KOWLOON WALLED CITY:
ITS ORIGIN AND EARLY HISTORY
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The Kowloon Walled City in Hong Kong is one of history's great anomalies. Until recently, it was a place over which two governments claimed jurisdiction but with neither actively administering it; anarchy reigned while secret societies presided. Above the maze of dark filthy narrow alleys with open drains hovered high-rise apartment buildings, constructed with neither respect nor reference to Hong Kong's building ordinances. Drug peddlers, addicts, pimps and prostitutes operated openly in this favoured hideout for criminals. Small factories, some supplying food for the rest of the territory, proliferated beyond the prying eye of factory and sanitary inspectors. For many years it did not have any water supply. Dentists and doctors unable to register with the Hong Kong government served the poor while lining their own pockets and upholding their professional dignity. Outsiders were immediately recognized and suspiciously watched. The Kowloon Walled City, in fact, was a world unto its own.

It has always aroused curiosity, and fear, and few dared venture inside. Since the announcement in January, 1987 of its demolition under the auspices of both the British and Chinese governments, interest has multiplied. Hardly a day passes now without some group of visitors trooping down the alleys hoping to see this unique physical, legal, historical and social edifice before it is gone forever. But, in a way, the City remains an enigma. This paper attempts to unveil some of the mystery by tracing the origin of the historical anomaly and revealing its pre-War development and the unusual role it played in the history of the region.

The City's site at the northeastern corner of Kowloon peninsula was first fortified in 1668 when a signal station was established. About 1810, a small — and according to one account, "miserable"
— fort was built at the head of the beach. Its strategic, administra-
tive and economic position remained relatively insignificant until
the British occupied Hong Kong Island in 1841. In 1843, after the
ratification of the Treaty of Nanking, the *hsun-chien* (Assis-
tant Magistrate) of the Hsin-an county, with administrative
responsibilities for 491 villages, was transferred there. Also trans-
ferred there was the Commodore of Ta-p'eng, the chief mili-
tary officer of the county, and the garrison was increased to 150.

It soon became apparent that these measures were not enough. In 1846, Ch'i-ying, the Governor-General of Kwangtung and
Kwangsi, further memorialized the imperial court pointing out
the exposed position of the site, and suggested constructing a
“walled-city” (tsai-ch'eng) mounted with cannon. He also
proposed building offices and barracks, not only to provide ac-
commodations for the civil and military personnel who had
hitherto been billeted in private homes, but also facilities for drill-
ing. Such measures, he felt, would have a “constraining effect” on
the barbarian base in Hong Kong, and would greatly strengthen
the coastal defence of the area.

The wall was completed in 1847, and the “Kowloon Walled
City” came into being.

Reports on the dimensions of the wall varied. As described by
James Stewart Lockhart, who reconnoitred the newly leased terri-

tory in 1898, it formed a rough parallelogram measuring 700 ft. by
400 ft., enclosing an area of 6.5 acres. It was built of granite ashlar
facing, 15 ft. in width at the top, and averaged 13 ft. in height.
There were six watch towers and four gateways, with doors of
wood lined with iron sheeting. Officially the main gate was the
South Gate over which the four characters “Chiu-lung tsai-ch'eng
九龍寨城 (Kowloon Walled City) were engraved, but it seems that
the East Gate, which opened onto the market place, saw the most
traffic. The parapet had 119 embrasures and an unknown num-
ber of cannon were mounted. At a later date, the wall was extended
from the northern corners up the hill behind, forming the apex of a
triangle at the top. The knoll, known both as White Crane Hill and
Twin Phoenix Hill, had a number of romantic legends associated
with it. With large boulders perched precariously on its slopes,
looking as though they would roll down any moment, it formed a dramatic and distinctive backdrop to the Walled City.

The City was primarily a garrison town. In 1898, the garrison numbered 544, with a civilian population of only 200, largely dependents of the military. By then the watch towers were being used as family dwellings. Besides the several official buildings there was also the Lung-chin i-hsueh 龍津義學 (Lung-chin Communal School), named after the small Lung-chin river nearby. The school’s raison d’etre is significant. Just as the British presence in Hong Kong had necessitated strengthening the civil and military establishment at Kowloon, so had it highlighted the need to strengthen the inhabitants’ moral fibres against Western decadence and materialism. The Hsin-an Magistrate, commenting on the founding of the school in 1847, declared that since Kowloon had become a point of interaction with barbarians, the inhabitants needed to be fortified morally, thus making a school necessary, and he even hoped that they might exert a civilizing influence on the intruders.

Built of blue baked bricks on a granite foundation, with granite lintels and frames to the entrance, the school was an imposing building with two main halls and two court yards, much like the grander ancestral halls of the New Territories. Local literati were elected to the school board each year. The source of fund was irregular. A generous official occasionally made a donation; in the 1880s, a special rate was levied on the sale of suckling pig meat to subsidize the school expenses. Characteristically, public meetings, often attended by officials, were also held there. Its reflecting wall bore the characters “Hai-pin Tsou Lu” 海濱鄭魯 to denote a place of high moral and academic excellence by the sea, emphasizing how strongly Confucian orthodoxy still prevailed in this outpost of Empire. In 1897, an annex, a fine two-storeyed building called the K’uei-hsing ke 魅星閣 (K’uei-hsing pavilion) was added, K’uei-hsing being the god who protected the literati. This shows that fifty years after its foundation, the school was still a going concern.

A small paper-burning pavilion stood near the East Gate. Traditionally, the Chinese literati revered the written word and, to
save it from defilement, they often built incinerators to burn paper with words written on it. In 1859, the Commodore, Chang Yu-t'ang, erected a fine pavilion over an incinerator and old men were hired to gather abandoned paper for burning. On the plaque over the entrance were engraved the characters “Ching-hsi-tzu-chih-ch'u” (A pavilion for revering word-bearing paper) in Chang's calligraphy. Though a military man, Chang had pretensions to being a scholar and calligrapher, and his inscriptions found in the pavilion were reportedly much copied in the region. 

Up to 1898 there were no shops of any kind within the City. In fact, the word “ch'eng” is rather arbitrarily translated as “city”, which to a modern person, immediately conjures up visions of shops and other commercial facilities. This is misleading since traditionally, a Chinese ch'eng was simply an area enclosed for defence, and where officials resided. However, a cluster of shops lined the street — Kowloon Street — which stretched for about a quarter of a mile from the East Gate to the water front. This became an increasingly prosperous market town, serving not only the Walled City but more distant areas such as Saikung and Shatin. From a fairly early date, a kaifong (chieh-fang i.e. neighbourhood) association, which organized such public functions as health, safety and good order, had existed. By 1880, the Lok Sin Tong (Luo-shan-t'ang; lit. Hall of Willing Charity) was founded. Like many Chinese “charitable societies”, it exercised great social and economic influence, and its contribution was most strongly manifested in providing free education and free medicine in the area.

As trade grew in the area, a Kwangtung Provincial Customs station was set up in 1871 to prevent smuggling, especially opium from Hong Kong. In 1886, it was replaced by a Chinese Maritime Customs station. A pier, the Lung-chin jetty, completed in 1875 after two years of construction, extended some 700 ft. into the sea. As the beach silted up and the jetty became worse for wear, it was repaired in 1892 and extended for another 260 ft. with a subscription of $1,700 raised by more than a hundred shops and individuals.
At the head of the pier was the Lung-chin Pavilion which provided shelter for travellers. It was also known as the "Mandarin-Greeting Pavilion" (ying-kuan t'ing 進官亭), for it was presumably here that officials landing at Kowloon were officially greeted before they proceeded to the Walled City.²¹

Ironically, the first invaders of the Walled City were not British, but Chinese. In 1854, certain anti-Dynastic elements in Hong Kong, taking advantage of the general disturbance caused by the T'ai-p'ing uprising, attacked the Walled City across the harbour and occupied it. According to British officials, they were mainly Hakka stone workers and Triad members. Though the rebels had promised the inhabitants protection if they withdrew their support from the Imperial forces, as soon as they took possession of the City, they ransacked the houses and seized pigs, poultry and dogs for food.

The Kowloon officials fled to Hong Kong Island. At one point, nine war junks carrying 2,000 Imperial soldiers were ready to confront an equal number of rebel naval forces. The British in fact held the ring by ordering all warships to leave Hong Kong waters and so averted a major naval battle. The Imperial troops finally prevailed.²² However, the hsun-chien’s official residence in the Walled City was so damaged by fire that for a while, he was obliged to move to Ch‘ih-wei 赤尾 on the Shumchun river.²³

Chinese officials at Kowloon and British officials in Hong Kong kept in close touch and generally co-operated in maintaining law and order in the vicinity. In 1867 for instance, when conflict broke out between villagers from either side of the border, Governor Macdonnell made a special trip to Kowloon, met the Chinese official on his steamer and agreed to co-operate in keeping peace.²⁴ In 1884, Kowloon officials warned the Hong Kong authorities of a possible rising of the Triad Society.²⁵

Under Ordinance 2 of 1850, Chinese fugitives in Hong Kong were handed over to Kowloon officials,²⁶ but the provision was not reciprocal — China had no obligation to extradite criminals to Hong Kong. Chinese authorities, however, did arrest and convict them. The Namoa case was the most dramatic example. In 1890,
pirates carried out a vicious attack on the s.s. Namoa. Some sus-
spects were arrested in Hong Kong and two of them were commit-
ted for trial, but they were released for lack of evidence. Those
arrested in Kowloon were less fortunate, for they were convicted
and beheaded on the beach in front of the City, with British offi-
cials invited to witness the execution.\(^27\) The Chinese were of
course also interested in keeping Chinese waters free of pirates and
joint efforts were made to this end.\(^28\)

Officials at Kowloon performed more than their strictly official
duties. Numerous temple inscriptions testify to their active in-
volvement with the community activities of the territory, on both
sides of the border.\(^29\) The stone tablet over the entrance of the Pei-
ti Temple at Wanchai, with the temple’s name inscribed in
Chang Yu-t’ang’s calligraphy is particularly significant.\(^30\)

The Chinese community in British Hong Kong were obviously
very aware of the Chinese official presence across the harbour.
Sometimes they looked to it for protection. For instance in 1886
when it was rumoured that 500 children would be required to
consecrate the Tytam Water Works, children were sent to Kow-
loon City for protection, to the extent that hardly any child was to
be seen anywhere for two days.\(^31\)

The Chinese in Hong Kong also looked to Kowloon as a
source of authority and patronage, and this was most clearly seen
in 1896 when the first Chinese Chamber of Commerce opened in
Hong Kong. As was customary, rites were performed before the
Kuan-ti, or martial god. The Kowloon Commodore, Ch’en
Kun-shan, officiated, as the dragon flag of Ch’ing China
fluttered above,\(^32\) as if to establish the Chineseness of the occasion.
Not surprisingly this display of loyalty to Chinese officialdom
incurred the resentment of the local English press. The Daily Press
leader lamented that the Hong Kong Governor had not been invit-
ed to officiate instead, and saw this as a move “to insult the estab-
lished order of the colony”.\(^33\) This, in fact, suggests that to some of
the foreign community at least, Kowloon, as a Chinese base, was
too close for comfort.

There were other problems. Gambling, prohibited in Hong
Kong except for a short interval between 1867 and 1871, was a major attraction of Kowloon City. Gambling houses fronting the beach offered free launch services and carried on a thriving business. This caused so much consternation in Hong Kong that, after a series of stunning embezzlement cases and a connection with the gambling “hells” of Kowloon had been established, the Hong Kong government passed an ordinance making it an offence for civil servants to visit Kowloon for the purpose of gambling. Under pressure from the Hong Kong government in the late 1890s, Chinese officials actually suppressed gambling. Ironically, it was under “British rule” in the twentieth century that gambling was re-introduced. But it was only after the Second World War, when Hong Kong prohibited brothels and opium that the Walled City was transformed into the squalid enclave of vice for which it later became notorious.

The City had other attractions. Both the Walled City and the fort had been frequently visited by foreigners since the 1850s. It was the terminal point of several interesting walks on the mainland popular with Europeans residents. They were not required to produce passes or go through other kinds of formalities normally required in a garrison town. Often at the end of an excursion, visitors took a quick walk around the wall, snapped a few pictures of “this curious and particularly dirty town”, and left for the Island by launch from the Lung-chin jetty.

The great change came in 1899. In the previous year, the Convention of Peking had been signed between China and Britain leasing territory south of the Shumchun river to Britain. However, in face of strong Chinese insistence on retaining jurisdiction in the Kowloon Walled City, the British agreed to include a clause that “within the city of Kowloon the Chinese officials now stationed there shall continue to exercise jurisdiction except so far as may be inconsistent with the military requirement to the defence of Hong Kong.” This reservation of Chinese jurisdiction upset many sectors of British interest, not least of all, foreign residents in Hong Kong, all seeing this Chinese enclave in the midst of a British administered territory a security risk.

The matter came to a head in 1899. The Hong Kong govern-
ment, when attempting in April to occupy the New Territory (as the New Territories were then called), encountered much more ferocious resistance than anticipated. At this juncture, 600 men were sent into the Kowloon Walled City by the Governor-General of Kwangtung and Kwangsi, and the British authorities, convinced that they were there to support the resistance, demanded their withdrawal. The Colonial Office went so far as to threaten starving out the garrison at the City until troops were removed. The Chinese, however, claimed that the troops had been sent by special request of the Hong Kong [sic] government to preserve order, and though some of the men were withdrawn, by 4th May, 200 were still stationed in the City.

This prompted the British to take action — to attack Shum-chun and Kowloon City as punishment for the Governor-General's duplicity in abetting the local resistance. On 16th May, at 3:00 p.m., a force of 300 men consisting of Royal Welsh Fusiliers and 100 Hong Kong Volunteers proceeded to Kowloon and occupied it, apparently meeting little resistance. All Chinese civil and military officials were ordered to depart as the British claimed that their continued presence and the retention of Kowloon Walled City in Chinese hands had proven inconsistent to British military requirement. To "legalize" the situation, an Order-in-Council was issued in December, announcing British jurisdiction over the Walled City which was to be administered in the same manner as the rest of the Colony. Yet this remained a unilateral revision of the Convention which the Chinese government never recognized.

The Chinese naturally responded bitterly to the development. T'an Chung-lin, the Governor-General, protested vehemently to the court of the undignified manner in which the military officers and soldiers were cast out. At Peking, the Tsungli Yamen complained to the British Minister. Chinese eagerness to recover jurisdiction at Kowloon is best revealed in the letters from Lo Feng-lu, Chinese Minister at St. James, to the Foreign Office. Yet, paradoxically, this eagerness was not accompanied by action; no attempt was made by the Chinese to reinstate an administration in the Walled City.
With two governments claiming jurisdiction over it, the Walled City fell between two stools, as one undertook minimal administrative responsibility to avoid diplomatic embarrassment, the other none at all. The result was a near vacuum of administrative function and authority.

After Chinese officials departed in 1899, the City's population was much depleted. Some of the original inhabitants stayed on. Their landownership was terminated by the Hong Kong government, which, in turn, granted them 5-year leases. The leases were necessarily short because of the awkward political circumstances. The government was in fact reluctant to grant land leases for any but public purposes and the Protestant Church became a major beneficiary of the situation, receiving several short-term leases to operate schools and charities in the City. In 1906, the Anglican Holy Trinity Church converted the former San-sheng (Three Saints) Temple into a chapel, the T'ien-kuo chiu-tao t'ang (Heavenly Kingdom Chapel). Sermons given every Wednesday and Sunday evening seem to have attracted many women and children from the neighbourhood, who might have attended as much for reasons of faith as for the entertainment.

The Church also obtained the lease of an official building to operate an old people's home, called the Kuang-yin yuan, and an alms house. Later, these were turned over to the Chinese Christian Churches Union which also ran a home for widows and orphans, known as Eyre's Refuge, in the large compound. In 1908, the Holy Trinity Church converted the former hsun-chien's office into a primary school, the T'ien-kuo (Heavenly Kingdom) School, operating it until 1936. For some time around 1931, the Church's youth groups also held their activities there.

The former Lung-chin Communal School was also put to good use. Between 1900 and 1905, it was the Land Court's office. Then the Secretary for Chinese Affairs took it over to run a free secondary school for over 300 students with funds from the Hou-wang Temple nearby. At one time, a public dispensary shared the premises. In this way, the schools and other charities, besides meeting the spiritual and material needs of the City's inhabitants,
also created an atmosphere of vitality and purpose in an otherwise rather sleepy and desolate place.

Meanwhile, parts of the Walled City fell into decay. The south wall soon began crumbling, and by the mid-20s, the Commodore's office, once the grandest building there and used for a time in the early twentieth century as a plague hospital, was in complete ruins. By the '30s, the sixty or so domestic dwellings were mostly in poor repair. Its vegetable gardens, pig farms and traditional crafts gave the "City" a rural flavour.

Until the outbreak of war in 1941, it remained a tourist attraction. Foreigners came to seek "a little bit of Old China". Invariably, Chinese guide books to Hong Kong recommended it for nostalgic, historical sightseeing. Local residents also found it worthwhile photographic material. It must have been rather pleasant to stroll in the shade of ancient trees, take photographs before the cannon and historical buildings, and admire the many inscriptions in them. One inhabitant even made a living by selling copies of the City's inscriptions to visitors.

The rapid development outside the wall from the 1910s onwards — the Kowloon Bay reclamation, the construction of tenement houses, shops and factories, and eventually the airport — passed the City by. Reclamation left it further and further inland. For a while after 1899, the customs station was used as a police station, but in the late 1920s, it had to be abandoned in favour of a site by the new waterfront. The Lung-chin jetty fell into disuse, and only the end portion could be used to serve a ferry running between Hong Kong Island, Hunghom and Kowloon City. After the War, the Yaumati Ferry Company built its Kowloon City Pier near the site.

The Kowloon fort was in decay. The cannon suffered various fates. The British had dismantled them, presumably out of distrust of the Chinese. Some were reportedly sold to old metal dealers. Two were displayed outside the Water Police Station, and four outside the new Kowloon City Police Station. Two more, one weighing 4,000 catties, the other 5,000 catties, were abandoned near the South Gate and much photographed. Apparently these
are the ones to be found remounted in the City today. Inscriptions on them indicate that they had been cast in 1802 and apparently transferred to Kowloon from the Tung-lung Forts in 1811. We do not know the origins of the other cannon, and since the War, there has been no trace of them.

And so the City languished. Although squatters had filtered in after 1899, in the 1930s, the population was still less than 500. Conditions there were insanitary but at least it escaped the horrific over-crowding of some other parts of the Colony. In 1933, however, the government announced plans to demolish the houses, ostensibly for sanitary reasons, sparing only those used for public purposes, and to make the area into “a place of popular resort and antiquarian interest”. There was some resistance from the residents; the Chinese authorities protested on their behalf while objecting to British disregard for the Convention. After several years’ hesitation, the Hong Kong government finally took steps, despite Chinese objections, to evict all residents. By 1940, all buildings, except the old people’s home, the former Lung-chin Communal School and the private home of a native resident, had been demolished. The dismantling continued under the Japanese: the wall was completely torn down to provide material to extend Kai Tak Airport.

The “Walled City” was no more.

After the War, as refugees fled to Hong Kong, a number of them settled in the “Walled City”; by 1947, its population had risen to about 2,000. Once more, the Hong Kong government’s attempt to expel them provoked diplomatic conflict. But this time, no eviction took place. Instead, the City was left to its own devices, and to develop, as Governor Sir Alexander Grantham described it, into “a cesspool of iniquity, with heroin divans, brothels and everything unsavoury.” From the early ’60s, squatter huts gave way to high-rise buildings, which seem designed to break every conceivable construction regulation. Built with no open space between them, but with passages connecting each other like rabbit warrens, they are fire and health hazards and perfect criminal hide-outs. The old people’s centre, formerly the Kuang-yin yuan, provides the only open area, and the mass of concrete around this
“courtyard” effectively forms a more sinister, hostile and impenetrable wall against outsiders than the one before.

The government’s recent proposal to clear the area no doubt produces a collective sigh of relief for the departure of this abomination. However, fragments of the old City — the cannon, parts of the former military office, some stone lions, the odd inscription, old residents’ memories — deserve preservation. Since the government plans to use the area as a park, perhaps we could revive the 1934 proposal to make it a place of popular resort and historical interest. In this way, we can preserve the memory of a unique international arrangement and a fascinating chapter in the history of the region.

Plates 1-7 at the rear of the Volume illustrate this article.
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