sydney for financial assistance. Inoue wrote to the Foreign Minister, Shidehara Kijūrō regarding Komine's request to borrow funds at low interest.⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ Shortly afterwards Hanaoka Masaichi, the directing manager of the Headquarters of the Nan'yō Sangyō Kaisha in Japan, sent a formal petition to Shidehara.⁽¹⁴⁸⁾ Prominent white residents in Rabaul also telegraphed to Tokyo to ask for assistance for Komine. They included the administrator Wisdom, Catholic Missionary Society, Methodist Church and Anglican Bishop.⁽¹⁴⁹⁾

However, Tokyo was reluctant to respond. Inoue pressed Shidehara again saying, 'unless the Japanese government took some measures or gave credible guarantee on the payment of his debts, it would be very conceivable that Japanese businesses, which had been firmly built on the islands, would be overturned from the foundation.'⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ Komine was frustrated and wrote a long letter to Inoue, emphasising that he started his business because he was encouraged by the admirals of the Imperial Navy, and appealed to national prestige. More importantly Komine clearly indicated his imperial ambition:

My purpose [in starting the business] was not to make profits but to lay a foundation for the development of the Empire in future. Therefore I kept good relations with German administrators and, of course, with Australian administrators. As imperial subjects, I and other Japanese have endured difficulties until today so that we should not disgrace the Empire. [If I do not get assistance] it would not only force my very dedicated employees, who have worked for me for many years, to suffer from losing jobs, but it would be a national disgrace as all people of other nationalities [in New Guinea] were watching the outcome of our situation. That would be an agony for me worse than death. I would like to beg you for your consideration.⁽¹⁵¹⁾

In response, Inoue appealed to Tokyo more strongly but in vain.⁽¹⁵²⁾ Even the Bank of New South Wales recommended 'favourable consideration of his [Komine's] application' to Tokyo, but the government declined any assistance.⁽¹⁵³⁾ Japan could not intervene in the

affairs of the Australian mandate, because it would have caused a diplomatic problem with Australia; Japan had been excluding non-Japanese economic activities, particularly the operations of Burns Philp, in Micronesia. Consequently, although Loxton (sympathetic honorary consul in Brisbane) intervened and succeeded in postponing the foreclosure for two months,⁽¹⁵⁴⁾ Komine's business (including properties) was auctioned on 30 December 1930.⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ At this time he was 64 years old, probably too old to run a business, as Inoue wrote in his letter to Shidehara that Komine needed able advisers.⁽¹⁵⁶⁾

After he lost his business, he returned to his old trade - shell fishing - despite his age. One day in October 1934 he took a schooner to the sea and died. He was then 68 years old. It was an ironic end of his dramatic life. He died like a careless fisherman, not like a once successful businessman. He was poisoned by a lobster which he caught and ate.⁽¹⁵⁷⁾ But his funeral revived his past glory. Hundreds of New Guineans from Manus, New Ireland, and Bougainville, Chinese and Europeans, including the Acting-Administrator Wanliss and other officials attended.⁽¹⁵⁸⁾ And Tatsue Yoshinobu, Komine's old friend since his exploration days, erected a monument in the European cemetery.⁽¹⁵⁹⁾ His body was cremated and his wife went back to Nagasaki with his bones.

However, Komine's death did not end Japanese business activities. At the time of liquidation, Komine persuaded Nagahama Taichi, a shipwright from Goryō village in Amakusa, to take over his business. Komine recruited Nagahama in the 1910s because Nagahama's family in Amakusa were well-known as master shipwrights for generations. In Rabaul, Nagahama worked for Komine for some years, but soon became independent and set up his own shipyard and coastal shipping business.⁽¹⁶⁰⁾ Fortunately Nagahama's business was not much affected by the fall of copra prices because he was not a planter. Komine told Nagahama that successors of Ah Tam, a wealthy Chinese resident in Rabaul and Komine's long-time friend, would provide as much assistance as possible for the purchase of Komine's businesses. According to Nagahama's daughter, what Komine most feared was that his assets would be taken over by Burns Philp, extinguishing Japanese influence in New Guinea.⁽¹⁶¹⁾ Nagahama bought all of Komine's plantations with Ah Tam's successors (Lee Tam Tuck, Tee Chee Wee, Tse Dong, See To Fat Whye).⁽¹⁶²⁾ Naturally Nagahama, now the most wealthy Japanese in New Guinea, took over the leadership of the community. In 1932 he became the founder and first president of the Rabaul Japanese Society.⁽¹⁶³⁾ His nephew, Yuki Yoshi, was also working in his shipyard. Although Nagahama did not have a history of bravery like Komine, probably he had an air of dignity cultivated by his upbringing in his master shipwright's family where the master-apprentice relationship was strictly maintained. Like Komine, he lived in Malaguna.

Nagahama also bought Komine's shipbuilding business but sublet it to Izumi Eikichi, another shipwright who came to Rabaul around the same time as Nagahama, from the same village in Amakusa. He was also a competent diver. The shipyard was close to Ah Tam's area. Business became very busy after the eruption of Matupit and Vulcan in 1937. He had

so many orders⁽¹⁶⁴⁾ that he went back to Japan and recruited three more shipwrights and expanded into a second dry dock at Timbur in Kokopo.⁽¹⁶⁵⁾ Izumi had to offer high wages to attract shipwrights to this unknown land. One of the new shipwrights, Hatamoto Otsaku, remembers the offered wages as almost three times higher than those in Japan. In fact, after only two months, he paid all his debts which he had made to buy new tools before coming to New Guinea, and began to remit money handsomely to his family.⁽¹⁶⁶⁾ Izumi's shipyard had a good reputation; his good repair work to the Australian vessel *China Maru* was reported in *The Rabaul Times*.⁽¹⁶⁷⁾ Izumi married Nataman, a New Ireland woman, in 1929 and had four children by the outbreak of the Pacific War.⁽¹⁶⁸⁾

Nozaki Tsunejirō was another well-known boatbuilder. Unlike other boatbuilders, he came from Shizuoka, a prefecture close to Tokyo, and started his boatbuilding by purchasing the business from an Australian boatbuilder, R.D. Pye in 1930.⁽¹⁶⁹⁾ He worked actively for the administration. He repaired the government vessels *M.S. Hermes* in 1930 and *M.V. Thetis* in 1933.⁽¹⁷⁰⁾ He performed 'extremely credible' work in salvaging the motor schooner *Marina* which had sunk off Matupi.⁽¹⁷¹⁾ He also acted as an accountant for Izumi.⁽¹⁷²⁾

Tashiro Tsunesuke and Tsurushima Sōkichi were probably the most common faces among the townfolk, as they had stores in Chinatown. Tashiro was an old resident. He was the eldest son of Otomatsu who came to Rabaul to trade before 1916 and in that year brought his wife and Tsunesuke.⁽¹⁷³⁾ Tsunesuke began to work as an agent of Nan'yō Bōeki and lived in the house opposite the Nan'yō Bōeki store. Nan'yō Bōeki expanded its trading in the mid-1930s. Its Rabaul branch was opened in 1936 (promotion from just an agency) and supplied Japanese goods wholesale to Burns Philp and Carpenters.⁽¹⁷⁴⁾ Tsunesuke did most of the work in Rabaul, although the company appointed another manager at its opening of the branch office. Tsunesuke's brother Kiyoshi, who was born in Rabaul in 1922 but was sent to Japan for education from 1925 until re-joining Tsunesuke in June 1939, also worked for the company. Arata Gunkichi, a descendant of samurai from Kagoshima, also worked for the company. He came to New Guinea in 1916 to work for Komine as a secretary.⁽¹⁷⁵⁾ He married a Manus woman and had three daughters.⁽¹⁷⁶⁾

Tsurushima Sōkichi, the store owner, was an old resident. He came to Rabaul to work for Komine as a sawyer from Shimabara in Nagasaki in 1912.⁽¹⁷⁷⁾ Soon he was involved in trading and opened a two-story store around 1935. He had many Chinese friends and his store was popular among them.⁽¹⁷⁸⁾ He imported mainly sundries from Japan. According to his relative, one time he brought back a neon lamp which was so bright that it created a sensation in the town: 'Tsurushima has brought back civilisation from Japan'.⁽¹⁷⁹⁾

Tabuchi Yoshimatsu came from Okayama in 1917 when he was 18 years old with the officially stated purpose to make a 'commercial inspection'.⁽¹⁸⁰⁾ He was a unique figure, well-known among Europeans. In New Guinea he took up a career very different from other Japanese. He became a clerk of Irwin Cromie, a solicitor at Rabaul, and assisted in legal matters mainly dealing with the Japanese.⁽¹⁸¹⁾ He was also an agent of Nan'yō Bōeki.⁽¹⁸²⁾

Tabuchi and Tsurushima were probably the most trusted among the Japanese. Sasaki Keisuke, a fisherman on Manus, left a will to distribute all his assets between the two.⁽¹⁸³⁾

According to oral evidence, Tabuchi married a very attractive mixed-race woman from Thursday Island, Carmelita. Her father was a Portuguese pearl diver and her mother a Torres Strait islander. They married in Rabaul on 3 January 1925 in the Catholic Church. They had four children, but he went back to Japan on 5 October 1938, thinking that war was about to break out. He never came back to New Guinea. In 1940, he re-married a Japanese woman and had two children in Japan.⁽¹⁸⁴⁾

There was a Japanese barber shop servicing mainly Europeans and Japanese. The barbers were Yamaji Fujigorō, Itō Matsutarō and his wife Tsuru.⁽¹⁸⁵⁾ Yamaji started the business first around 1920. He was also a tortoise-shell craftsman.⁽¹⁸⁶⁾ Itō joined the business later but closed the shop for some time and re-opened it on 25 April 1936 at Paatzch's Chambers.⁽¹⁸⁷⁾

Asanuma Ichimatsu was a popular mechanic and did general engineering and blacksmithing.⁽¹⁸⁸⁾ He came from Hachijō-jima, an island near Tokyo, in 1915. Until 1922 he worked for various people and then started his garage in Chinatown between Malaguna Road and the cemetery.⁽¹⁸⁹⁾ He could fix any sort of machinery such as boat engines, cars and even airplanes. He was diligent and did not drink but liked all kinds of sports. He married Louise, a Japanese woman who was adopted and raised by a Filipino family in Yap in the Caroline Islands. The family came to New Guinea in 1914. Louis could not speak Japanese. The couple had three children.

Tsujii Shigeru was another engineer.⁽¹⁹⁰⁾ He had his business in Malaguna but sold it to Wong Fat, a Chinese businessman in 1929.⁽¹⁹¹⁾ Later he started a fishing business.

Imaizumi Masao, the owner of the cinema in Chinatown, screened both Japanese and English films. His cinema also had a billiard saloon.⁽¹⁹²⁾ Sometimes when Japanese sailors visited Rabaul, he set up an arena in his cinema and organised a wrestling tournament to entertain the townsfolk.⁽¹⁹³⁾ He sold the business and left New Guinea in 1925.⁽¹⁹⁴⁾

The fishermen operated widely from the Ninigo Group to Bougainville and fished mainly for trochus shell. They worked for Komine until the liquidation of his business. After that, most formed companies and sold their catch to Tsurushima and Nan'yō Bōeki. They all owned at least one schooner and employed many Manus people.⁽¹⁹⁵⁾ Most lived in Rabaul, except for Kikuchi Ichisuke and Nakamura Sōshichi because of their marriages to New Guinean women. Both lived in Talasea.

Kikuchi came to New Guinea as a transport worker in 1917 when he was 25 years old.⁽¹⁹⁶⁾ He then married a New Guinean, Mongai, and lived on Kapo Island in Talasea where she came from.⁽¹⁹⁷⁾ Mongai was the daughter of a village head man, and the couple had five children. He first owned the *Marukin Maru*, a small five-ton boat, and then the *Ebisu Maru*, a thirty-ton schooner.

Nakamura had originally gone to Thursday Island from Wakayama in 1899⁽¹⁹⁸⁾ and later

he went to New Guinea, where he married a Kilenge woman, Mapole, around 1928 and had six children. He owned a schooner *Kilenge*.⁽¹⁹⁹⁾

The other fishermen, based at Rabaul, were Kimura Hideichirō, Tsujii Shigeru, Mano Kisaburō, Ikeda Kunizō and Ishibashi Umakichi. Kimura came to New Guinea in 1916 and married Josephine, a Filipino woman in 1939.⁽²⁰⁰⁾ Tsujii and Mano had a business partnership and they seem to have fished actively in the Ninigo Group: they applied for special leases on Ami and Lau island in the Group in 1938.⁽²⁰¹⁾ Ikeda and Ishibashi came in 1914 from a famous fishing town, Misaki in Kanagawa.⁽²⁰²⁾ Both seemed to be determined to live in New Guinea, because they brought their wives and children in 1939 when everybody was sensing the outbreak of war.⁽²⁰³⁾ In Rabaul, Ishibashi experienced an unfortunate accident. Reginald Reed, a young single Australian man, tried to hijack his schooner *Namanula* in order to leave New Guinea. Ishibashi resisted and was shot in his shoulder. His Chinese and Manus crew overpowered Reed and brought him to the police, and Ishibashi was sent to the hospital.⁽²⁰⁴⁾ Later he recovered and resumed fishing.

Plantation managers and planters were the last major group. Most worked in Manus either for Komine or Nagahama. Originally they came to New Guinea as fishermen or boatbuilders. Probably they were hard workers and won credit from Komine or Nagahama (both well-known for their strictness towards their employees). Their ability to form good relations with New Guineans probably helped in being appointed managers. Most married local women, which indicates that they were liked and accepted by the local communities.⁽²⁰⁵⁾ That was an important factor in managing plantations where hundreds of New Guineans had to be employed.

Yamashita Shichinosuke was the manager of the plantation on Pityilu Island in Manus. He came to New Guinea in 1913 probably as a fisherman. He was 20 years old and had just passed an examination for conscription. His home was Shikine Jima, a small island in Izu Islands south of Tokyo. He went to Misaki in Kanagawa to look for a job and knew about New Guinea from local fishermen and decided to come to New Guinea.⁽²⁰⁶⁾ In the 1920s Yamashita married Samaruesu, a woman from Nyada Village on the north coast of Manus and the couple had three children.⁽²⁰⁷⁾ On Pityilu he also ran a store and the schooner *Pityilu*. However, towards the end of the 1930s the management began to suffer deficits and accumulated large debts to Burns Philp. Yamashita could not bear the heavy pressure and committed suicide in 1940, detonating dynamite in a toilet on the beach.⁽²⁰⁸⁾

Ikesaki Tokuyoshi, who married a Kimbe woman, ran the plantation on Momote. He came to New Guinea at the age of 17 in 1912 as a sawyer from the same village as Nagahama.⁽²⁰⁹⁾ However, in New Guinea he became more interested in diving for trochus shell, which gave him more income. As well, he began to do some plantation work. He was a man of many romances. By the 1930s, he had contracted three marriages all with New Guinean women.⁽²¹⁰⁾ After he married the third wife, Gela (daughter of the village chief of Bulunuri village near Kimbe in West New Britain), he came to Manus and was appointed the manager of Momote plantation.⁽²¹¹⁾

Hagiwara Hikota, the manager of Pak Island plantation, came to New Guinea from Amakusa in the same year as Ikesaki. He was a sawyer and was 20 years old.⁽²¹²⁾ He married Phirai, a Manus woman, and had three children.

Endō Shigetarō was a small planter on Anir (Ambitle) Island in New Ireland.⁽²¹³⁾ He came to New Guinea from Tokushima in 1914 as a shipwright to work for Komine.⁽²¹⁴⁾ In the 1920s he married Nataman, a woman from Anir Island, then he moved to her island and began to plant copra and build small boats for the islanders.⁽²¹⁵⁾ The couple had three children.

Okaji Santarō kept operating a plantation and store in Buka Island and later Bougainville. Unlike others, he did not marry a New Guinean. But he was successful. From Buka Island where he originally started his business, he expanded into copra planting at Kieta. He had a 50-hectare lease north of Kieta.⁽²¹⁶⁾ However, he died in 1924 and his brother came to New Guinea to arrange his affairs.⁽²¹⁷⁾

In racial relations, the Japanese managed to form amicable relations with members of the main races in New Guinea. In the colonial structure which was strictly hierarchical by race, the Japanese precariously secured a position almost equal to the Australians in formal terms; in reality they did not enjoy the full privileges which Australians had. The Japanese held a position as business partners to the Chinese, and as masters to New Guineans. Their peaceful relationship with the Australians was partly attributable to their numerical and economic marginality.⁽²¹⁸⁾ The Australians could maintain their friendliness, because the Japanese hardly affected their interests. This contrasts with Australian uneasiness with the Chinese when their number increased and their business expanded.⁽²¹⁹⁾ If the Australians had not restricted Japanese migration and trading, the Japanese could have experienced the same fate as they did on Thursday Island from the 1890s and eventually been driven out of New Guinea. The amicable Japanese-Australian relations developed in this artificial circumstance.

At personal level, however, the administrators always respected Komine. That was demonstrated at the times of Komine's financial difficulties and funeral. Other Japanese also made personal friends. Nozaki, the boatbuilder, and his wife had been friends of John Thurston, a prominent planter, 'for many years.'⁽²²⁰⁾ In fact, the childless couple adopted Josephine, a daughter of Thurston.⁽²²¹⁾ Asanuma and Izumi were 'great friends' of Gordon Ehret, a Rabaul trader, and did much repair work for him.⁽²²²⁾ Similarly, ex-Rabaul shipwright, Hatamoto Otosaku, recalls good relations with his Australian counterparts.⁽²²³⁾ He was building boats for the administration with Australian boatbuilders and they used to go to the beach in Kokopo together.

The Japanese knew that their presence was at the mercy of the Australians. This made them almost impossible to show their patriotism or Japaneseness. Unlike in Micronesia, they built no Japanese shrines or temples. There was no New Year celebration in a Japanese style, unlike the Chinese. Nor was there the Bon Festival in mid-August.⁽²²⁴⁾ Probably these Japanese events were celebrated privately among themselves in Izumi's house which was unofficially called the 'Japan Club'.⁽²²⁵⁾ The Club was their only sanctuary in New Guinea; most Japanese used to meet there. Probably they thought it wise to confine their activities

to themselves in order not to offend any Australians, even though that in itself might have invited suspicion.

In order to keep friendly relations with the white settlers, the Japanese followed western customs. They celebrated Coronation Day, putting their own entry in the procession.⁽²²⁶⁾ Similarly, most inter-racial marriages were celebrated in Christian churches, although the Japanese did not accept the Christian faith. They hardly taught the Japanese language or Japanese customs or religions to their mixed-race children.⁽²²⁷⁾ And most mixed-race children were sent to Vunapope Mission School run by German Catholics.⁽²²⁸⁾

Japanese relations with New Guineans had two aspects. The Japanese were masters. Like their white counterparts, most Japanese kept master-servant relationships. They were well aware of the racial hierarchy and considered themselves equal to white masters.⁽²²⁹⁾ Some regarded New Guineans as mere labour and treated them cruelly. For example, there was a violent master, called Narumi, who always ill-treated his New Guinean crew.⁽²³⁰⁾ However, what distinguished the Japanese masters from their European counterparts was their cordial efforts to cultivate good relations, because the formation of good relations, which assured a supply of cheap labour, was essential to their economic survival. They had little capital (none were large capitalists and all were artisans or fishermen when they arrived); they could not attract investment from large Japanese capitalists who were far more interested in Southeast Asia; and the Japanese government never provided assistance due to the delicate diplomatic relations with Australia.

Komine set an example in forming such cordial relations. All oral evidence confirm that Komine brought many gifts and the islanders were happy to provide their labour in exchange.⁽²³¹⁾ He also instructed other Japanese, particularly plantation managers, to treat the islanders well, otherwise they were brought back to Rabaul. More importantly, Komine faithfully fulfilled reciprocal obligations with the islanders. That was extremely important in Melanesian traditions and was often neglected by white settlers. The following episode from elders of Ponam Island, where Komine's schooner was wrecked and he was helped by the islanders in 1907,⁽²³²⁾ is a good example. When the *luluai* village chief of the island died in 1925, Komine came from Rabaul bringing a concrete grave and buried him. The grave, which has Komine's name on its lower part, is still in the island's cemetery and the story of friendship between their *luluai* and Komine has been handed down from generation to generation.⁽²³³⁾

Forming family relationship through marriages and the adoption of children was another important tradition in Melanesian society, which Komine also followed. He adopted a New Guinean boy and sent him to Tokyo for education in the 1920s. The boy attended a private junior high school but got sick and died after a year.⁽²³⁴⁾ A shipwright from Amakusa also adopted a boy and brought him back.⁽²³⁵⁾ As seen in the previous section, some Japanese, who came to New Guinea at a young age, married local women. The marriages of course reinforced relations with the islanders.

The Japanese also formed good relations with the Chinese. It was another require-

ment for their survival. Komine once regarded the Chinese as formidable rivals. But the Japanese, since their migration and trading had been restricted, could not compete with the Chinese who were far more numerous and had a more extensive trading network extending to Southeast Asia. To make the Chinese their rivals in business was an unwise choice. As a result, the Japanese had many business deals with the Chinese. As described earlier, Tsujii sold his engineering business to Wong Fat in 1929, and Komine's business was bought by Nagahama and the successors of Ah Tam in 1930. Nagahama also bought a Chinese plantation in Namatanai when the planter, Lum Fook, died in 1928.⁽²³⁶⁾ Indeed, Bernard Chan, a prominent ex-Raub Chinese businessman, recalls his good relations with the Japanese, despite the fact that the Chinese generally disliked the Japanese due to their invasion in China:

After the Japanese invasion into China, some Chinese started to boycott the Japanese goods, but this was in a small way, because without Japanese goods, these shops were unable to operate. The second reason of the Chinese not against the local Japanese, because Nagahama and the other Japanese national are friendly people.⁽²³⁷⁾

Some oral evidence confirm Chan's memory. Tsurushima had many Chinese friends and used to play mahjong with his best Chinese friends - members of the prominent Seeto family.⁽²³⁸⁾ According to some informants, the Japanese were always on the side of the Chinese when Australian racism against Asians was strong: for instance, Nakamura used to stand up to the Australians when they harassed the Chinese.⁽²³⁹⁾

Conclusion

In the rapidly changing international situation between the two wars, the Japanese influence in New Guinea gradually declined because of the policies of both Australia and Japan. Australians reinforced their perceptions of an ever expanding Japanese Empire towards the south and their recognition of the strategic importance of New Guinea. New Guinea, Australians believed, had to be an Asian-free white bastion. The Japanese in Tokyo considered the small number of Japanese in New Guinea expendable in order to secure their exclusive control of Micronesia. Only some *nanshin-ron* advocates from the late-1930s were interested in using narratives about the settlers for propaganda. Thus the Japanese in New Guinea were deserted by their own government and restrained by the Australian government.

In these discouraging circumstances, nevertheless, the Japanese settlers were able to realise the dreams of *Meiji nanshin-ron* advocates - peaceful economic expansion. Although the Japanese economic activities were marginal in the overall economic growth of New Guinea, they expanded the trade dramatically, exporting copra and shell and

importing textiles: in terms of trade relations, Japan secured raw materials and markets for its manufactured goods. Thus the pattern of postwar economic relations between Japan and Papua New Guinea already existed in this period.⁽²⁴⁰⁾ In developing such economic relations, the Japanese community was transformed from a group of artisans to a group of businessmen. And such a transformation was possible because the Australians provided a colonial apparatus expedient to the Japanese. The Australians granted the Japanese the position of honorary colonial masters and allowed them to use New Guinean labour, that is, in effect, the Australians relieved the Japanese of the cost of bringing in their own labourers. Consequently, the Japanese were able to develop colonial relations with New Guineans within the Australian colonial apparatus. Thus, although they declined numerically and their total economic activities were relatively slight, the Japanese were indeed able to colonise New Guinea.

Notes

- (1) About Komine, see IWAMOTO, H. 1995. 'The origin and development of Japanese settlement in Papua and New Guinea, 1890-1914', *South Pacific Study*, 15(2): 97-133 and 'The impact of World War on Japanese settlers in Papua and New Guinea, 1914-1918', *South Pacific Study*, 16(2): 143-174, Kagoshima University South Pacific Research Center, Kagoshima.
- (2) LATHAM, J. 1920. *The significance of the Peace Conference from an Australian point of view*. p.3, Melville & Mullen Pty. Ltd., Melbourne.
- (3) 内田から松井への書簡, 1919年4月21日. 外務省 1971. 『日本外公文書』大正八年 第三冊上巻. 242頁, 東京. [Uchida to Matsui, 21 April 1919, in Foreign Ministry 1971. *Japanese diplomatic documents*, 1919, vol.3, No.1, p.242. Tokyo.]
- (4) 若槻泰雄 1972. 『排日の歴史』. 138頁, 中央公論社, 東京. [WAKATSUKI, Y. 1972. *History of discrimination against the Japanese*. p.138, Chūōkōron-sha, Tokyo.]
- (5) OWEN, F. 1954. *Tempestuous Journey: Lloyd George His Life and Times*. p.550, Hutchinson Stratford Place, London.
- (6) CLARK, M. 1987. *A Short History of Australia*, third edition. p.213, A Mentor Book, New York.
- (7) HUDSON, W. 1978. *Billy Hughes in Paris: the birth of Australian diplomacy*. p.55, Nelson, Melbourne.
- (8) SISSONS, D. 1971. The Immigration question in Australian diplomatic relations with Japan 1875-1919, paper presented to the 43rd Congress of the Australia and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science. p.38, Brisbane.
- (9) PIESSE, E. 9 January 1920. Draft for 'V. Future Policy, 19. The racial discrimination should be reduced to the utmost possible extent,' p.12, in Australian Archives (hereafter AA), A5954 1203/2, 'New Guinea and White Australia Policy: papers prepared

for first assembly of League of Nations - 1920'

- (10) LATHAM, op.cit., p.9.
- (11) GRATTAN, C.H. 1963. *The Southwest Pacific Since 1900: A Modern History, Australia, New Zealand, The Islands, Antarctica*. p.65, The University of Michigan Press, New York.
- (12) 若槻 [WAKATSUKI] , op.cit., p.153.
- (13) NELSON, H. 1995. 'Sacred trust and self-interest: Australia, Rabaul and beyond', In: *The Great War: gains and losses - ANZAC and Empire* (Ed. WILCOX, C.), p.111, Australian War memorial and Australian National University, Canberra.
- (14) 細谷千博 1988. 『両大戦間の日本外交』. 2頁, 岩波書店, 東京. [Hosoya C. 1988. *Japanese diplomacy between the two wars*. p.2, Iwanami shoten, Tokyo.]
- (15) 江口圭一 1994. 「1910 - 1930年代の日本 - アジア支配への道」. 『日本通史, 第18巻, 近代3』 (朝尾直弘他編), 31頁, 岩波書店, 東京. [EGUCHI K. 1994. 'Japan from 1910s to 1930s - the path to rule Asia', *History of Japan*, Vol.3, modern period 3 (Ed. ASANO. et al.), p.31, Iwanami shoten, Tokyo.]
- (16) COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA. 1992. *Parliamentary Debates*, Vol.XCIX. p.789, Melbourne.
- (17) PIESSE, E. 1926. 'Japan and Australia', *Foreign Affairs*, Vol.4. p.488, New York.
- (18) FREI, H.P. 1991. *Japan's Southward Advance and Australia*. p.114, Melbourne University Press, Melbourne.
- (19) ANDREWS, E. 1967. 'The Australian Government and Appeasement', *The Australian Journal of Politics and History*, Vol.13, p.41.
- (20) FREI, op.cit., p.127.
- (21) HUDSON, W. 1967. *Towards a Foreign Policy: 1914-1941*. p.67, Cassell Australia, Melbourne.
- (22) HUDSON, W. 1970. *Australian Diplomacy*. p.24, Macmillan of Australia, Melbourne.
- (23) Ibid., p.25.
- (24) 細谷千博 1979. 『日本外交の座標』. 75頁, 中央公論社, 東京. [HOSOYA C. 1979. *Coordinates of Japanese diplomacy*. p.75, Chūōkōron sha, Tokyo.]
- (25) WEINBER, G. 1980. *The Foreign Policy of Hitler's Germany: starting World War 1937-1939*. p.136, University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.
- (26) 日本国際政治学会 1963. 『太平洋戦争への道. 第7巻, 日本開戦』. 56~57頁, 朝日新聞社, 東京. [Japanese Association of International Politics. 1963. *The road to the Pacific War*. p.p.56-57, Vol.7, The outbreak of Japan-US war, Asahi shimbun sha, Tokyo.]
- (27) 外務大臣から在東京ドイツ大使への書簡, 1940年9月27日; 在東京ドイツ大使から外務大臣への書簡, 1940年9月27日. 日本国際政治学会 1963. 『太平洋戦争への道, 第5巻, 三国同盟, 日ソ中立条約』. 224~225頁, 朝日新聞社, 東京. [Japanese Foreign Minister to German ambassador at Tokyo, 27 September 1940, German ambassador at Tokyo to Japanese Foreign Minister, 27 September 1940. In *The road to the Pacific War, Vol.5, Tripartite Pact, USSR-Japan Non-*

- Aggression Pact* (Japanese Association of International Politics. 1963). p.p.224-225, Asahi shimbun sha, Tokyo.]
- (28) Quoted in HUDSON, W. (Ed.) 1974. *New Guinea Empire: Australia's colonial experience*. p.6, Cassell Australia, Melbourne.
- (29) 清水 元 1991. 「日本資本主義と南洋」『講座東南アジア学, 第10巻, 東南アジアと日本』(矢野暢編), 92頁, 弘文堂, 東京. [SHIMIZU H. 1991. 'Japanese capitalism and the South Seas' In: *Southeast Asia Studies, Vol.10, Southeast Asia and Japan* (Ed.YANO T.), p.92, Kobun-do, Tokyo.]
- (30) Tōnan ajia' in Japanese. It literally means 'East-South Asia'.
- (31) 岩本洋光 1995. 「太平洋戦争前のパプアおよびニューギニアへの出稼移民 - 南進と白濠主義の間に生きた人々」『移民研究年報』, 創刊号. 95頁, 日本移民学会, 東京. [IWAMOTO H. 1995. 'Japanese Migrants to Papua and New Guinea before the Pacific War. People caught between the "Nanshin" Policy and the "White Australia" Policy' Annual Review of Migration Studies, Vol.1. p.95, Japanese Association for Migration Studies, Tokyo.]
- (32) SHIMIZU, op.cit.
- (33) 清水 元 1986. 「『南進論』の帰趨と南洋貿易会議の思想」『両大戦間期日本・東南アジア関係の諸相』. 24~25頁, アジア経済研究所, 東京. [SHIMIZU H. 1986. 'The trend of southward advancement theory in the 1920s and the ideology of the South Seas Trade Conference'. In: *Various aspects of Japan-Southeast Asia relations between the two wars* (Ed. SHIMIZU H.), p.p.24-25, Ajia keizai kenkyū sho, Tokyo.]
- (34) 外務省通商局 1928. 『貿易, 企業及移民ヨリ観タル南洋』. 東京. [Commerce Bureau of the Department of Foreign Affairs 1928. *The South Seas in view of trade, companies and emigration*. Tokyo.]
- (35) Ibid., p.1.
- (36) 藤山雷太 1933. 「海の生命線と我が南洋発展」『植民』, 7~8頁, 植民通信社, 東京. [FUJIYAMA R. 1933. 'Sea life line and our South Seas development', *The Colonial Review*, p.p.7-8, Vol.12, No.9, Shokumin tsushin-sha, Tokyo.]
- (37) 波多野澄雄 1984. 「昭和海軍の南進論」『増刊歴史と人物』, 279頁, 中央公論社, 東京. [HATANO S. 1984. 'The southward advancement theory of the navy in the Showa period', *Special Issue, History and People*. p.279, Chūōkōron sha, Tokyo.]
- (38) Ibid., p.282.
- (39) 後藤乾一 1986. 『昭和期日本とインドネシア』. 35~36頁, 勁草書房, 東京. [GOTŌ K. 1986. *Showa Japan and Indonesia*. p.p.35-36, Keisō-shobō, Tokyo.]
- (40) 「付録16」. 矢野 暢 1979. 『日本の南洋史観』. 212頁, 中央公論社, 東京. [Appendix No.16. In: YANO T. 1979. *Japanese historical view of the South Seas*. p.212, Chūōkōron sha, Tokyo.]
- (41) The first shogun of the Edo Era, Tokugawa Ieyasu, encouraged the South Seas trade, before the shogunate government adopted *sakoku* [seclusion] policy. In order to protect trading ships, he institutes the system to issue *shuin-jō* [red-seal permits]

which were the letters of official endorsement of trade to the countries that the Japanese traders were dealing with. The trading was so active in the early 16th century that approximately 100,000 Japanese settled in Southeast Asia mainly for business purpose and created *Nihon machi* [Japanese town].

- (42) 岩生成一 1936. 『近世初期日本人南洋発展の歴史』. 台北大学, 台北. [IWAO S. 1936. *History of Japanese development in the South Seas in the early modern times*. Taipei University, Taipei.]
- (43) 岩生成一 1939. 『南洋に於ける日欧関係の推移』 『東西交渉史論』. 509 ~ 556 頁, 富山房, 東京. [IWAO S. 1939. 'The change of Japan-European relations in the South Seas', *Theory on the history of East-West contact*. p.p.509-556, Tomiyama-bō, Tokyo.]
- (44) 岩生成一 1940. 『南洋日本人町の研究』. 地人書館, 東京. [IWAO S. 1940. *Study on Japanese towns in the South Seas*. Chijin-shokan, Tokyo.]
- (45) 入江寅次 1938. 『邦人海外発展史』. 移民問題研究所, 東京. [IRIE T. 1938. *History of Japanese overseas development. Imin mondai kenkyū kai*, Tokyo.]
- (46) 筧 清澄 1938. 『南方諸方に於ける往昔日本人の活躍』. 1頁, 熱帯文化協会, 東京. [KAKEI K. 1938. *Japanese activities in the southern area in old times*, p.1, Netai bunka Kyōkai, Tokyo.]
- (47) 防衛庁防衛研修所戦史室 1968. 『大本営陸軍部 (2) 昭和16年12月まで』. 55 頁における引用文, 朝雲新聞社, 東京. [Quoted in War History Office, Defence Training Institute, Defence Agency] (ed.) 1968. *The Army Section of the Imperial Headquarters (2) until December 1940*. p.55, Asagumo shinbun sha, Tokyo.]
- (48) Ibid., p.56.
- (49) Quoted in *ibid.*, p.59.
- (50) 飯澤章治 1940. 『南方共栄圏』. 189頁, 高山書院, 東京. [IIZAWA S. 1940. *South Co-Prosperity Sphere*. p.189. Takayama shoin, Tokyo.]
- (51) 日本経済研究会 1941. 『南進日本商人』. 164頁, 伊藤書店, 東京. [JAPANESE SOCIETY OF ECONOMIC STUDIES (ed.) 1941. *Japanese merchants advancing south*. p.164 Itō shoten, Tokyo.]
- (52) 後藤 勇 1941. 『南洋興亡史』. 13頁, 東光社, 東京. [GOTŌ I. 1941. *History of rise and fall in the South Seas*. p.13 Tōkō sha, Tokyo.]
- (53) YANO, *op.cit.*, p.187.
- (54) The same source of Table 2.
- (55) 飯本信之, 佐藤 弘編 1942. 『南洋地理体系 第1巻 南洋総論』. 137 ~ 138 頁, ダイヤモンド社, 東京. [IMOTO N. and SATŌ H. (ed.) 1942. *Outline of the geography of the South Seas, Vol.1, Introduction to the South Seas*. p.p.137-138, Daiyamondo sha, Tokyo.]
- (56) 三菱経済研究所 1933. 『東洋および南洋諸国の国際貿易と日本の地位』. 1 頁, 集英社, 東京. [Mitsubishi Research Institute of Economy (ed.) 1933. *International trade of Oriental and South Seas countries and the position of Japan*. p.1, Shuei sha, Tokyo.]

- (57) 石川友紀 1972. 「統計よりみた日本出移民史 3」『地理科学』. 27～28頁のデータより集計, 地理科学学会, 広島. [Data from ISHIKAWA T. 1972. 'Emigration history in the view from statistics', *Geographic Science*. p.p.27-28, Vol.16, Chiri kagaku gakkai, Hiroshima.]
- (58) Quoted in SHIMIZU 1986, op.cit., p.28.
- (59) 清水 元 1985. 「特集にあたって」『アジア経済』, XXVI-3. 4頁, アジア経済研究所, 東京. [SHIMIZU H. 1985. 'Introduction of the special issue', *Developing Economy*, XXVI-3. p.4, Ajia keizai kenkyū sho, Tokyo.]
- (60) 外務省欧亜局 1938. 『英領パプア』. 東京; 外務省欧亜局 1938. 『濠洲委任統治領ニューギニア』. 東京; 拓務省拓務局 1938. 『濠洲委任統治領ニューギニア』. 東京. [Section of Europe, Department of Foreign Affairs 1938. *British territory of Papua*. Tokyo; Section of Europe, Department of Foreign Affairs 1938. *Australian Mandated Territory New Guinea*, Tokyo; Section of Colonisation, Department of Colonisation 1938. *Australian Mandated Territory New Guinea*, Tokyo.]
- (61) 南洋庁長官官房調査課 1939. 『ニューギニア事情 (濠洲委任統治領)』. コロール; 南洋庁長官官房調査課 1939. 『ニューギニア事情 (パプア領編)』. コロール. [Research Section of the Secretary-General of the South Seas Government 1939. *The situation in New Guinea (Australian Mandated Territory)*. Koror; Research Section of the Secretary-General of the South Seas Government 1939. *The situation in New Guinea (Territory of Papua)*. Koror]
- (62) 龍江義信 1924. 「食人種棲息するニューギニア探検談 (一)」『植民』, 第3巻第11号. 99頁, 植民通信社, 東京. [TATSUE Y. 1924. 'Accounts of exploration in New Guinea; land of cannibals (1)', *The Colonial Review*, Vol.3, No.11. p.99, Shokumin tsūshin sha, Tokyo.]
- (63) 三好朋十 1933. 「南洋の女さまざま」『植民』, 第12巻第12号. 100頁, 植民通信社, 東京. [MIYOSHI H. 1933. 'Variety of the South Seas women', *The Colonial Review*, Vol.12, No.12. p.100, Shokumin tsūshin sha, Tokyo.]
- (64) 南洋庁長官官房調査課 1939. 『ニューギニア事情 (パプア領編)』. 18頁, コロール. [Research Section of the Secretary-General of the South Seas Government 1939. *The situation in New Guinea (Territory of Papua)*. p.18, Koror.]
- (65) 南洋庁長官官房調査課 1939. 『ニューギニア事情 (濠洲委任統治領)』. 40頁, コロール. [Research Section of the Secretary-General of the South Seas Government 1939. *The situation in New Guinea (Australian Mandated Territory)*. p.40, Koror.]
- (66) 南の会 1937. 『ニューギニア土俗品図集』, 上・下巻. 南洋興発株式会社, コロール. [Society of South 1937. *Illustration of New Guinean artefacts*, Vol.1 and 2. Nan'yō Kōhatsu kabushiki kaisha, Koror.]
- (67) 藤木喜久呂 1939. 『ニューギニア其付近島嶼の土俗品』. 1～2頁, 吾八, 東京. [FUJIKI Y. 1939. *Artefacts of New Guinean and adjacent islands*. p.p.1-2, Gohachi, Tokyo.]

- (68) 村松 薫 1937. 「蘭領ニューギニア外観」『海外移住』, 第10巻第6号. 17頁, 移民問題研究所, 東京. [MURAMATSU K. 1937. 'Outlook of Dutch New Guinea', *Overseas emigration*, Vol.10, No.6. p.17, Imin mondai kenkyū sho, Tokyo.]
- (69) 南洋経済研究所 1939b. 「開拓時代のニューギニア石油事情」『研究資料』第2巻第11号. 49~51頁, 東京. [Research Institute of the South Seas Economy 1939c. 'Situation of oil in New Guinea: development stage', *Research Materials*, Vol.2, No.11. p.p.49-51, Tokyo.]
- (70) 南洋経済研究所 1939a. 「ニューギニアにおける労働力欠乏問題 - 亜細亜人労働者を入れるべきか - 」『研究資料』第2巻第8号; 1939c. 「濠洲委託統治領」『研究資料』第2巻第12号; 1939d. 「英領ニューギニア探検報告(1)-(4)」『研究資料』第3巻第6~9号. [Research Institute of the South Seas Economy 1939d, 'Labour shortage problem in New Guinea: should we import Asian labour?', *Research Materials*, Vol.2, No.8, Tokyo; 1939b, 'Outlook of industries in New Guinea', *Research Materials*, Vol.2, No.12; 1939a, 'Report of the exploration of British New Guinea (1)-(4)', *Research Materials*, Vol.3, No.6-9.]
- (71) 長柄次郎 1939. 「ニューギニア (濠洲委任統治領) パプア合併問題の一進展」『研究資料』第2巻第7号. 10~11頁, 南洋経済研究所, 東京. [NAGATSUKA J. 1939. 'Development of the issue of the annexation of New Guinea (Australian mandate) and Papua', *Research Materials*, Vol.2, No.7. p.p.10-11, Nan'yō Keizai Kenkyū sho, Tokyo]
- (72) Section of Colonisation, Department of Colonisation, op.cit., p.p.83-93; Research Section of the Secretary-General of the South Seas Government, op.cit., p.p.314-318.
- (73) 毎日新聞社, 『サンデー毎日』, 1935年7月8日, 「昭和の山田長政, 日本刀を捧げて独艦を生捕る: 南洋の開拓者小嶺磯吉」. 30頁, 東京. [Mainichi shinbun-sha, *Sunday Everyday*, 8 July 1935, 'Yamada Nagamasa of the Showa period captured a German ship alone with a Japanese sword: a pioneer of the South Seas, Komine Isokichi', p.30. Tokyo.] Yamada is a popular legendary figure believed to have served the Ayutaya dynasty in Thailand as a military commander in the 17th century. *Nanshin-ron* advocates from the late 1930s to the early 1940s regarded him as symbol of Japanese pioneers in the South Seas.
- (74) About Komine's actions, see IWAMOTO H. 1995. 'The origin and development of Japanese settlement in Papua and New Guinea, 1890-1914', *South Pacific Study*, 15(2). p.p.97-133; and 'The impact of World War I on Japanese settlers in Papua and New Guinea, 1914-1918', *South Pacific Study*, 16(2): 143-174, Kagoshima University South Pacific Research Center, Kagoshima.
- (75) 上条深志 1941. 『戦線1万海里: 前大戦時南洋の戦史』. 182~193頁, 南島群島文化協会, 東京. [KAMIJŌ F. 1941. *The war front of ten thousand miles: the history of the South Seas during World War* . p.p.182-193, Nantō guntō bunka kyōkai, Tokyo.]

- (76) 南方産業調査会編 1941. 『ニューギニア』. 148頁, 南進社, 東京. [Society of the South Seas Industry Research (ed.) 1941. New Guinea. p.148, Nanshin sha, Tokyo.]
- (77) 'Territories of New Guinea and Papua', Date unknown (possibly around 1939). AA, A518/1 O918/2, 'Papua admission of (Asiatics) Japanese'.
- (78) Interview by the author with Tanaka, Mary (daughter of Tanaka Taichirō), 22 December 1994, Samarai, Milne Bay, Papua New Guinea (hereafter PNG).
- (79) Nationwide News, *Pacific Islands Monthly*, November 1939. p.59, Sydney.
- (80) Telegram quoted in 'Memorandum for the Secretary, Department of External Affairs', 8 July 1940, AA, A981/1 PAPUA 3, 'Papua: sale of steamer "Papuan Chief" to Japanese firm'.
- (81) Prime Minister to the Lieutenant-Governor, 9 July 1940, *ibid*.
- (82) Statement of claim in the Supreme Court of the Northern Territory of Australia, 18 June 1938, AA, A1/1 1938/20320, 'Japanese lugger case transcript of proceedings in action No.14 of 1938 "New Guinea Maru" '.
- (83) 'Japanese lugger actions in the Supreme Court of the Northern Territory of Australia', 8 November 1938, *ibid*.
- (84) *The Papuan Villager*, October 1941, No.10, Vol.13.
- (85) *Papua Annual Report* 1920. p.13, Melbourne.
- (86) *Papua Annual Report*, 1949, p.34.
- (87) *Census of the Commonwealth of Australia*, 1933 Vol.1. p.p.573-574, Canberra.
- (88) Interview by the author with Koto, Jessie (grand daughter of Koto, Jimmy), 4 January 1994, Misima Island, Milne Bay, PNG.
- (89) Telegram received from Judge Murray, Sydney, 4 January 1923, AA, A457/1 C115 /9, Territory of Papua. Government Secretary's Department. Admission to Territory. Koto, Florence'.
- (90) Interview by the author with Tanaka, Mary *op.cit*.
- (91) Interview by the author with Murakami, Kalo (son of Murakami Heijirō), 4 January 1994, Misima Island, Milne Bay, PNG.
- (92) Interview by the author with Tetu, Joseph (grand son of Tamiya Mabe) 24 December 1993, Kanadamada village, Basilaki Island, Milne Bay, PNG.
- (93) Interview by the author with Namari, Kesaya (grand daughter of Tamiya Mabe), 30 December 1993, Biwa Village, Milne Bay, PNG.
- (94) 'Activities of Japanese and Germans in Rabaul', date unknown (definitely after 1919; Hunt was appointed the Commissioner of the Royal Commission on Late German New Guinea in 1919), AA, CP661/15/1 BOX 1, 'Papers of the Royal Commission on Late German New Guinea - Mr Atlee Hunt (Commissioner)'.
- (95) *The Japan Advertiser*, 23 May 1920, 'Discrimination against Japan'; *The Japan Weekly Chronicle*, 27 May 1920, 'Japan in the South Seas: Australian government charged with discrimination'.
- (96) Prime Minister, S.S. 'Madras Maru' Incident at Rabaul, 7 December 1920, AA, A3932/1 SC397, 'German New Guinea - Introduction of Japanese shipping'.

- (97) Prime Minister to Tamaki, 22 July 1920, *ibid.*
- (98) Memorandum for the Secretary, Prime Minister's Department, 16 April, 1920, *ibid.*
- (99) Prime Minister's Department, 1923, *Territory of New Guinea: treatment of foreigners and foreign interests*, p.17, in MS882, 'Piesse Paper', Manuscript Room, National Library of Australia, Canberra.
- (100) 'Activities of Japanese and Germans in Rabaul', *op.cit.*
- (101) The Secretary, Prime Minister's Department, 24 January 1920, AA, MP1049 1920/047, 'Japanese trade in the western Pacific, attempts to open up trade with Rabaul, Tulagi and other ports in the British Solomons'.
- (102) Royal Commission on (late) German New Guinea', 6 December 1919, AA, B197/0 2022/1/3, 'Japanese property in late German New Guinea - proposal to purchase'. It is doubtful whether MacKenzie really attempted to free New Guinea from Japanese influence, as his relations with Komine were cordial and good during the war. His proposal to purchase Japanese properties, which were indeed all Komine's properties, seemed to be aimed at assisting Komine who was short of funds to run his business.
- (103) *Ibid.*
- (104) Correspondence to Director of Naval Intelligence are in AA, MP1049/5 1877/13/66, 'Dept of Navy. Classified general correspondence files, 1923-1950'.
- (105) Commander (Ret.) R.A.N.R. to Director of Naval Intelligence, 25 October 1929; S.C. Thompson to Mr. Solomons, 29 October 1933; Admiralty Reporting Officer to Director of Naval Intelligence, 8 November 1932, AA, MP 1049/5/0 1877/13/152, 'Strange craft in Gulf Carpentaria, Solomons, & New Guinea matters relating to Japanese espionage in Australia with discussion on possibilities of Japanese aggression'.
- (106) Commander (Ret.) R.A.N.R. to Director of Naval Intelligence, 28 April 1936, *ibid.*
- (107) A Naval Expert 1928. 'Mandated Territories - Some Defence Consideration', Egglestone, Frederic (ed.), *The Australian Mandate for New Guinea*. p.95, Macmillan & Co.Ltd., Melbourne.
- (108) 'Southward advancement policy' received by the Prime Minister's Department, 6 December 1938, AA, A1606/1 SCBS12/1, 'Japanese activities in the South Seas'.
- (109) Administrator to the Secretary of the Prime Minister's Department, 21 October 1937, AA, A518/1 W834/1, 'New Guinea. Japanese mining activities'; Acting administrator to the Secretary of the Prime Minister's Department, 20 January 1939, AA, A816 /1 19/304/188, 'Japanese interests on Papua New Guinea'.
- (110) Acting administrator to the Secretary of the Prime Minister's Department, 20 January 1939, *ibid.*
- (111) *The Rabaul Times*, 18 January 1929, Rabaul, 'Meanderings of an Australian: Off the Beaten Track of the East, by Gordon Green, No.1, Impressions of the Japanese mandate'.

- (112) *The Rabaul Times*, 22 April 1932, 'The Japs and their mandate'.
- (113) *The Rabaul Times*, 15 September 1933, 'Japan and her mandated islands: A traveller's first hand impressions'.
- (114) *The Rabaul Times*, 22 September 1933, 'Martial murmurings'.
- (115) *The Rabaul Times*, 27 October 1933, 'The trend of events'.
- (116) *The Rabaul Times*, 22 December 1933, 'A German Journalist: arrives from the East on a world tour'.
- (116) *The Rabaul Times*, 22 December 1933, 'A German Journalist: arrives from the East on a world tour'.
- (117) *The Rabaul Times*, 19 January 1934, 'Our northern neighbours', and 17 May 1935, 'Poachers and policies'.
- (118) Memorandum for the Secretary, Department of Defence, Melbourne, 20 September 1920, AA, AWM33 57/5, 'Reports and memoranda concerning administration of German New Guinea from Big-Gen T Griffiths, Administrator, Rabaul to Department of Defence (September-October 1920)'.
- (119) *The Rabaul Times*, 14 December 1934, 'Eastern Espionage: gigantic system reported'.
- (120) All intelligence files (including secret files) related to Japanese activities in New Guinea, Micronesia and waters north of Australia in this period seem to be open to the public, but the author could not find a record related to Nishimura's death.
- (121) *The Rabaul Times*, 8 July 1927, 'Local and General'.
- (122) *The Rabaul Times*, 26 April 1929, 'Police News'.
- (123) *The Rabaul Times*, 5 October 1934, 'Death of a pioneer: Captain I. Komine'.
- (124) *The Rabaul Times*, 20 October 1939, 'Local and General', and 15 December 1939, 'Local and General'.
- (125) 'Territories of New Guinea and Papua', Date unknown (possibly around 1939), AA, A518/1 O918/2, 'Papua admission of (Asiatics) Japanese'.
- (126) 外交史料館所蔵文書. E.4.0.0.11. 「外南洋及南太平洋ニ於イテノ邦人ノ営ム農企業個人並商工業者査報一件」 [Japanese Diplomatic Record (hereafter JDR), E.4.0.0.11, 'Report on Japanese agricultural enterprises and individuals and merchants operating in the outer South Seas and South Pacific.']
- (127) The data from the same source of Table 11.
- (128) Ibid.
- (129) *The Rabaul Times*, 16 November 1934, advertisement (Tsurushima), and 31 December 1937, advertisement (Nay'yō Bōeki).
- (130) 内閣統計局 1938. 『大日本帝国統計年鑑』. 214頁, 東京. [Statistical Bureau of the Cabinet (ed.) 1938. Statistical yearbook of the Great Japan Empire. p.214, Vol.57, Tokyo.]
- (131) Various oral evidence collected by the author (from November 1993 to March 1994 in PNG) confirm this.
- (132) FUJIKI, op.cit., p.6.
- (133) Interview by the author with Hatamoto Otosaku (ex-Rabaul shipwright from 1937-

- 1940), 3 July 1993, Nagasaki, Japan. Hatamoto was interned in Australia during the Pacific War. He proudly told the author that the Japanese at Rabaul were sangyō kaihatsu-in (industrial development staff) and therefore Australian treatment in the internment camp was good. That indicates they thought that they were contributing to the development of New Guinea even though it was for Australia.
- (134) *The Rabaul Times*, 17 June 1927, advertisement (Asanuma); 1 May 1936, advertisement (Itō); 16 November 1934, advertisement (Tsurushima); and 31 December 1937, advertisement (Nan'yō Bōeki).
- (135) *Census of the commonwealth of Australia*, 1933. p.581, Vol.1, Canberra.
- (136) AA, MP1103/1 MJ18500-MJ18533, 'Registers of containing 'Service and Casualty' Forms (form A.112) of Internees and Prisoners of War held in camps in Australia, 1939-1947'.
- (137) Ibid.
- (138) Various oral evidence collected by the author, January 1994, Rabaul, PNG.
- (139) *Rabaul Gazette*, 1919, Vol.6, No.2. p.28, Rabaul.
- (140) Komine to Prime Minister, 12 July 1920, AA, A3932/1 SC397, 'German New Guinea - Introduction of Japanese shipping'.
- (141) Piesse's report, 26 May 1921, AA, A457/1 673/8, 'Territory of New Guinea. Administration: Land Department Applications to deal in Lands.I.Komine, mortgage to Morgan & Co.'
- (142) *Daily Telegraph*, 9 July 1920, Sydney, 'Pacific Pioneer. man who made a start'.
- (143) OVERELL L. 1923. *A Woman's impression of German New Guinea*. p. John Lane The Bodley Head Ltd., London; there was no Japanese consulate at Rabaul.
- (144) Various oral evidence collected by the author, March 1994, Manus, PNG. *Kiap* is a local term for a 'captain' which means an official of the colonial administration.
- (145) 外務省通商局 1929. 『在外本邦実業者調』. 339頁, 東京. 外交史料館所蔵文書, 通193, 「在外本邦実業者調, 昭和3年」 [Bureau of Commerce, Ministry of Foreign Affairs 1929. *Report about overseas Japanese businessmen*. p.339, Tokyo. In JDR, Tsū 193, 'Report on overseas Japanese businessmen 1928']
- (146) RADI, H. 1971. 'New Guinea under Mandate 1921-41'. In: *Australia and Papua New Guinea* (Ed.Hudson,W.J.), p.120, Sydney University Press, Sydney.
- (147) 井上から幣原への書簡, 1930年7月10日, 外交史料館所蔵文書, E.2.2.1.3-1. 「本邦会社関係, 南洋拓殖株式会社」 [Inoue to Shidehara, 10 July 1930, JDR, E.2.2.1.3-1, 'Miscellaneous matters about Japanese companies, the South Seas Industry Company'.]
- (148) 花岡から幣原への書簡, 1930年7月22日, 前掲史料. [Hanaoka to Shidehara, 22 July 1930, *ibid.*]
- (149) Administrator Wisdom, 14 July 1930; Catholic Missionary Society, 22 July 1930; Methodist Church, 23 July 1930; Anglican Bishop, 25 July 1930, *ibid.*
- (150) 井上から幣原への書簡, 1930年8月5日, 前掲史料. [Inoue to Shidehara, 5

- August 1930, *ibid.*]
- (151)小嶺から井上への書簡, 1930年8月12日, 前掲史料. [Komine to Inoue, 12 August 1930, *ibid.*]
- (152)井上から幣原への電文, 1930年9月16日, 前掲史料. [Telegram, Inoue to Shidehara, 16 September 1930, *ibid.*]
- (153)Telegram from the Bank of New South Wales to the Foreign Ministry in Tokyo, 6 September 1930, *ibid.*
- (154)井上から幣原への書簡, 1930年10月30日, 前掲史料. [Inoue to Shidehara, 30 October 1930, *ibid.*]
- (155)Managing Director of Burns Philp to Inoue, 30 October 1930, *ibid.*; *The Rabaul Times*, 18 July 1930, notice.
- (156)井上から幣原への書簡, 1930年8月5日, 前掲の外交史料館所蔵文書 E.2.2.1.3-1. [Inoue to Shidehara, 5 August 1930, *op.cit.*, JDR, E.2.2.1.3-1.]
- (157)Interview by the author with Sato Yachiyo (Komine's nephew's daughter), 1 July 1993, Nagasaki, Japan.
- (158)Various oral evidence collected by the author, January to March 1994, Rabaul, Kavieng, Manus, PNG; *Pacific Island Monthly*. p.16, 22 November 1934, Sydney.
- (159)南方産業調査会 1941. 『ニューギニア』. 149頁, 南進社, 東京. [Society of the South Seas Industry Research, 1941. *New Guinea*. p.149, Nanshin-sha, Tokyo.]
- (160)Interview by the author with Nagahama Tome (wife of Nagahama Yoshiyuki, Rabaul shipwright and nephew of Taichi Nagahama), 30 June 1993, Amakusa, Japan.
- (161)西条セツ子 (長濱太一の娘) から著者への書簡, 1993年7月13日. [A letter to the author from Saijō Setsuko (daughter of Nagahama Taichi), 13 July 1993]
- (162)'Agreement', date unknown, AA, A1379 EP/J/851 SECTION E, 'Taichi Nagahama Manus lease. Momote - acquisition of lease for defence purposes'.
- (163)外務省通商局 1939. 『在外日本人会並実業団体調』. 180頁. 外交史料館所蔵文書, 通210- 「在外日本人会実業団体調, 昭和14年」. [Bureau of Commerce, Ministry of Foreign Affairs 1939. *Report on Japanese societies and businessmen overseas*. p.180. In: JDR, Tsū-210, 'List of Overseas Japanese societies and Industry Organisation'] In the 1930s, the Japanese government encouraged the Japanese in the South Pacific to establish local clubs, reflecting the rise of Japanese interest in the South Seas. The Japanese societies were established in Rabaul, Noumea, Suva and New Hebrides in 1932 and in Tonga in 1935.
- (164)拓務省拓務局, 前掲書, 91頁. [Section of Colonisation, Department of Colonisation, *op.cit.*, p.91.]
- (165)The three shipwrights were Hatamoto Otosaku (from Nagasaki), Miyazaki Noriichi (Kumamoto) and Onoue Hideyoshi (Kagoshima).
- (166)畑本音作から著者への書簡, 1993年5月26日. [A letter to the author from Hatamoto Otosaku, 26 May 1993.]
- (167)*The Rabaul Times*, 8 September 1939, 'Local and General'.

- (168) Interviews with Japanese internees at no.4 camp, Tatura', 23 July 1946, AA., A367 C72538, 'IZUMI Eikichi'.
- (169) *The Rabaul Times*, 30 May 1930, advertisement (Nozaki).
- (170) *New Guinea Gazette*, 1930, No.272, p.2117; 1933, No.366, p.2748.
- (171) *The Rabaul Times*, 8 February 1935, 'Local and General'.
- (172) Interview by the author with Oehlerich, Cecile (grand daughter of Izumi Eikichi), 23 March 1994, Brisbane, Australia.
- (173) 外交史料館所蔵文書, 3.8.5.8, 「海外旅券下附表 1916年10月～12月」.
[October to December 1916, JDR 3.8.5.8, 'The list of overseas passport issues'.]
- (174) 拓務省拓務局, 前掲書, 93頁. [Section of Colonisation, Department of Colonisation, op.cit., p.93.]
- (175) 外交史料館所蔵文書, 3.8.5.8, 「海外旅券下附表 1917年10月～12月」.
[October to December 1917, JDR 3.8.5.8, 'The list of overseas passport issues'.]
- (176) Interview by the author with Asanuma, Michael (son of Asanuma Ichimatsu), 21 March 1994, Brisbane, Australia.
- (177) 外交史料館所蔵文書, 3.8.5.8, 「海外旅券下附表 1912年10月～12月」.
[October to December 1912, JDR 3.8.5.8, 'The list of overseas passport issues'.]
- (178) Interview by the author with Kai Chew (old Chinese resident), 25 January 1994, Rabaul, PNG; telephone interview by the author with Croydon, Barbara (old Chinese resident), 24 January 1994, Rabaul, PNG; 外務省通商局 1936 『在外本邦実業者調, 上巻』. 540頁. 外交史料館所蔵文書, 通195 『在外本邦実業者調 (上巻) 昭和10 - 11年』. [Bureau of Commerce, Ministry of Foreign Affairs 1936. *Report on Japanese overseas businessmen*, vol.1. p.540, JDR, Tsū-195, 'Report on overseas Japanese businessmen, vol.1, 1935-36'.]
- (179) 佐藤貞子 (鶴島の孫) から著者への書簡, 1993年6月4日. [A letter to the author from Sato Sadako (grand daughter of Tsurushima), 4 June 1993.]
- (180) 外交史料館所蔵文書, 3.8.5.8, 「海外旅券下附表 1917年10月～12月」.
[October to December 1917, JDR 3.8.5.8, 'The list of overseas passport issues'.]
- (181) THRELFALL, N. 1988. *From Mangroves to Frangipani: the story of Rabaul and East New Britain*, unpublished. p.360, Division of Pacific and Asian History, Australian National University, Canberra; Interview by the author with Tabuchi, Philip (son of Tabuchi Yoshimatsu), 4 February 1994, Kavieng, PNG.
- (182) 南洋庁長官官房調査課, 前掲書, 318頁. [Research Section of the Secretary-General of the South Seas Government, op.cit., p.318.]
- (183) *New Guinea Gazette*, 1931, No.286, p.2193.
- (184) Interview by the author with Tabuchi, op.cit.
- (185) 南洋庁長官官房調査課, 前掲書, 319頁. [Research Section of the Secretary-General of the South Seas Government, op.cit., p.319.]
- (186) Memorandum for the Secretary, Department of Defence, Melbourne, 20 September 1920, AA, AWM33 57/5, op.cit.
- (187) *The Rabaul Times*, 1 May 1936, advertisement (Itō).
- (188) *The Rabaul Times*, 17 June 1927, advertisement (Asanuma).

- (189)Memorandum for the Secretary, Department of Defence, Melbourne, 20 September 1920, op.cit.; Interviews with Japanese internees at no.4 camp, Tatura', 23 July 1946, AA., A367 C72533, 'ASANUMA Ichimatsu'.
- (190)He came from Nara. 外交史料館所蔵文書, 「外国旅券下付表 - 件府県報告」, 1932年 1月 ~ 3月. [January to March 1932, JDR, J.2.2.0.J13-7, 'Prefectural report on the issuance passports'.]
- (191)*The Rabaul Times*, 19 April 1929, notice.
- (192)Memorandum for the Secretary, Department of Defence, Melbourne, 20 September 1920, AA, AWM33 57/5, op.cit.
- (193)Telephone interview by the author with Imaizumi Kōtarō (son of Imaizumi Masao), 23 June 1993, Japan.
- (194)*New Guinea Gazette*, 1925, No.104, p.695.
- (195)Manus people were renowned for their seamanship and navigation.
- (196)Interviews with Japanese internees at no.4 camp, Tatura', 22 July 1946, AA., A367 C72546, 'KIKUCHI Ichisuke'.
- (197)Interview by the author with Kikuchi, Pius (son of Kikuchi Ichisuke), 18 March 1994, Brisbane, Australia.
- (198)外交史料館所蔵文書, 3.8.5.8, 「海外旅券下附表 1899年 1月 ~ 3月」. [January to March 1899, JDR 3.8.5.8, 'The list of overseas passport issues'.]
- (199)Interview with Nakamura, Andrew (son of Nakamura Sōshichi), 23 January 1994, Rabaul, PNG.
- (200)Interviews with Japanese internees at no.4 camp, Tatura', 23 July 1946, AA., A367 C72540, 'KIMURA Hideichiro'.
- (201)*New Guinea Gazette*, 1938, No.525, p.3979.
- (202)外交史料館所蔵文書, 3.8.5.8, 「海外旅券下附表 1914年 1月 ~ 3月」. [January to March 1914, JDR 3.8.5.8, 'The list of overseas passport issues'.]
- (203)外交史料館所蔵文書, 「外国旅券下付表 - 件府県報告」, 1939年 1月 ~ 3月. [January to March 1939, JDR, J.2.2.0.J13-7, 'Prefectural report on the issuance passports'.]
- (204)*The Rabaul Times*, 9 November 1928, 'Waterside shooting: Japanese severely wounded'; 7 December 1928, 'Piracy: interesting court case, Reed's admissions'.
- (205)Generally inter-racial marriages take place with acknowledgment of the community. They rarely take place based on individual decision.
- (206)Interview by the author with Yamashita Midori (daughter of the niece of Yamashita Shichinosuke), 21 June 1993, Tokyo, Japan.
- (207)Interview by the author with Yamashita, Johnny (grandson of Yamashita Shichinosuke), 28 January 1994, Kimbe, West New Britain, PNG; interview with Keksan, Kamui; Pokupeal, Sotil; Ngapen, Amos; Pombuai, Hendry; Kahu, Kaspar; Simon Sandrel (elders), 14 February 1994, Pityilu Island, Manus, PNG.
- (208)山下七之助の死亡証明書, 1945年 7月25日付, 東京都新島本村役場. [Death certificate for Yamashita Shichinosuke, dated 25 July 1945, Niijima Moto Village office, Tokyo.]

- (209)外交史料館所蔵文書, 3.8.5.8, 「海外旅券下附表 1912年10月~12月」.
[October to December 1912, JDR 3.8.5.8, 'The list of overseas passport issues'.]
- (210)Interview by the author with Ikesaki, Francis (son from the second wife of Ikesaki Tokuyoshi), 25 February 1994, Pere, Manus, PNG.
- (211)Interview by the author with Ikesaki, Peter (son from the third wife of Ikesaki Tokuyoshi), 26 January 1994, Rabaul, PNG.
- (212)外交史料館所蔵文書, 3.8.5.8, 「海外旅券下附表 1912年10月~12月」.
[October to December 1912, JDR 3.8.5.8, 'The list of overseas passport issues'];
Interview by the author with Kochir, George (elder), 7 February 1994, Andra Island, Manus, PNG.
- (213)拓務省拓務局, 前掲書, 91頁. [Section of Colonisation, Department of Colonisation, op.cit., p.91.]
- (214)'Interviews with Japanese internees at no.4 camp, Tatura', 23 July 1946, AA., A367 C72539, 'ENDO Shigetaro'.
- (215)Interview by the author with Asanuma, Michael (son of Asanuma Ichimatsu), 21 March 1994, Brisbane, Australia.
- (216)Memorandum for the Secretary, Department of Defence, Melbourne, 20 September 1920, AA, AWM33 57/5, op.cit.
- (217)外交史料館所蔵文書, 3.8.5.8, 「海外旅券下附表 1924年7月~9月」. [July to September 1924, JDR 3.8.5.8, 'The list of overseas passport issues'.]
- (218)Official trade restriction was lifted in 1923, but the migration restriction, which stopped the coming of new Japanese, virtually blocked the Japanese business expansion.
- (219)Various articles in *the Rabaul Times* verify this: 14 March 1930, 'Editorial'; 5 August 1932, 'The Chinese in Rabaul'; 2 June 1933, 'Correspondence: Chinese and trading'; 19 March 1937, 'Asiatic Immigration'; 23 April 1937, 'Correspondence: Asiatic immigration'.
- (220)Administrator to the Secretary of the Prime Minister's Department, 21 October 1937, AA, A518/1 W834/1, 'New Guinea Japanese mining activities'.
- (221)Interview with Oehlerich, op.cit.
- (222)Interview by the author with Ehret, Gordon (ex-Rabaul trader), 22 March 1994, Brisbane, Australia.
- (223)Interview by the author with Hatamoto Otosaku (ex-Rabaul shipwright from 1937-1940), 3 July 1993, Nagasaki, Japan.
- (224)The New Year day celebration and the Bon Festival (day for remembering ancestors' souls) were most common annual events in Japan. They are equivalent to Christmas and Easter.
- (225)Interview by the author with Asanuma, Michael (son of Asanuma Ichimatsu), 21 March 1994, Brisbane, Australia.
- (226)*The Rabaul Times*, 16 April 1937, 'Local and General'; 14 May 1937, 'Coronation celebrations'.
- (227)Various oral evidence collected by the author, November 1993 to March 1994, PNG

and Australia.

- (228) *Admission 1901-63 (boys and girls)*, Vunapope Catholic Mission School; the book was shown to the author by courtesy of Sister Bernadette. According to the registration, 14 boys and 4 girls attended the school from 1901 to 1963.
- (229) Interview with Hatamoto, op.cit.
- (230) Interview by the author with Kolomat, Korup and Pokomo, Poloat (elders who worked on Japanese schooners in young days), 6 February 1994, Lou Island, Manus, PNG.
- (231) Various oral evidence collected by the author, January to March 1994, Rabaul, Kavieng, Manus, PNG.
- (232) See IWAMOTO H. 1995. 'The origin and development of Japanese settlement in Papua and New Guinea, 1890-1914', *South Pacific Study*, 15(2). p.122, Kagoshima University South Pacific Research Center, Kagoshima.
- (233) Interview by the author with Sohau, Alphonse and Mohak, Pious (elders), 11 February 1994, Ponam island, Manus, PNG.
- (234) Telephone interview by the author with Imaizumi Kōtarō (son of Imaizumi Masao), 23 June 1993, Japan. The boy had a Japanese name, Tarō or Ichirō.
- (235) The author has decided not to reveal detailed information about the boy in order to protect his privacy. The boy grew up in Japan, served in the Pacific War, married a Japanese woman and is still alive in Amakusa.
- (236) *New Guinea Gazette*, 1929, No.221, p.1815.
- (237) A letter to the author from Chan, Bernard, 8 August 1994.
- (238) Telephone interview with Croydon, op.cit.
- (239) Interview with Kai Chew, op.cit.; interview with Nakamura, Andrew (son of Nakamura Soshichi), 23 January 1994, Rabaul, PNG.
- (240) For the postwar economic relations, see IWAMOTO H. 1990. *Japan-Papua New Guinea economic relations in the postwar period: analysis from dependency perspective*, honours thesis, Flinders University of South Australia, Adelaide.

(Accepted July 31, 1996)

