

JAPAN INSIDE OUT

The Challenge of Today

By

SYNGMAN RHEE, Ph. D.

*First President of the Provisional Government of the
Republic of Korea in Exile*



NEW YORK

Fleming H. Revell Company

LONDON

AND

EDINBURGH



JAPAN INSIDE OUT

The Challenge of Today

By

SYNGMAN RHEE, Ph. D.

*First President of the Provisional Government of the
Republic of Korea in Exile*



NEW YORK

Fleming H. Revell Company

LONDON

AND

EDINBURGH

Copyright, MCMXLI, by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

All rights reserved: no part of this book may be reproduced in any form without permission from the Publisher, except by a reviewer desiring to quote brief passages for inclusion in a notice to be inserted in a newspaper or periodical.

Printed in the United States of America

New York: 158 Fifth Avenue
London: 21 Paternoster Square

CONTENTS

	PAGE
FOREWORD	7
I. JAPAN'S "DIVINE MISSION" AND WAR PSYCHOLOGY	13
II. TANAKA MEMORIAL	23
III. JAPAN READY TO UNMASK HERSELF	33
IV. THE BEGINNING OF THE SINO-JAPANESE WAR	44
V. FOREIGN NEWSPAPERMEN MUST GO	52
VI. FOREIGN MISSIONARIES	63
VII. THE "LADYBIRD" AND THE "PANAY" INCIDENTS	84
VIII. U. S. NATIONALS AND THEIR INTERESTS	102
IX. NINE-POWER PARLEY	116
X. JAPAN'S MARCH OF CONQUEST AND ITS REPERCUSSIONS	126
XI. THE UNITED STATES NAVAL INCREASE	151
XII. JAPANESE PROPAGANDA SHOULD BE CHECKED	159
XIII. PACIFISTS IN AMERICA	165
XIV. PACIFISTS ARE LIKE FIFTH COLUMNISTS	178
XV. DEMOCRACY VERSUS TOTALITARIANISM	188
CONCLUSION	199

FOREWORD

AT the outset, I want to say that my motive in presenting this volume is not for war but for peace. In this respect I have been often misunderstood. Some of my friends ask me now and then, while discussing Oriental problems, "Do you want the United States to go to war with Japan?" No. On the contrary, I want the United States to avoid war with Japan, and I believe the United States can solve the problem even now without war. That is what I want to tell in this book.

I am a pacifist, in the general sense of the word, by temperament and religion. I was raised in a Confucian family and educated in a Confucian school. Confucius placed war beyond the pale of civilization, for the rule of force is the rule of barbarians.

Korea enjoyed a high standard of Confucian civilization for more than two thousand years. Peace was the guiding principle of the nation in philosophy, politics, and poetry, and it was the household word in its everyday life. The very name of the nation, given by its founder, Tan Kun, in 2317 B. C. and renewed by the ensuing dynasty, Ki Cha, 1122 B. C., was the Land of the Morning Calm (Peace). Instead of saying among themselves, "How do you do?" "Good-bye," etc., the Koreans say, "Are you in peace?" "Go in peace," "Peace be with you," etc. Born and raised in that atmosphere, I was naturally a man of peace.

But with the advent of Western civilization came the Western idea of military conquest and superior modern weapons of war. Japan, as an apt pupil of the West, soon equipped herself with the modern instruments and Western military mentality. When she was fully ready, she came, bowed, and asked for our good will by saying, "Please make friends with us, as we are your next-door neighbor. All the nations of the world throw their

doors wide open to one another. They have international law and also international treaties to protect all nations, weak as well as strong. Please do not suspect, but trust, us."

The conservative Korean government, having a childlike faith in the treaties, by which all the leading powers promised to protect them in time of need, opened everything to the Japanese without preparing for national defense. It was in 1895, soon after the close of the first Sino-Japanese war, that I came to realize the danger and undertook to inform the nation of the imminent menace to our independent existence. I started the first daily newspaper in Korea, through the columns of which I did all I could to cause our people to know what the Japanese and the Russians, the two rival forces, were trying to do. In co-operation with many patriotic leaders, we succeeded in arousing a sufficient number of people to join with us in inaugurating a national defense program.

Unfortunately for Korea, the government was unable to understand the situation and tried to suppress the nationalist movement. After a long struggle between the conservative party and the nationalist party, the former succeeded in crushing the latter, and, consequently, I soon found myself, together with many others, landed in jail, where I spent nearly seven years.

When the Russo-Japanese war broke out in 1904, the nationalist party got into power temporarily, and they let me out of the prison. As I walked out of the old iron gate of Kamoksu, the Seoul prison, the Russian influence in the Korean court had crumbled. The Japanese, who won the moral support of the Western nations by posing as champions of the independence of Korea, were already tightening their death grip on the very life of that country, their ally. The new Korean government tried to send me as a special envoy to the United States for the purpose of asking the United States to "use its good offices" against Japan. But, to its dismay, the Korean government discovered that the Japanese had already closed every possible loophole and no direct appeal for help could be sent to the outside world. The Japanese, who had been known up to that time as friends of the Korean nationalist party, were closely

watching me in every move I made. I managed to leave Korea hurriedly for America in early November, 1904. The Japanese did not know that I had brought with me several important diplomatic communications from Prince Min and General Hahn. That is, however, another story, for which I have no place here.

I make this personal reference in order to show that I was in a position to see from behind the scenes what was carefully kept from the gaze of the outside world. No clairvoyance or far-sighted statesmanship was required to foretell what was to come. In fact, every educated Japanese knew then, as they know now, what to expect, and when. The difference was that they would not tell.

Naturally, I attempted to tell many things to the American people. I soon discovered that the mass of the people in this country in 1905 were just as unaware of the situation as the Koreans had been ten years before. I discovered also that there were eminent Americans who were highly enlightened on the subject and were equally anxious to disseminate the facts to their fellow citizens, but they could do nothing because public sentiment was so overwhelmingly pro-Japanese that no one would believe that these unfavorable statements about Japan could be true. Consequently, our warnings were but voices in the wilderness.

To refer to Korea again. If the Koreans had seen Japan in 1894 as they saw her in 1592, the year of Hideyoshi's unsuccessful invasion of Korea, they could have saved their country and themselves from the plight in which they find themselves today. On the other hand, if the American people had seen Japan in 1894 and 1904 as they see her today, they would have looked askance at Japan's annexation of Korea, and would have tried to meet Japanese expansion of sea power, which now offers a powerful threat on the other side of the Pacific.

These painful experiences are reviewed here in the hope of warning the United States to watch Japan. Therefore, I believe all Americans should know what they are now confronting. They should know that the things which they could have averted years ago by saying a few simple words or showing a firm attitude

at the right time cannot be averted so easily now. This problem must be settled, and the sooner it is settled the better.

Postponement is not a settlement. The forest fire will not extinguish itself. It is drawing nearer day by day. Years ago you heard but faint whispers of impending trouble. It was so far away. It seemed as if it might be on Mars, or some other planet. Later on, you saw columns of smoke rising at a distance, or perhaps a glow of the flames reflected on the clouds, or, at times, even heard the roaring or crackling of burning trees. Yet it was still far enough away to cause you no worry or alarm. Now that is all changed. You already begin to feel the heat. It is coming too close for your comfort. You must move from your own home or your own business because it is dangerous for you to ignore it longer. You must give up the international settlements in the Orient. You must lose your business investments, mission stations, universities, hospitals, and any and all other institutions that are yours. You must not carry on war games in the Pacific, because the Japanese say that the Pacific is their "back yard." You do not know what to do with the Philippine Islands, because the Japanese may want them. You must not fortify or even talk about fortifying any of your island outposts, because the Japanese will object. And that is not all. Even in your own homeland, you must not enact any law to regulate the influx of their nationals, because they say it is an insult to their race. And when they deliberately bomb and sink your ships you must not criticize them, because they are a proud and sensitive race and their feelings may be hurt. These are some of the things which have actually been happening. Can you still believe the forest fire is far away? Can you still say, "Let the Koreans, the Manchurians, and the Chinese fight their own fight; it is none of our business" ?

In this book I will endeavor to answer these perplexing questions. The answers will be found, perhaps, not in what I say, but rather in the events which have actually taken place. With this in view, we will not interest ourselves in the Sino-Japanese conflict as a whole, but only in a certain phase of the conflict that affects foreigners in general and Americans in particular.

FOREWORD

11

As the ever advancing, irresistible war machine moves along, it leaves in its wake the wreckage of civilization and humanity. It keeps on moving to more and greater destruction. A terrified world stands aghast and asks, "Why and what does all this mean? Why are they doing all this?" It means just this: the Mikado in the East and the Fascists and Nazis in the West are bent on conquering the world. As they have great mechanized armies, they believe they are destined to rule the world.

I

JAPAN'S "DIVINE MISSION" AND WAR PSYCHOLOGY

IN order to save democracy, the American people must face the world situation and act quickly, and co-operate with all the peoples of the world struggling to retain their liberty or to regain their lost freedom. The United States must take an active, leading part in all the great world issues which involve the peace and safety, not only of the Western Hemisphere, but of the world. There will be no peace and safety in the world so long as it remains half democratic and half totalitarian. It must be one or the other. The maintenance of democracy in the world depends upon how the American people act at this time. It is a tremendous task, to be sure. It would have been much easier even a decade or two ago, but the Americans have been sleeping, while the totalitarian nations were preparing. If America insists on continuing with a false idea of peace, there will be no escape.

The American government and the people are, at last, partly awake and are now pushing ahead with necessary material preparations as fast as possible. Yet material equipment alone is not sufficient. The importance of preparing the American public to meet the inevitable and unavoidable menace cannot be over-estimated. Japan knew long ago the value of mental power and has been busily engaged in training the nation's mind. Today she is far superior to any nation in the world, except Germany, in the development of a war psychology. Some of the ideas expressed here sound fantastic and ridiculous to practical Western minds. It seems incredible for the people of a "modernized" nation to believe in such incongruous and mythical fabrications, but the point is that they do believe them, and millions are will-

ing and ready to die to prove their faith. With this spiritual equipment, plus an "invincible" army and navy, they are determined to conquer the world. We who are trying not to be conquered should take special interest in studying the idea of "divinity" back of Japanese rulers.

The *Japan Advertiser* printed a translation of an editorial in the Japanese vernacular newspaper *Niroku* on May 9, 1919, as follows:

"To preserve the world's peace and promote the welfare of mankind is the mission of the Imperial Family of Japan. Heaven has invested the Imperial Family with all the necessary qualifications to fulfill this mission. He who can fulfill this mission is one who is the object of Humanity's admiration and adoration, and who holds the prerogative of administration forever. The Imperial Family of Japan is as worthy of respect as God, and is the embodiment of benevolence and justice. The great principle of the Imperial Family is to make popular interests paramount—most important. The Imperial Family of Japan is the parent, not only of her sixty millions, but of all mankind on earth. In the eyes of the Imperial Family all races are one and the same. It is above all racial considerations. All human disputes, therefore, may be settled in accordance with its immaculate justice. The League of Nations, proposed to save mankind from horrors of war, can attain its real object only by placing the Imperial Family of Japan at its head, for to attain its object the League must have a strong punitive force and a supernational and super-racial character; and this force can be found only in the Imperial Family of Japan."

The title "Emperor" for their ruler is a misnomer. The Japanese do not call him emperor, but *Tenno*, the Heavenly King. Every time they mention this word *Tenno*, they bow their heads or doff their hats. They do not class him with the emperors and kings of nations. He is above them all. He is a superior being. His sanctity is proclaimed in all official statements, in the national history for every school. Scholars, philosophers, lawyers, and writers, all teach and preach this all-important doctrine. Even great Christian leaders educated in

the West, such as the late Inazo Nitobe, declare the ruler of Japan is "the bodily representative of Heaven and Earth."

More ardent patriots trace the divine origin to the creation of the earth. According to this tale of Japanese mythology, the gods Izanagi and Izanami united in marriage and gave birth to the Japanese islands. The islands, therefore, are different from the rest of the earth. Then they gave birth to the sun goddess Amaterasu, whose direct descendant became the ruler of Japan. The first emperor was the deity Jimmu Tenno. The story of the birth of the Japanese Islands related in *The Japanese Nationalist Bible* is as follows:

"The holy couple, Izanagi and Izanami, were ordered by other gods to give birth to the drifting land from the bridge of high heaven, and the male god thrust his jeweled spear into the primeval brine. From the coagulation which took place, the Islands of Japan were formed, and from the drops that fell from the spear the rest of the world came into being. Therefore, all nations should be grateful to Japan, because to the creation of Japan the world owes its existence . . ."

This is by no means the end of the divinity story. Japanese divinity does not stop with the Emperor and the land. The people are also a part of it. The aborigines of Japan were all gods and goddesses, and from them descended the present Yamato race, Seed of the Sun. All other mortals are of lower orders. From the divine descent of the Japanese people "proceeds their immeasurable superiority to the natives of other countries in courage and intelligence."

Every Japanese is taught to believe he is more or less a god, because he belongs to this divine race, Yamato. Every child grows up with the belief that (1) Japan's Emperor is the only divine ruler, (2) Japan is the only divine land, (3) Japan's people are the only divine people and, therefore, Japan must be the light of the world. A soldier who dies in battle, or a patriot who sacrifices his life for the Emperor, automatically becomes a full god and joins the great family of gods in the Lotus heaven. The so-called Imperial Genealogy was invented about 700 A. D.

and completed only seventy years ago, when the Shogunate was abolished and the Emperor was restored to power. How the story originated matters very little to the Japanese. All now believe in the divinity of their Emperor, their land, and their people. No doubt this is the great uniting and driving force behind the Japanese race—"each unimportant in himself but all together omnipotent." In this sense, "Japan is a war machine of seventy million gods." In recent years, while all other faiths have been crumbling, this Shintoistic doctrine has grown supreme. The government has ordered the Christian churches in Japan and Korea to transfer administrative responsibility to the Japanese and has imposed other restrictions. In a wireless dispatch to *The New York Times* from Tokyo, on Aug. 28, 1940, Hugh Byas wrote, in part:

"The movement for the eradication of foreign influence from Japanese Christianity is progressing rapidly. A purely national Church, tentatively named the Genuine Japan Christian Church, is being organized. Efforts are being made to have the new Church formally constituted October 17 at the 2600th anniversary of the traditional date of the founding of the Japanese Empire by the Sun Goddess.

"The movement is part of the present wave of extreme nationalism that is sweeping Japan, but the Japanese Christians deny hostility to American or other missionaries. The amalgamation is advocated as a means of making up for the loss of foreign donations."

We who believe in the freedom of religion may have no business to dig into other people's religious faith. If they want to believe that their Emperor, land, people, and even all the living creatures in Japan are divine, it is their privilege and we have nothing to say. After all, the theory of the divine origin of man sounds better than the Western idea of evolution from anthropoid ancestry. Let them believe, to their hearts' content, that they are superior because of their heavenly origin. But that is not all. It is the basis of their claims to the world domination under the rule of their Mikado. Since their Mikado is the only heavenly

king, the logical conclusion is that he is the only rightful ruler of the universe, and that his army and navy are sent to save the world. There should be but one sun in all the heavens and but one ruler in all this mundane sphere. World peace, so much desired, can be obtained only through Japanese sovereignty. It is Japan's heaven-ordained mission to establish "a new order in Asia," and that is why "Japan is the only stabilizing force in the Far East." At present, it is the part of caution that the Japanese modify their claims by confining themselves to Asia and the Far East. But they will soon extend "the new order in Asia" to "a new world order," and "a stabilizing power in the Far East" to a "stabilizing power on the entire earth." The Imperial rescript of Emperor Jimmu, which, according to the Japanese military textbook, "has been given to us an everlasting and categorical imperative," says, "We shall build our capital all over our dominion, because we are ordained by heaven to save the entire world from chaos and ruin."

Yosuke Matsuoka, then chief of the South Manchurian Railways, stated in 1931: "It is my conviction that the mission of the Yamato race is to prevent the human race from becoming devilish, to rescue it from destruction and lead it to the world of light." Count Fatura recently declared in the House of Peers that the racial spirit of Japan alone can save the world from the chaos into which it has fallen. Japanese vernacular newspapers unhesitatingly claim that the souls of their dead soldiers, deified by the Emperor in special ceremonies, are fighting with the living in the invasion of China today. The wind that changed its direction just in time to enable the Japanese troops to land in Shanghai was believed to be an act of their gods, as they were engaged in a "holy war to bring together all the races of the world into one happy accord," which "has been the ideal and national aspiration of the Japanese since the very foundation of our empire. . . . We also aspire to make a clean sweep of injustice and inequality from the earth and to bring about everlasting happiness among mankind. . . ." Therefore, according to their interpretation, their crusade is being waged against all the unholy elements of the West. In that sense, their war

against the West is not only military, but essentially religious and political.

Religiously, we have already seen the crusade against foreign missionaries and Christian churches to establish the Shintoistic idea of emperor worship as the supreme national religion. This war will be waged in all the territories under their control so long as they are left unchecked. In their philosophy of life there should be but one supreme religion; two or more religions or religious ideas, conflicting with one another in one nation, destroy peace. So the proposed new order is a crusade against freedom of religion.

Politically, the democratic idea of freedom and equality is diametrically opposed to the Japanese system of government. The ruling class, belonging to heaven, must be as high as the heavens above the mass of people. No individual liberty can be allowed to disrupt this order of nature. According to this principle of government, freedom of the press and freedom of speech are just as dangerous to the political organism of Japan as poison is to the human lung. Openly to criticize or condemn the chief executive of a nation, as is done in America, is unheard of in Japan. The practice of strikes as a part of the recognized exercise of individual rights is regarded as an evil in the social and economic life of the nation. To call the head of a nation a "public servant" and to call his official residence the White House instead of a white palace is a sign of confusion and disorder. This and many other things must be destroyed, because they are part of democratic principles and as such influence some Japanese liberals and the people of subject races against the imperial rule of Japan. In this sense, the Japanese crusade is being waged against the democratic system of government in America.

In the light of all their wonderful achievements during the last half century, there is small wonder that they became cocky. They are human, like the rest of us. They are a small folk, small in body and brain, circumscribed in their small island world for centuries. Suddenly the heavens opened like a fairy story and they were brought face to face with a new world, new

civilization, and new ways of life. A fish raised in a bowl suddenly dropped into a vast lake could not feel freer. The most wonderful of all was that the new war instruments of civilized man, with all his military tactics and technics, tumbled into their laps as if from heaven above. Note how many military victories they have scored since! How can they help being megalomaniac? Are they not "invincible"? The entire world was united in singing their praises. If they told the nations to shut their eyes and see nothing but what they showed them, the world, with all its education and intelligence, would fail to see the traps and snares carefully laid for them. Abraham Lincoln's famous saying, "You cannot fool all the people all the time," does not seem to hold true here. The Japanese have been fooling the people for the last half century, and now, at last, they have thrown off their sheep skin and revealed their wolf fangs. A large part of the world still refuses to believe. Yet have not Japanese been insulting the flags of the Western Powers, which the Western peoples salute and respect as the sacred emblems of their respective nations? Have not Japanese militarists been kicking, ripping, slapping, and destroying the lives and properties of the citizens of the United States and of Great Britain for the last three years in China, not to mention what they did before? But the Western Powers are apparently helpless, and their long-established supremacy is crumbling before the armies of the Mikado. It is the gods, the ancestors of their rulers, who brought about these wonderful things in the past and who hold many more wonderful things in store for them, the Japanese believe.

Out of this Shintoistic mysticism they have gradually developed a peculiar psychology of war combined with an extreme sense of patriotism. Having been confined in their island world ever since the creation, and their every attempt to secure a foothold beyond the seas during all the past centuries having been frustrated by the people of the mainland of Asia, their hereditary national ambition was naturally a military conquest overseas. The wish is father to the thought. Out of their wish they developed this war-making mentality, which, in turn, produced the proud warrior race of the Samurai. Later, the opening of

the country to intercourse with the Western Powers brought into their minds the idea of nationalism and patriotism which was highly developed in the Western world. While adopting all the Western ideas of life, they accepted chauvinism unreservedly and gave to it the place formerly held by the idea of loyalty to their feudal lords which prevailed in the old days of the Shogunate.

Side by side with the Shintoistic idea of emperor worship has grown the "cult of war." With national expansion as its objective, the practice of warrior worship has become almost a religion. Born and raised in that atmosphere and educated and inculcated with patriotic militarism, every Japanese has the same attitude toward the Emperor and the Empire—to die for them is the highest glory on earth. What effect these teachings have on their everyday life can be seen in the following few excerpts from *The Literary Digest* of July 18, 1936:

"The peculiar psychology of the Japanese fanatical patriots is illustrated in the story of Colonel Saburo Aizawa, who, in August, 1935, cut to death with his saber the Director General of Military Affairs, Tetsuzan Nagata. The significant part of his act is to be seen in his testimony given before the court in his trial. He said he had prayed before his act in the two most sacred shrines of Japan, as he believed that he was to 'act on command of a higher power and as a most loyal subject to the Emperor.' He further stated in self-justification: 'Young girls in the district where I was born no longer like to work on the farms, there is no opportunity to bring up serious minded young men. Mah-jong and cafés are becoming intolerable. When I saw this, the teachings on which I had been brought up to give up everything for the Emperor burst out and encouraged me.' He shouted to the audience to 'repent and believe in the absolute power of the Emperor,' and wept when a petition in his favor, written in the blood of the signers, was submitted to the court."

As a result of the famous Young Army Revolution of 1936, sixteen army officers and one civilian were executed by firing squads. The verdict of the court was based, not on the crime of assassinating their government Ministers, but on their refusal to obey the Emperor's command to surrender. Their crimes

were condoned on the ground that they were committed with noble and patriotic motives. The son of Takahashi, the eighty-one-year-old statesman assassinated by the army revolutionists, when interviewed, expressed his sentiments in the following words:

"My father cut the army budget. If the assassins were right, I must hold them blameless. If what they did will benefit my country, I cannot regret my father's death. Much more serious than the slaying of a few statesmen was their subsequent act of refusing to obey when the Emperor's edict was brought to them, etc. . . ."

When they were summoned to yield, one captain killed himself and another shot himself in the head, but failed to die. All the 123 convicted men were members of ultra-patriotic societies which abound in Japan to study, pray, and plan methods of leading their empire to a higher destiny.

As late as January 5, 1941, Japanese Foreign Minister Matsuoka declared in a radio address to Japanese communities abroad, mainly in the South Sea islands, that ". . . this is not my desire alone; it is the desire of all Japanese. The ideal of the founder of our empire—'all mankind under one roof'—should be made the ideal of all mankind. . . . Those ideals are interwoven into our alliance with Germany, which is the guiding spirit of our foreign policy."

So far, we have seen clearly that this formidable army of teeming millions, mechanically and mentally equipped, are forcing themselves rapidly and irresistibly upon the world. In addition, they are capable of using one group of white nations against another group to exhaust, if not destroy, all the major Powers of the West. The Western Powers, selfish and jealous of one another, believing that they are serving their own purposes, are only serving the purpose of those who desire to conquer them all.

However, the war lords in Tokyo, overconfident of the invincibility of their army and the divinity of their rulers, have overlooked one vital factor in their calculation. They have failed to take into consideration the latent power of resistance

they have unconsciously created in the hearts of their conquered peoples. Twenty-three million Koreans at their own doorstep are today their bitterest enemies. Disarmed and disorganized, they have constantly broken out in open revolts, despite the barbarous Japanese methods of suppression and repression. They will rise again in a nation-wide revolution at the first opportunity, as they did in the Passive Uprising of 1919. The 450,000,000 Chinese, once reputed to be hopelessly divided among themselves, are today standing as one man in resisting the Japanese. These miracles have been achieved by the Japanese themselves. The two nations, China and Korea, were hereditary allies, and now their alliance has been renewed. All they need is a sufficient supply of war machines and war materials. It has already been demonstrated that as long as they have weapons with which to fight, they can take care of the Japanese.

To utilize this enormous man power, by furnishing it with supplies, is to keep the United States out of war, so far as the Pacific is concerned. The open Japanese threats of war against the United States are only a bluff. They know too well that it would be suicidal for them to plunge into war with the United States, while Great Britain and China are menacing the Axis line-up from both ends. Adequate and continued material assistance to China will now, without doubt, keep Japan too deeply engrossed to consider further conquest. "Armageddon," which I saw in its embryo thirty-five years ago and against which I have been trying all these years to warn the American people, may thus be averted.

II

TANAKA MEMORIAL

COOPED up in a small group of islands, Japan's traditional ambition has been territorial expansion. Korea and China knew it. For the peace of the Far East they had their own traditional policy, which was to keep the islanders in their own islands. Japan's repeated invasions of Korea as first steps toward the conquest of the mainland of Asia met with failure. The last and most destructive war of Hideyoshi, "the Napoleon of Japan," 1592, although he was completely defeated by the Sino-Korean allied armies, left Korea so helplessly devastated that it never completely recovered. From that time on to 1876 the isolation of Korea was so air-tight that not a Japanese or Chinese was allowed to enter the country without special permit. Thus the Land of the Morning Calm managed to maintain its calm and earned its sobriquet, the "Hermit Kingdom."

The warriors of the Samurai race, though defeated and repulsed by the allied troops of Korea and China after the Hideyoshi invasion, never ceased to cherish their dream of "world conquest." Their idea of the world never extended beyond the continent of Asia, "within the Four Seas."

The new era altered all this by bringing the West to meet the East. At first, the East resisted. It soon discovered, to its great surprise, a superior civilization beyond "the Four Seas" and bowed. While the Chinese and Koreans, scholarly minded, were beginning to study Western philosophy, literature, and religion in comparison with theirs, the ambitious Samurai saw at once the superiority of the lethal weapons of the Westerners and adapted them to their own purposes. Slowly the wish to adopt and equip themselves with these modern armaments so as to conquer the world dawned in their minds as the rising sun dawns on their islands.

In 1894, Japan suddenly attacked China, unprepared and unsuspecting, and with the aid of new weapons and of the United States and Great Britain, she came near to the realization of her traditional dream by defeating the giant Empire of China. Flushed with victory, she rushed secret preparations for another war, and in 1904 she was ready to tackle Russia. Prior to the outbreak of this war, the Japanese government proposed, and the Korean government agreed, to sign a defensive and offensive alliance, by which Korea was to open the Peninsula for the Japanese troops to march through, and by which Japan solemnly pledged to withdraw her troops from Korea when peace should be restored. With that understanding, a Korean national army marched side by side with the Japanese army to fight the Russians in Manchuria. When the war was over, however, Japan, in open violation of her pledged words, filled the country with her victorious army returning from the China border and betrayed her ally by robbing it of its independence and robbing its people of their land. In 1910, she declared the formal annexation of Korea.

This act of international banditry and outlawry was perpetrated by Japan with the full sanction and approval of the civilized nations of the world which had solemnly pledged themselves to help Korea in time of need. The first of these treaties was signed between the United States and Korea in 1882. The first article of this treaty contained what is known as the amity clause, which reads as follows:

“ If other powers deal unjustly or oppressively with either government, the other will exert their good offices, on being informed of the case, to bring about an amicable arrangement, thus showing their friendly feelings.”

All the leading European powers, following the example of the United States, made commercial treaties with Korea. Each of these treaties included the amity clause. They have never been abrogated, nor their legality questioned. In 1905, only twenty-three years later, the United States used its “good offices,” not for Korea, according to its treaty covenants, but for

Japan, which was dealing "unjustly and oppressively" with Korea in open violation of her sacred promise. This was the spark which started the conflagration.

During the World War, the German government was universally condemned for calling international treaties "scraps of paper," but Germany was only practicing what the American government did nine years before. It is highly significant that such a tiny little fire—a flame of international injustice—started in a remote corner of the earth, has spread so rapidly that many nations in the West, as well as those in the East, have been reduced to ruin and others are threatened with the same fate. The very nation whose violation of her treaties with Korea the United States condoned is now violating all the treaties and agreements she has made with the United States. And now the American people are facing a peril to their peace and security which, all unwittingly, they helped to create.

As early as 1895, soon after Japan's victory over China, I heard the Japanese talking about *Dai Dong Hap Bang* (the United States of the Great East), under the hegemony of Japan of course. And later I read a book under the title of *Il Mi Chun Chang Mi Rai Ki* (Japanese-American War in the Future). I have in my possession now a book written in Japanese by a high Japanese naval authority, predicting a war between the United States and Japan. I picked it up from the bookcase of a Korean family in San Francisco in 1934.

The great victories they won were bound to have an effect on the minds of the Japanese. They began to believe that they were invincible. The whole nation was convinced that so long as it was trained and equipped it could carry its conquests in the West as well as in the East. Out of this national dream came into existence what was later known as the Tanaka Memorial. The idea of world conquest, as incorporated in that document, was by no means new. It was the nation's hereditary ambition put into new language, with its scope widened. This policy, which was made familiar to every Japanese, so that the whole nation would be solidly behind it, was to be kept from the knowledge of Westerners, especially Americans. That is why

the Japanese have vigorously denied the authenticity of the Tanaka document. They may deny as they wish. Their actions speak more loudly than their words.

According to Mark J. Gayn, whose article appeared under the topic, "Japan's Blue Print," in *The Washington Post* on April 10, 1941,

"Matsuoka's talks, naturally, were on matters of high policy—but whether this policy meant peace or war for the Pacific no one would tell. No one, that is, except a nameless Korean who more than a decade ago stole, copied, or forged what has become a blue print of Japan's long-term policy. Little is known of the Korean. Three years ago, Chinese political agents in Shanghai told me he was somewhere in Central China hiding from the long arm of the Japanese secret service. If he has not been assassinated since, he must have migrated inland with hundreds of other Korean revolutionaries and soldiers of fortune.

"Some time between 1927 and 1931, the Korean served as a clerk in the office of the Japanese premier. . . . The memorial was highly secret but, somehow, the Korean clerk managed to lay his hands on the document and copy it. A shrewd man, he realized the explosive possibilities of the memorial and decided to capitalize on it. As every Korean, he nursed little love for Japan.

"Some time in 1931, he approached the Chinese government with the offer to sell a highly confidential Japanese document. On September 24, 1931, five days after Japan invaded Manchuria, the Chinese returned Tanaka's name to world headlines by publishing the Korean's document. The moment could not have been chosen better, for the conquest of Manchuria was one of the major steps outlined in the memorial.

"Of course, the Japanese promptly and vehemently denied its authenticity by saying that it was a forgery, either manufactured by the Chinese propaganda bureau or sold by a Korean forger.

"Foreign newspaper men and diplomatic officials took another look at the 'Tanaka Memorial.' They were still prepared to take Japan's word that it was a forgery, but they were forcibly struck by its close adherence to the pattern of Japanese aggression. The further south the Japanese juggernaut rolled, the more remarkable the Korean document began to look. The Korean might have been

a forger, but if he was, he was then endowed with a gift of prophecy not given to ordinary man."

Baron Tanaka's secret memorial is to Japan what Hitler's *Mein Kampf* is to Germany. Both were written, not as prophecy, predicting what would come to pass, but as a military blue print for remapping the world. Hitler knew that the world would not take his book seriously, and if it did he did not care. Millions read it and scoffed at the audacity of a madman. Meanwhile, he went ahead, step by step. Europe is now under his thumb.

Baron Tanaka, on the other hand, knew that Japan had to move stealthily until she was strong enough to come out in the open. For that reason he kept the memorial secret. One copy of the document was smuggled out of Japan and made public. The American people were not prepared to accept it as a revelation of Japan's military aims. Most Americans disregarded it, just as most Europeans disregarded Hitler's book. The Japanese official denial of its authenticity was taken as a statement of fact.

However, the world situation has altered rapidly during recent years. The continents of Europe and Asia are being remapped, with no end of the process in sight. Great changes have taken place. They are a partial realization of Baron Tanaka's predictions. Certain statements in the memorial are very significant:

"For settling the difficulties in Eastern Asia, Japan must adopt a policy of iron and blood. . . . In order to conquer the world, Japan must conquer Europe and Asia; in order to conquer Europe and Asia, Japan must conquer China. . . . In the future, if we wish to control China, the primary move is to crush the United States. . . . If we succeed in conquering China, the rest of the Asiatic countries and the South Sea countries will fear us and surrender to us. . . ."

In the light of the Sino-Japanese conflict, it is all too evident that the complete subjugation of China is an integral part of Japan's design. Although she is still far from succeeding in that grandiose scheme, its repercussions are shaking the world.

Whenever militarists overestimate their own power it is the beginning of their downfall. The Japanese are no exception. They were so sure of their invincibility that they made two great blunders in their China campaign.

First, they failed to estimate correctly the latent but awakening spirit of Chinese patriotism. Japanese bomb and machine-gun raids, more than anything else, achieved the miracle. They aroused in the Chinese a determined spirit of unity and resistance. The mighty Nipponese army bogged down. In the main, invasion, so far, has succeeded little beyond the coast. It should be recalled that when Japan was about to unmask herself in 1936, she was ready to spring upon any of the major powers of the West. Russia's timely preparation for her defense along the Siberian border forced the Japanese to change their tactics and attack China. An easy victory in China would have enabled them to launch a major campaign against the United States with all the man power and material resources of a conquered China at their command. The plan was to be executed while Hitler and Mussolini were confining British resistance to Europe and the Mediterranean, thus furnishing a heaven-sent opportunity for Japan to stab the United States in the back. A sudden attack on America, while Americans were unprepared and unaware, would have put Japan in an advantageous position for carrying on the rest of the campaign. But first it was necessary to subjugate China.

Second, the Japanese started too soon to close the "Open Door." Made overconfident by their quick successes early in the undeclared war on China, they undertook at once to oust all white men and their businesses, and to make Japanese control over China complete. They knew well enough that no Western Power, or Powers, would go to war with them in order to maintain the "Open Door," and measures short of war did not much concern them. But their calculations were wrong. If, instead of adopting this terrorist method, they had patiently followed the slow-moving, underhanded process which they had used so effectively in seizing Korea, they would doubtless have met with greater success. When her forces were entering Korea thirty-five

years ago, Japan was under the leadership of shrewd, far-sighted statesmen of the old school. They knew that they were in need of the moral and material support of the great nations of the West and dared not do anything that would arouse indignation or suspicion against them. They took great pains to make friends with all foreigners, missionaries, newspapermen, and others, and to such an extent that most of the foreigners openly supported them in their efforts to bring Korea under their domination. When they succeeded in that, the Japanese employed all sorts of underhanded schemes, by which means they gradually got rid of all the foreigners. If they had made use of this slow process in their China campaign, they would have succeeded in keeping the American people unsuspecting and unprepared.

The Japanese, however, like all other militarists, believed that force was a short cut to success, and set out to prove it. As a result, the bombing raids upon unprotected civilian sectors in China revealed to the American people, perhaps for the first time, the real purpose of the Japanese army, while the wanton destruction of the lives and property of foreigners in China served as an eye-opener to Americans, who began to see the real Japanese menace threatening the peace of the Pacific. The growing sympathy for China and suspicion of Japan in America gradually crystallized into a national policy of giving China all the material support needed in her life or death struggle against Japan. Thus American material help steadily found its way to the Chungking government, enabling them to keep up their resistance and also encouraging and helping the morale of the Chinese armies. Naturally, anti-American feeling among the Japanese also has been considerable.

Meanwhile, Hitler, on the other side of the world, also failed to score a quick success in his London raids. Contrary to the Fuehrer's prediction of the fall of London at the beginning of autumn, 1940, the British, unlike the French, refused to collapse. There, again, it was American material support which enabled the British to continue their fight with greater vigor and determination. Thus the Germans and Japanese find them-

selves face to face with the United States. From their standpoint, then, it is the United States that stands in their way, of course. Under these circumstances, it is perfectly natural for the United States to furnish munitions and war supplies for the Chinese and Koreans to fight the Japanese in the Far East, and to give similar help to the British against the Germans, thus keeping America's first lines of defense far away from her shores. Is it not the policy of wisdom to keep war away from the American door rather than to fight on the American doorstep?

The United States, fully aware of the situation, turned over to Great Britain fifty old destroyers in exchange for the lease of defense bases in some of the British colonial possessions in the Western hemisphere. At the same time, an American loan of \$25,000,000 to China was a manifestation of the fact that the American government and the American people had come to a realization of the impending danger.

The Axis group has been co-operating in a sort of loose alliance. Knowing that Americans were still endeavoring to remain out of war, they have constantly played on that policy with veiled threats, hoping thus to frighten America into cutting off aid to Britain and China. On September 26, 1940, *The Japan Times* suggested a plan for settlement of Pacific problems on the basis of a triple alliance among the United States, Japan, and Germany, with the following comment: "Japan is finally convinced that the United States stands unalterably opposed to her legitimate expansion in the Orient and she can be expected to give Germany active support if America enters the European war."

Japan finally decided to take all the risks in pursuing her "Greater East Asia" policy by making a formal alliance with Berlin and Rome on September 27, 1940. She gambled on Germany's winning the war before the United States could be ready. The pact was meant as a warning to the United States. Article III states that Japan, Germany, and Italy undertake to assist one another with all political, economic, and military means when one of the three contracting parties is attacked by a power not at present involved in the European war or in the

Sino-Japanese conflict. Article IV states: "Any state that attempts to interfere in the closing phase of the wars which seek a solution of European problems or those of Eastern Asia will run afoul of the combined determined forces of 250,000,000 people." It is significant that Japan's usual phrase of "East Asia" is now "Greater East Asia." How soon will the latter change again? Each new term brings Japan nearer to America.

Foreign Minister Yosuke Matsuoka, in a broadcast on October 10, 1940, declared:

"I wish earnestly that such a powerful nation as the United States and all other nations at present neutral do not become involved in the European war or come by any chance into conflict with Japan because of the China incident or otherwise. Such an eventuality, with all the possibility of bringing awful catastrophe upon humanity, is enough to make one shudder, if one stops to imagine the consequences."

Prince Konoye said to newspaper men on October 6, 1940:

"The question of peace or war in the Pacific will be decided by whether the United States and Japan understand and respect each other's positions. If the United States recognizes Japan's leadership in East Asia, Japan would recognize United States leadership of the Americas. If the United States refuses to understand the real intention of Japan, Germany, and Italy in concluding an alliance for positive co-operation in creating a new world order, and persist in challenging those powers in the belief that the accord is a hostile action there will be no other course open to it than to go to war."

In reference to Article III, which may compel the Japanese navy to attack the United States, he said, "In such case Japan would cut off American supplies, and force the United States to take an offensive under disadvantageous conditions."

The nationalist leader, Seigo Nakano, said in *Nichi Nichi*:

"If the United States refuses to send oil, we should obtain it in the Netherland Indies and Malaya, and suppress zinc and tin ship-

ments to America. If the United States resorts to force, we must meet the attack in the western Pacific."

Thus Japan, almost in desperation, burst into open intimidation as a last resort. She had employed this method constantly in the past, though not so boldly and menacingly, and had always been rewarded with magical success. Such stock phrases as "great eventualities" and "grave consequences," which her diplomats and propagandists used with gusto in former times, were not strong enough on this occasion. The fore, both the Premier and the Foreign Minister, for the first time in the history of American-Japanese diplomacy, openly and officially asserted, in the form of newspaper interviews, that Japan "would declare war on the United States." This direct intimidation produced an adverse effect in America. Of course, and as usual, pro-Japanese elements in the United States used this reaction as an occasion publicly to criticize the government for "dragging the United States into war." But the general public was indignant, and some called it "an open insult," while others referred to it as a "virtual ultimatum." From the standpoint of America's national defense, the action of the Tokyo-Berlin gangsters in shaking their fists at America from the East and the West at the same time was probably just the thing some Americans needed to open their eyes to the facts. Those who had a vague idea of Germany's ultimate design to attack the Western hemisphere, but still refused to believe Japan had any such ambition, now began to give whole-hearted support to the national defense program. This conviction of the inevitability of an ultimate United States-Japanese clash, together with the rising tide of anger in America against Japanese incidents in China, convinced most Americans that "the sooner we have a two-ocean navy the better."

III

JAPAN READY TO UNMASK HERSELF

SOON after the Japanese army had completed its invasion of Manchuria, followed by the inauguration of a puppet regime, the whole Japanese nation was profoundly stirred by the demand for revision of the naval treaty with the United States and Great Britain. The government and the people were all one in this demand, and were so clamorous and obstreperous in making it heard that there was no mistaking the meaning of the widely circulated statement that "the years 1935-1936 were to be the most critical in the history of the Island Empire."

What did all this mean? Why the "crisis"?

It meant simply this:

The years 1935-1936 would be the time when Japan's secret preparations for war would reach their peak, and when Japan would unmask herself and take the world by surprise. In other words, her material preparations, which took many years' hard, secret work, were about to be completed, and the nation should now be mentally and spiritually prepared to see it through when the time came. Every Japanese understood it clearly and was expecting something significant to be put under way during these years. Therefore, the question of the revision of the naval treaty was taken up as a preliminary step toward the final show-down.

The 1921 Washington Conference, which decreed the 5-5-3 naval ratio, with the London revision of 1931 to 10-10-7, was to be either renewed or revised again at the end of 1936. Beginning in 1933, three years before the expiration of the term of the treaty, the Japanese government started a nation-wide agitation which resulted in demanding the revision of the ratio formula. The contention was that the treaty was unfair and discriminatory, and, therefore, an insult to the Japanese people.

The whole nation clamored that Japan should have either a naval status equal to that of the United States and Britain or be released from any restriction.

This was, of course, a sudden change in attitude. If the treaty was really unfair and discriminatory, why did Japan agree to the terms in 1921 and again in 1931? Or, to put it in reverse order, if the Japanese failed to see the unfairness of the ratio when they were signing the treaty, what caused them to see the unfairness of it now? The answer to these questions will reveal what had been considered by foreign observers as an open secret.

So far as the United States and Great Britain were concerned, their naval construction plans remained the same as in 1921, but in Japan, in 1933, the situation was vastly different. At the time of the Washington and London Conferences, Japan was still in the process of her secret preparations for war; but in 1933 her preparations were about to reach completion and she wanted to rid herself of any international entanglements which might hamper her. A brief review of the situation will make it clear.

When the 5-5-3 formula was agreed upon in 1921, the Japanese delegates at first protested for the sake of form, and then acquiesced as if out of good sportsmanship. In fact, they were the happiest and most successful group in the whole conference. Their successes were twofold. To win the honor of being one of the three greatest naval powers in the world was a great step forward, which would cater to the overweening pride of the Japanese race. And to set up a ratio which would keep her two rival powers from increasing their naval strength beyond the given limit was an unexpected victory for Japan, which fell into her lap like a windfall. She would never be able to build a navy second to none, even if she had to exhaust her treasury in a building race with the United States and Great Britain. But she could manage to maintain a secret reservation under which she could build all she desired, without open violation of the treaty. With this mental reservation, the poker-faced diplomats went home from Washington in high spirits.

The Japanese kept their factories, arsenals, and navy yards

going at full blast, more or less covertly, in a feverish attempt to outbuild their Occidental rivals. The Western world, naively confident that the naval agreement would prevent Japan from excessive building, paid no attention. Later on, some keen observers in the West now and then demanded an international inquiry into Japan's covert preparation for war, but each time the Tokyo militarists came out boldly with indignant statements that such an inquiry would be regarded as an insult to the proud Samurai race, and the world remained silent.

Nevertheless, there were certain groups of people in America who were fully aware of what was going on behind Nippon's mask. The Japanese strategists knew that these groups must be sidetracked and their reports discredited. This was to be done by the combined efforts of diplomats and propagandists. They handled the situation skillfully. America heard or read everywhere such slogans as "Japan wants peace," "War between Japan and the United States is absurd," "There are jingoists and alarmists in Japan and the United States, but Japan hates these warmongers," etc. The world was fed on these statements so constantly that if anyone ventured to reveal Japan's well-concealed war scheme he was severely censured as a trouble maker. The peace-loving citizens of America would rather suspect and criticize the policies and motives of their own government, true to democratic principles, than to suspect and criticize those of a foreign government. "If Japan demands naval parity," they would say, "it is because of the unfairness of the ratio idea imposed upon her by ourselves and Great Britain, and we should not suspect her."

Thus Americans unintentionally cultivated the American public mind for foreign propaganda statements like that of Admiral Kichisaburo Nomura, which is typical of many. In his article on "Japan's Demand for Naval Equality," published in the *Foreign Affairs* magazine, January, 1935, he said, in substance, that the ratio limit in capital ships was decidedly a blow to the self-respect of the Japanese people, who look upon it as a stigma of inferiority. Japan, in her Far Eastern position, cannot accept it, because it deprives her of armaments necessary for the execu-

tion of her policy of maintaining peace in the Orient. He said, further, that therefore this ratio should be abolished, thus giving Japan a position of equality with other powers. Then she would be content with the minimum of armaments adequate to guarantee her national security. If the powers should insist on keeping Japan in an inferior position, the Japanese people would resent it as strongly as the continued enjoyment of extraterritoriality by foreigners was resented in the early years of Meiji.

In this article, the admiral stated that Japan objected to the ratio because it gave her an inferiority complex and also because it jeopardized her national security. He indicated not the slightest inkling of further expansion of Japan, of the projected conquest of China, or of the campaign against foreigners, all of which were in Japan's military program. Anyone who reads that article today can see readily that the admiral purposely treated this part of the program as a military secret, and in 1935 everyone took his statement at its face value.

While Japanese admirals and diplomats were thus creating world opinion in their favor, they kept on building their navy until the time of the proposed London Naval Conference, when they had 154 under-age warships totaling 998,208 tons. This exceeded in number America's ninety-one ships, totaling 743,300 tons. At the time Britain had fifty new ships under construction, totaling 165,350 tons, America was constructing eighty-four ships, totaling 280,150 tons, and Japan only forty, totaling 115,807 tons. This comparison was based only on the figures that were made public. There was no way for other powers to ascertain how many more ships, in addition to the forty, Japan was constructing under cover. And even if her figures were correct, Japan had only 2078 tons more to build to attain the treaty limit by the end of 1936, while Britain would have had to build 90,697 tons and America 71,135 tons to reach their treaty limits. When Japan went into conference she had, in effect, "the world's best navy," according to United States naval experts. No longer satisfied even with this favorable comparison, Japan was determined to make her navy "second to none."

During the celebration in 1935 of the anniversary of Admiral Togo's defeat of the Russian fleet at Port Arthur in 1904, the Japanese Navy Department published a pamphlet saying:

"With present modernization, navies are enabled to come to the Orient from any distance with their whole power. Without a superior power in control of Oriental waters, Japan cannot maintain peace in the Far East. . . . However, some other powers, with a century of Eastern influence, do not understand Japan's position. These powers desire to continue their influence, hence they need strong naval power as a background, making the solution of disarmament most difficult. . . . Now, since Japan is able to maintain peace in the Orient alone, the powers should intrust peace maintenance to Japan. It has become a national belief that Japan is the only stabilizing power in the Orient."

Such propaganda statements as quoted above, coupled with persistent demands for a revision of the naval ratio, finally led to the Five Power parley called to meet in London on December 9, 1935, although the term of the existing ratio was not to expire until the end of 1936.

On December 12, the four powers, Britain, France, Italy, and the United States, flatly rejected demands made by the Japanese delegation for a navy "second to none." This quartet of nations, together with Japan, constituted the conference. Japan's bid for a single standard which should be applied to all nations indiscriminately, regardless of defense requirements, was rebuffed by all the Western powers, whose common stand was supported by all the British dominions.

The British took the lead in objecting to the Japanese proposal. Norman H. Davis, chief of the American delegation, stressed in his speech the following points:

1. The proposed plan would cause an enormous increase in naval construction rather than a decrease.
2. Absolute parity did not take into consideration the difference in naval needs of the powers concerned, that is, Britain's far-flung empire and the extensive coast lines of the United States in contrast with Japan's comparatively smaller areas.

3. The adoption of this new plan would upset the equilibrium established by the Washington treaty and upheld by the London Conference, and the United States could find no reason in the international situation for such a change.

On the following day, December 13, all four delegations said no, and the Japanese walked out, just as another Japanese group had walked out in Geneva three years before.

The Japanese newspaper *Asahi* said in an editorial on December 14, 1935:

“If the London Naval Conference collapses, the United States must shoulder the blame; America is trying to acquire offensive strength. The United States proved herself the greatest opponent to the Japanese plan. This attitude is not surprising in view of British and American world policies.”

All this propaganda was purely for American consumption. The vernacular papers had different versions for their home markets.

Every statement they issue for the outside world has a special point upon which they hammer. The average reader does not see it. He reads what the newspaper says, and feels that the United States is unfair. As he begins to feel it, “We are not working in earnest for peace but are trying to get too much power, and that is how we shall get into trouble with Japan.” This is just the impression the Japanese propagandists seek to create in America, and thus has Japan been leading and misleading American public opinion. The best guide for the average reader of newspaper statements coming from Japan is to compare them with Japanese actions. The very fact that their words and deeds do not agree is evidence that their statements are inconsistent. The remarkable fact is that a gullible and credulous world does not stop to check them but swallows them whole. One does not have to travel far into history to discover this falsification. Take any of the Japanese statements made four or five years ago on an international issue and compare them with what is happening in Asia today. No harmony or consistency will be found.

As an answer to the question, "Why doesn't America let Japan have what she wants?" the following excerpts from an article by Fletcher Pratt, published in the *American Mercury*, January, 1937, briefly explain the great issues that are involved:

"It is about time to say publicly what every naval man has known in private for the last ten years—that the Japanese navy has been cheating on warship building ever since 1924. The facts are these: the Japanese have constructed 10,000-ton cruisers which are in fact pocket battleships, light cruisers that are in fact 10,000 tonners, destroyers over the naval treaty quotas, and defensive submarines which can operate off the Panama Canal from Japan without refuelling.

". . . These particulars are merely an explanation why the American and British admirals were so reluctant to agree at London on that 'common upper level' of naval strength which seems so reasonable a demand. The official explanation has been that the common upper limit would give Japan so decisive a naval superiority in the Western Pacific that America would be unable to maintain her hold on the Philippines and her trade interests in China; and the incontrovertible answer has been that America has no business in the Philippines and her trade interests in China are insignificant. But actually the case is far stronger—the admirals have learned that Japan refuses to be bound by anything that does not suit her convenience, and a naval treaty that accorded parity to Japan would actually mean Japanese naval superiority, not in the Western Pacific, but off the coast of California. And Japanese superiority in these waters is nothing to be contemplated with equanimity by anyone who is aware of the fact that America has given the Orientals causes of grievance which they feel as keenly as they did the Russian theft of Port Arthur. . . .

"The real emergence of Japan, however, as a consistent and energetic violator of naval limitation engagements dates from the fatuous London Conference of 1931. . . .

". . . It seems impossible to escape the conclusion that the Japanese built the number and size of destroyers they wanted and then arbitrarily announced tonnages to fit the treaty figures."

Their military preparations completed, the Japanese threw off the mask to let the world know that they were no longer the

polite, docile, bowing people they were in the time of Commodore Perry's visits, but are now a people whom the whole world must respect and fear. However, this did not mean that they would reveal their secret military program in advance. That would never do. It would be suicidal. They would rather complete all their plans behind the curtain, so that when they were ready for action they could take the world by surprise. So it is by action, not by word, that Japan would unveil her true self. Until then she would keep the outside world ignorant of her intentions.

In spite of all her camouflaging, there were many people in America who knew what Japan was about to attempt. The late United States Senator Key Pittman was one of them. He had the courage to voice his conviction. In an address given in Las Vegas, Nevada, December 19, 1935, Senator Pittman said:

"Sooner or later, the United States will be faced with the necessity of fighting for its very existence, and if we wait too long, the outcome will be much in doubt. What are we going to do, if they [the Japanese] grab the Philippines, which is almost sure to come? Will we retreat or will we stand and fight?"

This startling statement came like a bolt from the blue, not only to peaceful, complacent news readers in America, but also to the Japanese militarists themselves. The excited Tokyo officials promptly replied in sharp, cutting words. Tart-tongued foreign office spokesman, Eiji Amau, said:

"The senator cannot know much about the Orient. His arguments are not worthy of serious consideration. We are disappointed that a statesman in such a responsible position should advance them. The senator's statements simply reveal a lack of common sense."

Hiroshi Saito, the Japanese Ambassador to the United States, released an official statement declaring that the possibility of a United States-Japanese conflict is "absurd. I beg Americans,"

he said, "to believe me that it is the desire of Japan to maintain only the most friendly relations with the United States. We are fully conscious that war between Japan and the United States would be the greatest of folly. We are each other's best customers. The naval parity presented a problem for all naval powers, not Japan and America alone."

Among wishful thinkers in America, the Japanese replies had more influence than had the bombshell speech of the American senator. One of the Washington newspapers editorially commented:

"The senator's startling remarks are incredible. For a body which seems to believe it can keep the United States at peace more successfully than the State Department, the Senate contains an astonishingly high portion of irresponsible trouble makers."

Later events proved, however, that Ambassador Saito was farther removed from the truth than was the senator whom he attempted to refute. He was either ignorant of the facts and simply expressed his belief that his government would never attack America, which is highly improbable for an outstanding diplomat of his caliber, or he shut his eyes to the truth and followed the beaten tracks of practice laid down by all his predecessors in attempting to deceive the "ignorant," gullible West. At any rate, the "incidents" that followed cannot be called "an assured system of non-aggression and non-attack." Compared with the trifling incidents Japan used as an excuse for starting the Sino-Japanese war, as well as her previous wars, the sinking and bombing of the U. S. S. *Panay* was a sufficient *casus belli* for a declaration of war upon Japan by the United States. Was not the sinking of the steamship *Lusitania* one of the causes of America's declaration of war on Germany in 1917? That peace is still maintained between the two countries is owing, not to lack of warlike intention on the part of Japan nor to want of war-making causes on the part of the United States, but entirely to the spirit of patience and tolerance maintained by the United States through trying circumstances. The most encouraging sign emerging from these dark days is the awaken-

ing of the American people, who will no longer sit back and say, "The Japanese declare there will be no war and therefore we need not be alarmed." If the American people had taken Senator Pittman's warning more seriously in 1935, and had prepared to protect American citizens and American interests even at the risk of war, America might have saved herself the *Panay* experience in 1937, and the necessity of evacuating many of her citizens from the Orient in 1940.

On January 16, 1936, Premier Keisuke Okada stated: "I do not believe that a naval building race is coming. But the people of Japan must be prepared to meet whatever the future holds." Vice Admiral Takahashi, commander of the battle fleet, declared: "If the Japanese navy is called on to fight the combined powers of America and Great Britain, I am confident we will win, even if the ratio is ten to one."

These statements were made as government leaders and naval authorities launched an intensive publicity campaign to allay public fear of an increasing financial burden in the event of a navy race, especially with the United States.

Such a menacing attitude was bound to produce repercussions. By way of reply, Senator Pittman declared:

"Japan has presented no sound argument for maintenance of a navy larger than that of the United States. The area defended by Japan has less than a tenth of the coast line required to be protected by the United States. It is evident that Japan intends to enter upon unlimited enlargement of her fleet. Withdrawal of Japan from the naval conference makes it impossible for the United States to enter agreement with anyone for reduction of her naval program."

The Japanese, who did everything to knife the naval limitation treaties a year before the term of the treaty expired, and openly started the building race, made an overture to the United States asking for naval building limitation. Early in 1938 Japanese Foreign Minister Koki Hirota issued a statement expressing the hope that a halt would be reached in the world naval construction race "through appeals to the sense of fair-

ness and justice among the major powers." The United States government indicated that such Japanese overtures would now be ignored.

This clever Japanese propaganda was meant to be an appeal to the American people in general, and to pacifist elements in particular, over the head of the United States government. Having failed at the London Conference to put herself on a parity with the United States on paper, Japan came to realize that she could not successfully compete with the United States in the building race. Hence the propaganda tactics and the appeal to the American people to use their "sense of fairness and justice" by keeping their government from augmenting their naval strength. Tactics of this kind had paid high dividends in the past. So long as a method pays, it will continue to be used. Americans, like others, are susceptible to blandishments, and in the practice of their own political faith are not prone to criticize foreign governments. But that same political creed permits them the utmost freedom to criticize their own government and all its acts. In their care, then, not to give offense it has become almost a social fashion, if not a habit, in America to look upon Japan as a friendly nation. The astute Nipponese diplomats know this and use it to the full.

IV

THE BEGINNING OF THE SINO-JAPANESE WAR

WHETHER it is coincidence, Oriental fatalism, or the guiding hand of the Japanese gods whose direct descendants they claim to be, it is interesting to note that each time the Japanese were ready to start another foray of brigandage, something happened elsewhere in the world, as if "made to order" for their convenience.

After Japan succeeded in getting rid of the naval ratio problem, the way was cleared for the long heralded war which was to start in the "most critical" year of 1936. Japan was expected by all to throw off her sheep's skin and reveal herself in her true colors. All observers, both Occidental and Oriental, believed the next victim of attack would be Russia, as was, indeed, planned in the original program.

As a matter of fact, the Japanese had started massing troops along the Russian border, but there they discovered two major obstacles. First, the Russians had completed their military preparations all along the Siberian frontiers. Unlike 1904, the Soviets were wide-awake to the Japanese menace and rushed their defense plans, so that the Japanese army, having failed to effect a surprise, found very little chance for a successful drive to Lake Baikal. Second, the prevailing sentiment in America was not keen on backing up Japan in her anti-Comintern war. The situation in 1904 being far different, Soviet propaganda had been able to create wide-spread anti-Japanese feeling in the United States, and without moral and material support from the United States Japan could not be sure of quick success.

In the opinion of the keen-sighted Japanese, a war with Great Britain would be entirely unnecessary, for, as they had said repeatedly, the days of British dominion in the Far East were

numbered. To cross swords with the United States would be welcome to their army and navy, because they wanted to prove their "invincibility." But this was too risky as yet. To carry out their original plan to attack Russia unexpectedly was still their best course.

Japanese-Manchurian armies were about to cut across Outer Mongolia to sever the Trans-Siberian Railway at Lake Baikal. By slashing that vital artery of transportation, Japan thought she could easily cut off Eastern Asia and Vladivostok, which then would fall into her hands like a ripe fruit. Firing actually began near Lake Bor, which is claimed by both the Japanese and the Mongols.

On July 1, 1935, the Soviet Ambassador in Tokyo delivered a note of protest, which said, in part, that "these violations of Soviet frontiers by Japanese-Manchukuoan authorities may bring very serious consequences in the relations between the U. S. S. R. and Japan and to the cause of peace in the Far East."

The Russians, fully aware of the danger, rushed completion of a second Trans-Siberian Railway, north of Lake Baikal. Russian arms, machine guns, and bombing planes were poured into Urga, the capital of Outer Mongolia, and were spectacularly arrayed and displayed as though ready for operation. It was soon reported that the Mongol-Soviet forces outnumbered the Japanese-Manchurian troops at least two to one.

On July 7, 1935, in a speech to a huge crowd in Moscow, Vlas Chubar, Soviet Vice Minister, charged that the Japanese militarists were provoking "collision in the Far East." The attitude of the Japanese was "threatening," but, he added, "no menace will alter our policy for peace or our readiness to defend the Soviet Union with all means at our disposal."

At this time the Russian newspapers declared, without mincing words, that "Japan was deliberately provoking incidents to make an excuse for adding new territories to its recent gouging in Manchuria and North China."

It is characteristic of the Japanese military strategists that when their chance of winning a war is fifty-fifty, they back down to wait until they have one hundred per cent advantage. This

can be proved by the fact that all the wars they have won were waged when their enemies were unprepared and unawares.

The Japanese War Minister Kawashima made an extended trip in Manchukuo to investigate the real situation, and, upon his return, he reported to the National Policy Council that Japan needed a large increase in her forces in Manchukuo "to hold the Soviet in check." He stated, further, that there were 200,000 Soviet troops along the frontier "in well-chosen and well-fortified positions, which no Japanese forces are able to resist."

Manchukuo was willing to continue fighting at thirty degrees below zero, but the Tokyo government, using the frigid weather as a face-saving excuse for a temporary suspension of operations, halted the Siberian invasion. The real cause was the war minister's statement, given out to the Tokyo press, which said: "The Red army of the Soviet Union is 1,300,000, and the Soviet Far Eastern army is at least 250,000. Both are about equal to the entire Japanese standing army."

When a bully faces a chance of being beaten, he is astonishingly quick in piping down. The Tokyo government suddenly made a wheedling offer to Moscow. They withdrew their previous demands for a majority of delegates in a joint commission to settle border incidents. Thus they made it possible for a peaceful settlement of the incidents which they had intended to use as a cause of conflict. Premier Keisuke Okada was too timid to plunge the nation into a war with Russia.

But the ambitious young militarists could not keep patient any longer. The result was what is known as the Young Army Revolution. On February 26, 1936, long before dawn, one thousand soldiers quietly marched into Tokyo, captured the heart of the city and took charge of it. The newspapers were forbidden to reveal the movement, and telephones and the telegraph had ceased to function. The troops took possession of Premier Okada's residence, and some other bands went to the Peers' Club and the residences of other high liberal leaders. They demanded that Okada "come out and die for the country." A man walked out of the house and was shot to death. It was announced that Okada was dead. Goto, one of

the ministers in Okada's Cabinet, was appointed Premier. Then it was reported that it was not Okada who had been killed, but his brother-in-law, Matsuo, who had died in his place in order to save Okada's life. At that time, Korekiyo Takahashi, Minister of Finance, who had been opposed to increased army appropriations, Admiral Viscount Makoto Saito, known as liberal adviser to the Emperor, and General Jotaro Watanabe, chief of military education, were assassinated by other bands, while Kantaro Suzuki was seriously wounded.

Emperor Hirohito called a hasty conference and ordered his own Imperial Guard to keep the rebellious army down. Navy squadrons soon were poured into Tokyo, martial law was proclaimed, and all citizens around the rebel districts were cleared out.

The motive of this mutiny was reported to be opposition to the "anti-military" sentiment shown in the Cabinet and Diet. It seemed evident that the civil government was trying to slow down the march of conquest, in view of the unfavorable feeling steadily growing in America after the Manchu invasion. On the other hand, the young army officers, who had been fed on the great idea that they were invincible, wanted the government to turn them loose to challenge one of the strongest powers of the West. The dissatisfaction had been brewing for some time and finally it broke out in this rebellion.

The officers were tried by court-martial in secret session. The government took every precaution in declaring a war-time censorship and forbidding all newspapers to issue extras, so that no news of the trial could leak out. Then the government explained in a somewhat apologetic manner that the purpose of the revolt was "to get rid of the ministers who were trying to keep Japan shackled to the 5-5-3 naval ratio."

The verdict, "promulgated in order to avoid disturbing public opinion," read as follows:

"Studies and thoughts begin innocently in the simplicity of the young officers' minds. . . . They lost their discrimination between right and wrong. . . . They thought the Ministers close to the

Throne had, since the London Naval Treaty, been interfering with the Imperial prerogative. They thought the ministers were far above the law and, therefore, could not be dealt with by legal means, . . . hence they took the method which transcends law in order to inflict upon them the penalties of Heaven."

It is perfectly clear to anyone who understands the mental processes of the Japanese that these young military leaders started the revolt in an effort to do away with the men in the government who did not think the time had come for Japan to start hostilities against either or both of her naval rivals, the United States and Great Britain. In the nation-wide excitement about the "critical year 1936" the militarists insisted on attacking the Western nations which stood in their way and prevented Japan from "leading to a high destiny." This no civil government could dare to venture, and, consequently, the clash between the military and civilian groups had been growing to a high tension. This accounts for many of the assassinations which took place in this period.

The list of political murders since 1931 includes two premiers, a senior general, a leading industrialist, and two of the foremost financiers. It was deemed patriotic to kill anyone, whether a high government official or a private citizen, for the sake of the nation. The public erected shrines and temples in honor of the assassins.

It was in 1934, in a "prayer meeting conspiracy," that the "sacred warriors'" club plotted the assassination of Charlie Chaplin, then in Japan, to bring about war with the United States. And in February, 1935, Kasuke Nagasaki, member of the *Bushinkai*, a patriotic society, stabbed a Tokyo publisher for sponsoring a movement to bring the American baseball player, Babe Ruth, to Japan.

Following the army revolution, it was difficult to find one suitable for the premiership. As always before choosing a new premier, the Emperor asked the advice of old Prince Kimmochi Saionji, last of the elder statesmen who served in the Cabinet of the great Emperor Meiji; he recommended forty-five-year-old

THE BEGINNING OF THE SINO-JAPANESE WAR 49

Prince Fuminaro Konoye, President of the House of Peers, an independent, militaristic aristocrat. Though inexperienced in administration, he accepted the position and at once started to organize his Cabinet. By telephoning the prospective ministers, he succeeded in filling all the portfolios within a few hours. It was consequently dubbed "the telephone Cabinet."

The new premier had to make a decision, as it could no longer be delayed. To conquer China first was considered the course of least resistance, and the Japanese government decided to take that course.

The clash between Chinese and Japanese soldiers at Marco Polo bridge, near Peiping, on July 7, 1937, was used as the cause of this undeclared Sino-Japanese war. As the invading army and navy pushed ahead, they captured, one by one, all the important business centers and, excepting a route or two kept open by the Chinese, closed all the coast line to the rest of the world. Stories of the war too horrible for publication were all destroyed before they could reach beyond the blockade line, with the exception of only a few reports that were brought out through devious ways.

The net gain of territory, with all the wealth and investments therein, the Japanese added to their empire during the hostilities up to 1939 can be seen at a glance in the following list:

<i>Year</i>		<i>Area square miles</i>	<i>Population</i>
	Japan proper	148,756	72,222,700
1895	Formosa	13,890	5,212,719
1895	The Pescadors	50	60,000
1905	Japanese Saghalin	13,930	331,949
1910	Korea	85,228	22,355,485
1915	Kwantung (Liaotung)	1,438	1,656,726
1919	Japanese Mandates	829	331,949
1931	Manchukuo	503,013	35,338,000
1939	China	900,000	150,000,000
1939	The Spratly Islands		
		1,667,134 Sq. m.	287,242,398

Lives Destroyed

It is estimated that between 2,000,000 and 2,500,000 Chinese have been killed or wounded in battle or in the air bombing of cities. More than 40,000,000 * Chinese fled to new homes in the interior.

The Japanese admit that 70,000 of their soldiers have been killed or wounded in China, but foreign observers put the number of killed and wounded at hundreds of thousands. The Chinese estimate of Japanese losses is 1,000,000.

Foreign Monetary Losses

The Chinese custom survey in 1938 estimated foreign losses in China resulting from the war at approximately \$800,000,000, of which half was incurred by the British, \$200,000,000 by American, and the remainder by German interests.

The above estimates were obtained in 1939.

Before we proceed further, we may pause a moment to survey the general aspect of this Far Eastern outburst, with all its bearings on the entire world situation.

When a fire rages through a forest, everyone living near by at once thinks of his home and does something to save it. Yet there are many people who have never seen a real forest fire and cannot fully comprehend its terrible destructiveness. Probably that is why comparatively few people take it seriously. Some would say, "The fire is burning on the other side of the mountain, and it will be a long time before it can reach here." Others would say, "Let those whose houses are on fire fight it. It is their business and not ours." Still some others would say, "It may destroy our next town or even the house of our neighbor, but so long as we keep ourselves completely detached, it will never bother us." In this way, all those whose homes are not yet caught in the flames would have nothing to do with the conflagration and those whose homes are already reduced to ashes would have nothing more about which to be concerned.

* Admiral Yarnell's report, made on December 11, 1939, agrees with this figure. Chinese soldiers killed in battle numbered 1,218,462. The number of men, women and children who died of starvation and privation is estimated to be between 5,000,000 and 10,000,000.

THE BEGINNING OF THE SINO-JAPANESE WAR 51

The only persons really in earnest about stopping the catastrophe are those whose properties are actually going up in smoke, and to their sad disappointment, they find it too late to save the situation. This is a homely illustration, in which everyone can see how impossible it would be for the people living in a forest to take such an indifferent attitude toward a fire. Yet this is the position taken by nations today regarding the war which is destroying them one by one.

Let us take the most recent development of the fire which started in Korea in 1905. Manchuria and China, Ethiopia, Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Albania, Norway, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and France were invaded and destroyed one after another, and still there seems to be no end in sight. Only a short time ago every nation thought it was not concerned. This attitude was soon changed into the question, "Who will be next?" And now more than half the European nations have been wiped from the map, and the few remaining nations are asking themselves, "When will our turn come?" It seems that nations are doomed by their own sins of selfishness. If the general tendency of every nation is to be one of purely selfish concern there will be no salvation for any.

The refusal by the white races to admit that the war forced upon the Chinese is also aimed at them does not alter the fact in the least. The conflict is on, and in its wake the results will bring out this fact in bold relief. This is the part of the Sino-Japanese conflict in which Americans are particularly interested.

FOREIGN NEWSPAPERMEN MUST GO

TO occupy China's commercial centers while foreigners continued to enjoy their treaty rights would be to the Japanese like keeping a cattle ranch infested with lions. Therefore the foreigners must go. This end, the Japanese expect to attain through various tortuous means, and, naturally, it will take time. But the newspapermen must go at once. The idea of a free press has always been abhorrent to the Japanese system of political and social life. Now they have to subjugate more than one-half of China's entire population—rebellious, unconquered, and unconquerable in spirit. This has to be achieved through a continuous program of massacre, burning, torture, and imprisonment, together with the use of all the ingenious devices of modern and medieval barbarism combined, which will turn the conquered parts of China into a veritable purgatory. This process of reducing the native population is effective in two ways, Japanese believe. It kills off the anti-Japanese spirit and makes room for the Japanese themselves. "They must die, the Koreans, Manchurians, and Chinese, so that we Japanese may live, and live more comfortably," they say. Is not the theory of the "survival of the fittest" a modern philosophy of life preached and practiced among the "civilized nations" of the West? they argue.

With all these ideas in their heads, these modernized Japanese, hailed all over the world as the most "civilized" people in the East, have been carrying out this "extinction policy" in Korea, Chientao, Kirin, and other parts of Manchuria ever since the annexation of Korea. The dead are dumb, they cannot speak. But some of the victims of these horrible tortures are still living and their bodies bear the marks of Japan's "modernized" in-

humanity. Some of these men are now in the United States. One of the thirty-three signers of the Korean Declaration of Independence on March 1, 1919, a minister in one of the Korean churches in Hawaii, must constantly apply medicine to the sores caused by the burning torture used by the Japanese police in their effort to extort a "confession." All this was done in secret. The outside world must know nothing. The Japanese will keep on practicing their methods in China on an even larger scale, for that is the only way they can hope to keep China down.

Therefore, the foreigners they must put out first are the American newspaper correspondents. The militarists nurse a particular hatred for these writers. Relentless publicity is their nemesis. That is why their government has spent a million dollars or more each year for propaganda in the United States for the last thirty years. Through the propaganda network in the United States the Japanese have been able to cover up the ugly side of their nature and to focus the spotlight on their painted face. The Domei News Service, Japan's national news agency, organized with their trained and well qualified nationals, together with a number of Americans, is ready to take over the work at any time. Foreign services such as Reuter's of London, the Associated Press, the United Press, and others of America, will have to go to Domei representatives for information which they may send to their headquarters abroad.

Henry W. Kinney of Hawaii was invited by Yosuke Mat-suoka, formerly Japan's chief delegate at Geneva, to serve in connection with the Japanese news agency. As they were about to chase out from the Orient all the newspapermen who were not absolutely for them, the Japanese were in need of Americans who were one hundred per cent pro-Japanese. Kinney was born in Hawaii, became a newspaper man, and later was appointed Superintendent of the Department of Public Instruction. He proved himself a true friend of Japan. In the invasion of Manchuria they used him as liaison man between Japanese military officers and foreigners. His services proved highly satisfactory. He retired in 1935, when the Manchukuo administration was thoroughly consolidated. Now that they are

pushing to the south, they need him again and have called him back.

If Japan succeeds, or rather if Japan is left unchecked in carrying out her present program, which is well under way, the outside world will be completely cut off from all information about the vast region occupied by the Japanese. The press will be unable to obtain news other than propaganda releases which the Japanese want them to print, true or false. The stories they hand out in Tokyo, Manchukuo, Peiping, etc., are so cunningly devised and disguised that both the news-seeking press and the news-reading public may swallow them without suspicion. The leaders in Tokyo, who are in touch with every part of the world, and every part of the United States in particular, feel the pulse of public sentiment from day to day as a physician feels the pulse of his patients, and send out news dispatches to influence the rank and file of the various peoples.

Japan started her program of military conquest in Korea thirty-five years ago on an experimental basis. She met with such success that ever since she has been repeating that program in nearly every detail, first in her Manchukuo invasion and then in her China campaign. She has handled the press in China just as she handled it in Korea.

News correspondents must leave Japanese-controlled areas, with the exception of a few who may be able to manage to please the conquerors. The foreigners living there must indicate pro-Japanese sentiment and show no sympathy for the "natives." Otherwise, they cannot remain. The Japanese do not merely tell them to get out. They use devious and roundabout methods. Military necessity is the best excuse. "We cannot be responsible for your safety. We warn you all to evacuate from the danger zone for your own sakes," they say. In the meantime, some "incident" results in destruction of property and endangers the persons of foreigners. This method produces the desired result. In cases of less than one hundred per cent success, the Japanese are ready to make any sort of wild accusation against those whose presence they do not desire, charging them with violating the army criminal code or attempting to assassinate

a Japanese admiral or governor. At any rate, any foreigner who refuses to submit to the "new order" cannot long remain. Those who prefer to stay cannot do or say anything derogatory to the Japanese regime. Foreign tourists are unable to see or hear anything which the Japanese wish to keep covered. Nor do the tourists wish to incur the hostility of the Japanese, as they may wish to visit the Orient again.

As soon as Japan's "new order" is definitely established, the entire region under her military rule will be kept closed to the outside world, as is Korea today. Newspapers in America will have to publish all the Japanese propaganda stories or nothing. A significant notice is printed at the foot of the *New York Times'* front page, as follows: "Dispatches from Europe and the Far East are subject to censorship at the source."

In the warning given to foreign correspondents in Peiping by Lieutenant Colonel Junzo Harada, Japanese military spokesman, in September, 1937, may be seen how cleverly the Japanese started the censorship campaign. Colonel Harada admonished news correspondents not to be misled by foreign news reports. He said, "It seems to me that the Chinese are trying to appeal to the world's sympathy, therefore these agencies are being operated not by foreigners but by Chinese employees." Then he said he believed the reports of the Canton bombings were "manufactured" in Shanghai, as if to say that Canton was never bombed. This aroused the indignation of the correspondents, who challenged him to explain. He could not say the Canton bombing reports were false, and calmly replied, "I am speaking merely as a patriotic Japanese. I feel too much sympathy has been shown the Chinese side by foreigners." It seems very hard for the militarists to take into consideration that world sympathy could have anything to do with their own behavior. They always insist on demanding that the other nations be their friends, whether they are right or wrong, since to them "might makes right." If the world fails to recognize this fact, they will punish the world sooner or later. That is their military psychology. Colonel Harada gave a gentle hint, and if the correspondents failed to heed it they could take the consequences.

In spite of this gentle warning, some of the correspondents, true to the spirit of American headline hunters, are still dispatching news reports vividly and graphically describing the war scenes. Haldore Hanson, Associated Press correspondent, has been sending his reports to the United Press, which are printed in most of the leading newspapers throughout the nation. His dispatch from Paotingfu, dated October 11, 1937, was one of many that did not please the Japanese. He said, in part: "Six American women and one man, besides myself, are safe in this gutted city, amid desolation following one of the bloodiest chapters of the Sino-Japanese war." Referring to American missionaries, he said: "All of them have gone through thrilling, horrifying experiences, which they have been relating to me since I arrived here in September on bicycle." If he had taken Colonel Harada's admonition to heart, he would not have mentioned any of the horrifying scenes of the war, since they would stimulate public sentiment in America in favor of China. Instead, he would have told all about the perfect moral behavior, the heroism and demeanor of the Japanese army and navy at the battle front, as all the correspondents did in praise of the Japanese in the Sino-Japanese war of 1894, and again in the Russo-Japanese war of 1904. Perhaps they conducted their warfare with more circumspection in those wars than they have this time. Instead of trying to change their own behavior to win over world sympathy, they decided that the world must change its attitude toward them.

Haldore Hanson was arrested by Japanese soldiers, when he was on his way back to Peiping, and was taken to Paotingfu. There he was grilled by Japanese gendarmes for eight consecutive hours. A fever developed and he became ill from Japanese food. He was sent to the Presbyterian hospital, where he spent ten days in bed. He wrote:

"I was given to understand by the Japanese that if I made any attempt to leave the city it would mean another arrest. This message is being sent to Peiping by a means I am unable to divulge. I am living in a brick-strewn compound where every house has its

chimney shot off or a wall blown in. My bedroom is riddled with machine-gun bullets."

Nearly three weeks after his arrest, his case was brought to the attention of the United States Embassy at Peiping and representations were made to the Japanese Embassy. Special attention was called to the fact that Hanson was not permitted to notify the United States Embassy and was detained at military police headquarters for four consecutive days until late at night without food or water and without any legal charge against him.

In this case, the Japanese knew the punishment was harsh and unjustified, but they did not worry about that. The main thing was to produce the desired effect. All the foreigners must know that the tables were turned, and that henceforth it is not the Japanese who are to live in a white men's world but that the white men are to live in a Japanese world. In order to create this impression, exemplary punishments, severe enough to create fear as a means of discipline, must be meted out. Thus Hanson was the victim of this "new order," with no means of redress.

If news reporters who write articles unfavorable to Japan are to be punished, cameramen who depict the same stories in pictures cannot be left unchecked. H. S. Wong, Chinese cameraman for Fox Movietone, a veteran of ten years' service with that firm, was arrested in Shanghai in February, 1937, by the Municipal Police, at the request of the Japanese authorities, on the charge of being engaged in anti-Japanese activities. The direct cause of his arrest was, however, his picture of a wounded baby on the South Station platform, following a Japanese bombing, which appeared in *Life* magazine. So Wong learned his lesson. If he and all others like him want to keep in good grace with the militarists, they must send to America nothing but pictures of cherry blossoms, silk kimonos, and Japanese dolls.

James Russel Young, correspondent of International News Service, for thirteen years one of the outstanding foreign newspapermen in Japan, was arrested at the Imperial Hotel in Tokyo on January 21, 1940. The police took all his files and corre-

spondence and searched his apartment twice, without informing him of the charge.

Young went to China as a war correspondent and cabled six articles from Hong Kong describing the horrors of Japan's undeclared war on China. He also delivered a number of speeches, which did not please the Japanese. His special friendship with Ambassador Joseph C. Grew also was counted against him. When he returned to Tokyo he was arrested for "spreading fabrications and rumors concerning military affairs in time of war and emergency."

It was disclosed on February 2 that he was thrown into a cell in Sugamo prison. During his detention in dungeon for fifty days he was not allowed to see even his wife or officials of the United States Embassy. When the Embassy was informed of his arrest, William T. Turner, the second secretary, immediately got in touch with the Japanese authorities, but was told that no one would be allowed to see Young. Plenty of warm clothes, including the Ambassador's old fur coat, were sent to the prison. The police said that he wouldn't need pajamas, "as the cell is so cold he will keep his cloth on at night."

On March 15 his trial was concluded; one week later he was sentenced to six months' imprisonment and payment of the cost of his trial. The court "graciously" suspended his prison term, put him on probation for three years, and then sent him back to his cell to remain there until the end of March.

There were numerous dispatches in American newspapers showing how Japanese propagandists try to cover acts of injustice to an American with a show of friendliness. In the case of Mr. Young the Japanese authorities tried to create an impression that the court showed him a great favor, because he was an American, by "speeding the preliminary inquiry," and by "disposing of the trial with greater speed," as if to say he would have been in jail for years instead of more than seven weeks if it had not been for his American citizenship. Another great favor shown him was that "he was tried by a civil court," as if to say that if it had not been that he was an American, he would have been court-martialed and shot. "He would be

allowed to leave the country," as if to say that if he had not been an American, he would have been kept in Japan all his life. The truth is that he was expelled. When average news readers in America read such reports as these, they generally overlook the anti-American spirit underlying them and see only the "friendly" attitude shown toward Americans. Many trusting and unsuspecting Americans still believe that the Japanese are friendly to America and deserving of American confidence. This is how Japan has been successful in her conquest of American public opinion, while destroying all American interests and prestige in the Far East.

The *Japan Advertiser* has been known as one of the most outstanding American-owned dailies outside the United States. The Konoye Cabinet quietly pronounced the death sentence on that paper on October 10, 1940. It was put under Japanese control by a merger with the *Japan Times* and *Japan Mail*, which were already nothing but Japanese mouthpieces. B. W. Fleisher, formerly of Philadelphia, who became its owner in 1910, and is now seventy years old and in poor health, left Japan, not to return. At the same time, *Dong Ah Ilbo*, of Seoul, formerly the largest and now the only remaining daily newspaper owned and run by Koreans, met with the same fate.

Mr. Fleisher, like many others, spent the prime of his life in Japan promoting American friendship in the belief that by so doing he was advancing the cause of peace in the Pacific. Now he has come to realize, like many others, that he was only helping in building Greater Japan. As one of the founders of the American Japan Society, he devoted himself to that organization for twenty years. In fact, he was so friendly with the Japanese that his newspaper was for years known as pro-Japanese in contrast with the *Japan Chronicle*, another outstanding English daily in Japan. Now that Japan needs his services no longer, he has been elbowed out.

In this connection, I must say a few words about R. O. Matheson, who served as editor-in-chief of *The Japan Advertiser* for many years. For ten years before, up to the time of his acceptance of the Tokyo offer soon after the World War, he was

editor-in-chief of the *Honolulu Advertiser*. He was a man of fine character and enjoyed the full confidence of the cosmopolitan community in Hawaii. In the editorials and news columns of his paper he showed special interest in the Korean Christian Institute and the Korean Christian Church which I started in Honolulu. He always showed his sympathy for the small Korean people minority in the territory, and often clashed with the Japanese, who constituted almost a majority of the population. Japanese are empire builders wherever they go, and they were building a small Japan in that American possession. Leading Americans, especially the financiers, were helping the Japanese by insisting on the much heralded "melting pot" idea. The Koreans saw the melting pot turning out Japanese types rather than American and refused to be dumped into it. Naturally, they were singled out and gradually fell into the limbo of forgotten men.

Mr. Matheson, realizing that some day this neglected Korean element would be of some service to the United States, presented their side of the picture to the public whenever he could. He was soon criticized by the Japanese as a champion of the Korean cause. No doubt, the Japanese decided that it would be smart to invite him to Tokyo. The invitation came from *The Japan Advertiser*, and he accepted it. When the Passive Revolution broke out in Korea in 1919, Matheson published in his columns, and also dispatched to the United States, a series of articles giving most graphic and thrilling accounts of the heroic struggle staged by the unarmed and peaceful men and women against the barbarous bayonet and rifle charges of the Japanese soldiers, gendarmes, and police. Once I sent him a cable message, to which I received no reply; but some time later I received a message through a confidential channel requesting me not to send any word to him directly. Several years later, he passed away in Japan, and the news of his death came as a great blow to me.

I close this chapter with the latest report of one of the saddest tragedies ever recorded in the annals of modern journalism. It is the story of Melville J. Cox, Reuter's correspondent in Tokyo, who was arrested on July 27, 1940, and died two days later as

a climax of a fifty-five hour torture. Complete information about the surrounding suspicious circumstances was made public in London on October 3. As usual, there is wide divergence between the Japanese version and the foreign version of the story. According to the Japanese, Cox committed suicide by jumping out of a fifth-floor window of the police court when he discovered that the police were in possession of "proof of his guilt." The foreigners were of the belief that he was so broken by torture that the police thought it best to throw him from the window in order to have an excuse for the wounds and bruises on his body. The evidence furnished by his wife supported the latter view.

When he was seized by the police in Tokyo on July 27, his wife was told that they wanted to ask him "some questions" and that there was no charge against him. On the morning of July 29 she took breakfast to him at the prison at the usual hour, and his lunch at 1:30. She asked for an answer to a note she had sent in with his breakfast and was told to wait at the gate. It was brought out half an hour later, but she saw that it was written in a very shaky hand—so much so that she had difficulty in recognizing it as her husband's writing. When she returned to her hotel, she found a telephone message saying that her husband was injured and that she was to come to the police court. She hurried there, stopping only at the British Embassy to let them know what had happened. "They took me to the fifth floor," said Mrs. Cox, according to published reports, "and I saw the ghastly spectacle of my poor husband lying on a hard bench, his legs stretched out, and his whole body swollen with wounds. His legs and his arms were hanging limp and also his spine was injured. His face and hands were purple. His right eye was closed, his skull was fractured and chin also. I counted more than thirty-five injection marks. Some of the police were smiling."

According to the dispatch, Cox kept shouting, "Hell, hell—let me go—take me away—what do you want of me? Blast all of you—let me alone, oh, let me go." Mrs. Cox continued, "Jimmy was suffering martyrdom. After a while, as I wanted

to make him comfortable, I asked for a pillow, but there was only a hard Japanese cushion." She demanded that the police immediately bring the two suitcases containing the warm clothing which she had sent to her husband. When, finally, they brought the suitcases, she found that nothing she had sent to make him comfortable had reached him. Cox died in his wife's arms. It is her firm belief that he received his fatal injuries between ten and eleven o'clock that morning and not at 12:30, as the police said, and that she was called in only when it was clear that he was dying. "It is impossible that between the time of my leaving and the telephone call that they could have taken him up, and washed, and bandaged him," she said. By threatening to throw herself from the window Mrs. Cox forced the Japanese to take her to the basement cell where her husband had been kept. It was a small cubicle, dark, foul, damp, and not high enough to stand up in. It had a door only three feet high and nothing but a wooden bench to sit on.

After his death, the police said they had "proof of his guilt," but still failed to make known the charge.

Such a story as this has been of frequent occurrence among the Koreans. Many news reporters, as well as men in other walks of life, mysteriously disappeared as victims of torture or other foul play. Yet they had neither recourse nor a chance to make their sorrow and grievance known to their fellow men.

Is it not strange that the British people, who had always been so blindly pro-Japanese, should suffer such treatment at the hands of their "friends"? There are those who still insist that Americans should remain friendly with Japan, even at the expense of national defense, under the belief that the peace of the Pacific can be saved only through American friendship with that aggressor nation.

VI

FOREIGN MISSIONARIES

NEXT to the newspapermen, the foreign missionary is the most undesirable to Japan. His business there is soul-saving. If he is true to his mission, he works for the spiritual welfare of the Chinese people. While all other foreigners pack up and leave the country as soon as they find that they can get neither the profit nor the pleasure they seek, the missionary remains with what money comes from his country and carries on his work even at the risk of his life.

There are several reasons why his stay in Japan is objectionable:

(1) The natives look up to him as superior, not only to themselves, but also to the Japanese. This does not please the Japanese, who try to prove to the world that they are superior to all other races, including the white man. So long as the missionary is there, "the natives" will go to him for spiritual and moral guidance. The Chinese will never completely submit to the Japanese. The Japanese insist that there must be but one master, and that that one master be Japanese. Therefore, the Japanese decided thirty years ago in Korea that the missionaries must do one of the two things—"bow and no go, or go and no bow." They knew well enough that if they publicly announced it as their policy, they would be criticized as anti-Christian. This would be derogatory to the honor of the Empire as one of the most civilized nations of the world. Why should they risk that? Underhanded methods, of which they are past masters, would bring the same results without incurring the criticism. Consequently, the missionaries have had to undergo all kinds of humiliation, discrimination, and even personal injuries, under every possible pretext.

(2) The missionaries live in the interior and travel every-

where. They witness everything the Japanese do. Naturally they are sympathetic with the Chinese. They condemn the crimes and atrocities perpetrated by the military invaders in their efforts to bring the Chinese to submission. They are the ones that stir up the feelings of outside nations by sending to their respective homelands eyewitness descriptions and snapshot evidence of the horrors of Japan's barbarism. Japanese militarists, like all other militarists, know no other way to break the resistance of their victims than by torture, burning, and wholesale massacre. All this no foreigner can be allowed to observe; therefore, the missionaries must go.

(3) The democratic spirit of the West is poisonous to the very life of Mikadoism. The missionary preaches the idea that right and not might will ultimately prevail, that wrong and injustice will be punished by its own wrongdoing, and that in democratic countries men will give their lives for the cause of liberty. This can never be tolerated by the Samurai regime.

(4) The religion the missionary preaches is diametrically opposed to the Nipponese national religions of Buddhism and Shintoism. All mankind should bow before the Mikado's shrines, for the Japanese rulers are direct descendants of divinity. Christians are unwilling to join in the shrine worship. The Tokyo government had much trouble in forcing missionaries and their followers in Japan and Korea to pay due respect to the portrait of the Emperor of Japan. Although some of them do it, it is done with reluctance. As the Japanese see it, the cause of much trouble lies in the presence of the Christian missionaries, therefore they must go.

When they were enforcing this policy in Korea thirty years ago, the Japanese knew that they had to go slowly. But now in China, what do they have to fear? Are they not out to prove to the world their military might? Therefore, it is to be expected that the missionaries in China now will suffer more than those in Korea suffered. The relation of a few of many incidents will tell the story.

The civilized peoples of the world make special efforts to spare, if not protect and preserve, institutions of learning and spiritual

worship, even in time of war. This has been recognized as an established law among nations, and its observance is considered a part of human instinct. However, Nipponese raiders defy this established usage and make these institutions the target of their bombs. Whenever their armies entered a city, the soldiers were turned loose for a Roman holiday. Freedom to loot and rape at will is the order of the day. Everyone helps himself to anything and everything.

In the meantime certain groups are detailed to ransack all institutions, such as museums, libraries, and art galleries, under special instructions to remove from them all relics of ancient civilization and objects of art and science, which are to be sent to Japan, thus making Tokyo the center of Oriental culture and civilization. This system of organized international looting was first inaugurated by the Japanese army which occupied the city of Seoul, Korea, in 1905. They ransacked Kiu Jang Kak, one of the two most famous and oldest libraries in the Far East, and took most of the rare books and articles of antiquity to Japan.

Later they dispatched a large band of troops, armed with drawn bayonets and loaded firearms, to Poongduk, near Songdo, where the troops took apart one of the two biggest and oldest pagodas in Korea and shipped the whole thing to Japan. In this connection it may be interesting to the reader to know that even in America the same spirit prevails among the Japanese. They seek every opportunity to enrich their Empire by fair means or foul. They make persistent efforts to destroy every trace of historical fact, and have despoiled Korea of her centuries-old culture and civilization. They make systematic searches and either remove or destroy any and every book which gives a correct account of the past. And to crown their efforts the Japanese have been compiling a new Korean history. The Koreans know what kind of history it is going to be. In spite of the fact that Japan as a nation was more than two thousand years behind Korea, the Japanese new Korean history will try to prove that the first ruler of Korea was a brother of the Emperor Jimmu and that Koreans were time and again subjected to Japanese rule.

The Japanese would have the whole world believe that they are descendants of the sun goddess or moon goddess, but they cannot change the historical truth about Korea.

Before we return to our topic, I must mention another important point in this connection. It should be borne in mind that when Japan is some day brought to her knees by the joint forces of Korea and China, no peace terms should be signed nor armistice declared until she has returned every book and every article stolen from Korea and China.

Institutions owned by Americans were especially marked for destruction. Lingnan University, at Canton, owned by Americans, suffered heavy damages and a Chinese woman was killed when the Japanese raiders dropped several bombs on the university campus. Boone College in Hankow, owned by the American Church Mission, was also hit by three bombs, which caused extensive damage to its buildings. At the same time, seven other bombs were dropped on American property outside the college, killing six refugees. One of the bombs landing on the college grounds caused the instant death of seven refugees in one of the buildings. No one can claim this was unintentional or a mistake.

According to Bishop W. P. Roberts of the American Church Mission, Japanese were occupying, at the beginning of June, 1938, mission churches, schools, and residences in Soochow, Changshu, Yangchow, and elsewhere, and nine of the missions within his diocese had been destroyed up to that date. Furthermore, he stated publicly that Japanese in Yangchow deliberately burned the Mission library there, and, despite strong protests, converted the Baptist hospital into a military hospital.

The Baptist Mission in Chapei, valued originally at \$250,000, was almost totally ruined by constant bombing and shelling, and their occupancy of buildings that were still habitable was abhorrent to all religious sense of sanctity. In some they stabled their horses, and others they used as barracks and munitions storehouses. Other cities had similar experiences.

In Wuchang Japanese soldiers scaled hospital walls and "bothered" Chinese refugee girls. When such conduct was

reported to their headquarters, their officers simply smiled and advised the complainants to go home and keep quiet about it.

When they were occupying these and other mission properties in the invaded territories, on the plea of military necessity, they tried to give the impression that they would remain only a short time. Whenever questioned, they replied that as soon as military necessity was ended, the properties would be restored to the original owners. But the situation will not change until a superior power brings it about. American consuls and the State Department have made strong representations, and so have the British diplomats, but the Japanese militarists, securely in the saddle, blandly reply: "The areas occupied by the Japanese will not be opened to foreigners until conditions permit."

Father Downs, of Erie, Pa., a missionary under the Maryknoll Mission Society, was engaged in his work at his home in Hong Kong in July, 1938. During the two-hour bombing raid of Swatow forty-nine bombs were rained on the civilian population of that city. He tried not to show concern over the raids and continued on his routine duties. Soon he heard shrapnel striking his walls, and suddenly his house collapsed. He miraculously escaped, with minor injuries, and made his way to the water front, where he dropped, unconscious. Later he was picked up by a tender and taken aboard the naval vessel *Sacramento*.

According to two Americans, Orpha Gould and Rosalin Rinker, the occupation of Paotingfu was the bloodiest of all the reigns of terror inaugurated by the Japanese invasion of China. They walked sixty miles from Layuan through a hailstorm and took six days to arrive in Paotingfu the night before the beginning of the battle. While on the journey, Japanese planes machine-gunned them three times, but they ran for cover and sometimes hid in cotton or bean fields, thus miraculously escaping with their lives. They were eyewitnesses of some of the most horrible war scenes. Hundreds of peaceful civilians, men, women, and children, were shot down promiscuously, and the whole city was sacked and looted by Japanese soldiers, with their officers looking on.

On June 18, 1938, the American Southern Baptist Mission at

Pingtu, Shantung Province, was bombed, the school buildings being damaged extensively and numerous Chinese civilians being killed. Six American flags were flying at the time of the bombing.

The Lutheran Mission Hospital at Kioshan, outside the city of Hankow, was bombed in spite of being marked by twelve large American flags; the flags could be seen for ten miles.

Japanese bombs struck the Southern Baptist Mission at Changchow three times, seriously injuring four Chinese patients in the Mission hospital, in spite of the fact that a big sign marked "U. S. A." and an American flag forty feet long were painted on the hospital roof. In addition, a large American flag was flying from a pole at the compound.

On January 19, 1938, the Japanese dropped several bombs on the New Zealand Presbyterian hospital compound at Hongchung, one of which rolled into a deep open well and exploded at the bottom, shaking the buildings and residents, but doing no serious damage.

The Moore Memorial Church of the Southern Methodist Mission in Shanghai was hit by a grenade thrown into the yard on February 3, 1938. The serious nature of this incident lies in the fact that this church was located in the International Settlement, which has been regarded as foreign territory.

All these incidents might be excusable on the ground that it was almost impossible for Japanese raiders to avoid hitting foreign missions. In numerous cases, however, no such argument or plea constitutes a justification. It is plainly indicated that Japanese bombers were only obeying orders and seemed to find huge amusement in doing so. In May, 1938, Japanese war planes five times bombed the Italian Catholic mission at Kaifeng, until, finally, a bomb hit the chapel and demolished it completely. There was no army station in the vicinity, and the weather was clear enough for anyone to see from a distance of many miles the huge Italian flag fifty feet square flying over the chapel and three other Italian flags conspicuously displayed outside the Mission. British and Canadian missions in various

sections, each marked with the Union Jack, were raided time and again without warning.

The automobile in which J. P. Anderson, Seventh Day Adventist missionary, was traveling toward Waichow, was machine-gunned in broad daylight. There can be no mistake as to the attackers' intention.

The most barbarous of the known atrocities perpetrated by Nipponese invaders against foreign missionaries during this time was the massacre of nine Catholic missionaries. The presiding bishop of the Catholic mission inside the city was visited by a Japanese officer, who assured him that the notice he was posting on the mission gate that troops were not to molest the inmates would protect him and the mission. In the light of the ensuing events it was evident that the notice which was supposed to be a sign of safety was in reality a signal for foul play. The following evening, ten uniformed soldiers rushed into the mission house while the missionaries were at dinner, herded them out, tied their hands, blindfolded them, and drove them away in an army truck to a Japanese military crematory. What happened to them no one knows.

From Chinese sources it was reported later that the unsuspecting missionaries were bayoneted to death and their bodies burned to ashes. Their offense was sympathy for the Chinese. When the story spread over the country it struck terror to the hearts of all foreigners.

No one knows the facts concerning a Pentecostal missionary known as Leonard, a middle-aged cripple in Taiyuan, Shansi Province. He mysteriously disappeared. His wife Eleanor was so horror-stricken that she could give no coherent account of what had happened. When she was found alone in her room, she was prostrated and half-conscious. Efforts to piece her vague, disconnected words together revealed the information that her husband was pulled out of bed at night, gagged, tied, and dragged away bleeding. The Japanese were the only ones who knew what had become of him.

On December 5, 1937, when the American Board Mission Hospital in Tsechow was taking care of many wounded Chinese,

Japanese military authorities tried to remove five of them. The hospital authorities refused, on humanitarian grounds, to give the Japanese the necessary permission, explaining that the removal would mean certain death to the patients. Several days later the Japanese forcibly entered the hospital and took the patients away. This was only one of hundreds of such cases.

The American people do not want war. The Japanese army and navy want war because they believe it is only by war that they can achieve their purpose of becoming the dominant race in the Far East. Looting, raping, and bombing conquered territories are a part of their terroristic campaign, and even seem to be enjoyed by them as sports are enjoyed by Americans. At first the Japanese were satisfied with shooting Chinese, either combatant or civilian. But they soon became tired of shooting Chinese only, and now and then they find it amusing to turn their guns on a white man or two, to terrorize, if not actually to kill, them.

The story of Professor H. C. Brownell of Burlington, Vermont, is typical of many such incidents. He was head professor at Lingnan University. While he was investigating a Japanese sentry post on the university campus on December 1, 1938, Japanese soldiers fired over his head, as if for sport. Of course, he was frightened. This was a huge joke, and they had a good laugh. The irate professor protested to the Japanese officer, fully expecting him to order an investigation or offer an apology for the insult. To his surprise, the officer calmly replied that there were Chinese soldiers there at the time. The professor, realizing his helplessness, saw that he could do nothing.

Before I pass on to another subject, it may be well to review here briefly what the Japanese did to carry out their policy toward foreign missionaries in Korea. To review the past is to preview the future. It should be borne in mind that when Japan was betraying her ally, Korea, by annexing her, in deliberate violation of her treaty covenants, she was not strong enough to go far in opposing the wishes of the United States and Great Britain. If these powers had stood firmly against her, she would never have gone so far as she did. Now that she has become

powerful through the material and moral contributions of these powers, she feels ready to betray and defy them. The United States and Great Britain failed to stop her when they could have done so without difficulty, because they did not then know Japan well enough. Now they know and would like to stop her, but are afraid to make the effort because they think it would mean war. Now they can only parry for time and hope for the best. So it goes. All have helped to build up in Japan the idea that she is invincible.

When Japan tried to solve the missionary problem in Korea, she started with soft-pedaling, as she thought it not wise to arouse suspicion in the West. Instead of terrorizing the Christians as she is now doing in China, she tried, at first, to win them over.

The Japanese Congregational Church, a semiofficial and semi-political organization in religious disguise, sent "missionaries" from Japan to Korea. Side by side with them went Buddhist and Shinto priests. The sole purpose was to proselyte the Korean Christians and alienate them from their affiliation with American missions. Magnificent temples and churches, as well as Japanese Y. M. C. A. and Y. M. B. A.* buildings, were erected, and Korean Christians were induced to join them with promises that the government would do much for them. But the Japanese found out, to their disappointment, that the Korean Christians were not to be perverted. There might be a few, as there might be a few among any group of people, who could be won by political or financial reasons. But the Christian Koreans, as a whole, kept their faith in spite of political discrimination and religious persecution. The church leaders of every denomination saw the hidden motive behind the Japanese movement, and refused to have anything to do with it.

In the early spring of 1911 a joint committee of all the Christian churches and the Y. M. C. A. in Japan sent an official invitation to prominent Koreans to come on a friendly visit to Japan. The list of those invited included the name of the author.

* Young Men's Buddhist Association.

Through friendly sources everyone on the list was quietly advised to accept the invitation and show the Japanese a Christian spirit, for, otherwise, the Japanese might feel hurt and become suspicious. At any rate, it was considered wise to go, and almost everyone went who could do so. I was one of the few who stayed home. When the party started on the tour, and I remained, without explanation, the Japanese police were indignant. When I was absent from my home they called and demanded the reason why I did not go to Japan. Servants told them that the Yung Kan Yim (old gentleman) was sick and Dr. Rhee could not leave. Indeed, my father was sick and I could not leave, although I would not have gone anyway.

The party, made up of practically all the outstanding leaders of Protestant churches and Y. M. C. A.'s throughout Korea, arrived in Japan. From the time of their arrival to the final hour of their stay they were entertained with sight-seeing trips to scenic spots, famous temples and shrines, and other great buildings, old and modern. At dinners, banquets, and public meetings they attended, news reporters greeted them and requested interviews. The following day "interviews" came out in the papers in which Reverend, Doctor, or Mr. So and So, was quoted as having said that Japan was a great nation and that it was a good thing for Korea to be under Japanese rule. In this way the Japanese tried to make the Koreans believe that Japan was the most powerful nation on earth and that the Koreans should dismiss any dream of ever being independent again. In addition, the Japanese were deliberately putting these leaders in a false light before the eyes of their congregations at home. When the Korean Christians read these news reports, some of them, the Japanese thought, would be influenced to think Korean independence was a hopeless dream. Also, it was thought, most of them would condemn their leaders for making such unpatriotic utterances. Many churches in Korea did suffer as a result, because of their young people dropping out. The leaders were unable to explain or correct the reports.

One evening, when Japan's Korean guests were entertained at a great banquet attended by the Prime Minister and many other

government officials, the former inquired which of the guests was Yi Sang Chai. Some one pointed out one of the most plain, democratic looking men in the group. He was, in fact, the most famous man in Korea, known among Christians in America as the Tolstoi of Korea. In his early days he was the first secretary of the Korean Legation in Washington, and for many years served in the former Korean government in various capacities as one of its high officers. His official and public career was full of interesting and inspiring incidents illustrating his brilliant wisdom and sense of honor. The Japanese Cabinet ministers knew of his presence among the party and were expecting to learn at close range what kind of a man he was. When the Premier saw him, he asked the toastmaster to call on the honorable Yi Sang Chai for a speech. The toastmaster paid Yi Sang Chai high tribute in his introductory remarks and said the gathering would like to hear a few words from this distinguished guest from Korea. Mr. Yi quietly stepped forward and said, in substance:

“You Japanese think Japan is one of the two or three most powerful nations in the world and, therefore, you can do almost anything you may choose. Do not forget, however, that there is another kingdom, so powerful that if its King should become angry He could destroy the army and navy of Japan in a few minutes. If the Japanese people would remember this fact and always do what would please that King, Japan would be a great nation. The King of that country is God in Heaven.”

The Japanese ministers looked at one another, nodded their heads, and said, “That is true.” This speech was printed and reprinted in all the newspapers in Japan, and those who read it may also have assented that it was true. If they did, is it not self-evident that, judging from what she has been doing in Korea and China, Japan cannot last long as a powerful nation? At all events, the results of this trip were not a complete success, for Japan’s attempts to alienate Korean Christians from foreign missions.

Governor-general Terauchi abandoned the peaceful plan and decided to resort to force. This led to what is known as "The Christian Conspiracy Case of 1911."

The Korean leaders knew what was brewing, because the Japanese police and their Korean hirelings were detailed to watch every one of us, so that there could be no possibility of escape. I remember that the Korean secret service man Yoon Piunghi, known as the most notorious of all the *San Yung Kai* (hunting dogs)—a term applied by the Koreans to all those hired by the Japanese—was assigned to "look after" Baron Yun Chi Ho and myself, because we were both associated with the Central Y. M. C. A. in Seoul. These men were instructed to circulate all sorts of wild rumors about the leaders having been thrown into dungeons, where they had been tortured to death, etc., with the hope that we might feel forced to submit to them. I had a small room arranged for myself in the attic of the Y. M. C. A. building, and sometimes I went there for the night. One dark night I had my room boy, In Gil, help me burn up some of the papers and documents in my files and store the rest under the roof, because the police would seize every scrap of paper in my possession. The next day, very early in the morning, my father came to the building with tears in his eyes, and asked everybody he met, "Do you know what has happened to my son? They have tortured him and broken his legs. He is nearly dead, Yoon Piunghi told me." My father was the happiest man on earth when he found me safe and sound in my attic room.

Many others, more than a hundred in number, were going through more or less the same experience at the time. We realized we were in danger and were prepared for the worst. If I had remained in Korea a few months longer, I would have been thrown into a dark prison cell, from which I would not have emerged alive. How my life was spared so many times through all the stormy days in Korea is like a series of miracles, which alone would fill an interesting volume. This was, no doubt, one of those occasions in which an unseen hand intervened and led me out of difficulties humanly insurmountable. All that I can say here is that while those noble Christian martyrs were left in

the hands of their persecutors, I was enabled to leave the country and return to the United States, the land of the free.

The most prominent Christians throughout the country were arrested on a charge of conspiring to assassinate the Governor-general. They were tortured in preliminary "examinations" to extract "confessions" from them. The confessions were made up by the police in advance and the prisoners were forced to sign them. If the sympathy and indignation of the Christian world had not been sufficiently aroused in behalf of these innocent men, the signatures attached to charges of a murder conspiracy would have gone down in history as unmistakable proof of their guilt. Things did not turn out as the Japanese had intended, and the court was compelled, by the irresistible force of public sentiment, to give the victims a new trial in open session. In this trial the prisoners repudiated their signatures. Yet nine of the accused men were exiled without trial, three were known to have died as a direct result of torture, and 123 were turned over to the district court of Seoul for trial on June 28, 1912. At this farcical trial no witness for the defense was permitted, and the final decision was based entirely on "confessions" wrung by torture. Judgment was pronounced on September 29, and 126 men were sentenced to terms of imprisonment ranging from five to six years.

The Japanese thought they had been highly successful in crushing the unconquerable spirit of the Korean Christians. However, that was not the end. It was but the beginning. The Japanese had come to know that so long as some of the leading American missionaries—whom the Koreans regarded as their guardian saints—were left unconquered, the Koreans would again develop their spirit of independence, and new leaders would come up in place of the old. Therefore, it was necessary for them to get rid of some of these Americans. A secret plan was concocted to bring into court the names of Dr. Horace Underwood and several others as accomplices in a conspiracy against the life of the Governor-general. The men who had died under torture during the preliminary examinations by the police had chosen death rather than signing their names to the

forged statement implicating their missionary friends in the plot.

The American press soon began to dig into the facts. The mission boards kept the wires hot between New York, Tokyo, and Seoul, demanding detailed information concerning the case. Dr. Arthur J. Brown, secretary of the Presbyterian Foreign Board in New York, published "The Korean Conspiracy Case," revealing how the entire episode was framed and why J. K. Ohl, Peking correspondent of the New York *Herald*, was hurriedly dispatched to Seoul to report on the trial. The latter's correspondence was published in a series of articles disclosing the whole fabrication by the police and the court. Dr. W. W. Pinson, secretary of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, hurried to Korea for the sole purpose of investigating the case. Dr. Charles W. Elliot, President Emeritus of Harvard University, then in Tokyo, publicly declared that the standing of Japan among civilized nations would be improved by judicious modification of the preliminary proceedings against the alleged criminals. Churches in the United States were reported to be holding special prayer meetings for the persecuted Christians in Korea.

This was the time when Japan was still endeavoring to appear in the eyes of the world as a good, well-behaved neighbor, and she could not afford to ignore the rising tide of American sentiment against her. The Japanese Governor-general, who had adopted the use of force, found it necessary to instruct the Court of Appeals to retry the Koreans and to use "conciliatory" methods in conducting the proceedings. As a result of the new trial, all the prisoners, with the exception of the six most prominent leaders, were set free. Of the six, five were sentenced to six years' penal servitude, and one to five years'. This was nothing but a face-saving process, with no reason why some should be held and others released. The Presbyterian Foreign Mission Board in New York made an official representation to the Japanese Embassy in Washington inquiring as to the cause of the Koreans' conviction. Some time later the Mission Board was quietly approached by semiofficial representatives of the Japanese Embassy with the suggestion that the Japanese Govern-

ment would acquit them as a matter of special favor, if the American Missions would admit their guilt and appeal for clemency. This was categorically refused. The accused men were detained in damp, dark cells until they were finally released under an amnesty designed to show the "Imperial clemency" in honor of the coronation of the new Emperor. Thus ended the story of the so-called Christian conspiracy in Korea.

However, it was by no means the end of persecution of Korean Christians. During the passive revolution of 1919 in Korea all the mission hospitals were filled with Koreans wounded by Japanese swords, bayonets, and firemen's hooks. Under medical care, some of them were struggling for life. The "civilized" Japanese forcibly took from the hospitals all "dangerous" Koreans, in spite of the fact that their removal meant certain death to them. Koreans tried to make these facts known to America through news reports, but they were regarded as anti-Japanese propaganda stories, which the American public would not believe. The world has been changing since, and no one in America now would regard such reports as false propaganda.

As an aftermath of this memorable uprising hundreds of Christians in Korea, Kirin, Chientao, as well as those along the Siberian border, were massacred wholesale, their churches burned, and in many places in the interior whole villages destroyed. The only crime charged against them was their participation in the passive, nonviolent revolution which had been supported by the entire nation, including, besides the Christians, Buddhists, Confucians, and Chundoists. Yet the Christians were the ones crucified for the "crime" of the whole nation.

Of the innumerable cases of Japanese atrocities committed during this period, the one in Chi Am-ni is the most notorious. When we say most notorious, we refer to cases known in America. What is known among the Koreans in their homeland does not count. The Koreans cannot keep any written account of these incidents, nor can eyewitnesses of wholesale murders relate the stories, even among themselves. When it is asked how one of the victims of these atrocities died, all the answer the victim's friends or relatives can give is a shrug of the shoulders or a shake

of the head. The destruction of life and property suffered by the Koreans can never be recorded, because the dead cannot speak and the living dare not. The cases we refer to were accounts given in writing by foreigners who knew the facts. Some of these accounts were printed in books and pamphlets, which were distributed to libraries and clubs in America. Now few of these copies can be found, because the Japanese have made systematic efforts to destroy them wherever possible. But newspapers of those days and the *Congressional Record* preserve many of the stories safe from Japanese destruction. The author has carefully collected and preserved copies of most of them.

Now, to return to the Chi Am-ni massacre of April 15, 1919. Japanese soldiers had entered the village of Chi Am-ni, some seventeen miles from Suwon in the southern part of Korea, and had issued orders that all adult male Christians were to hear a lecture to be given in the church. Twenty-nine men went as ordered. They were soon surrounded by the soldiers, who shot at them through the windows. When most of them had been killed or wounded, the Japanese set fire to the building. Those who rushed out to escape were either bayoneted or shot to death. Six bodies were found outside the church. Two women, whose husbands were in the burning church, and who tried to reach their husbands, were brutally murdered. One of them, nineteen years of age, was bayoneted to death, while the other, about forty years old, was shot. Both of them were Christians. When this was over, the soldiers set the village on fire and left.

In a brief account of the experience of her husband a missionary said that on March 4, 1919, he heard the cry, *Mansei* (Long live Korea), and rushed downtown. He was gone for about an hour. He came back, crying aloud, "My God, such a sight." Japanese coolies, armed with firehooks and clubs, were tearing and rending the unarmed Koreans to shreds! He saw one man dragged along by two coolies, his head gashed open and one leg dragging limp.

Many other horrible stories are too repulsive for print. Such was the Japanese barbarism, a massacre unsurpassed by the Turk or the Hun. If it had been committed under any other flag it

would have brought down storms of protests and denunciations from every part of the globe. But since it was done under the cover of the flag of the Rising Sun the nations were all deaf and dumb for fear they might offend these little Huns of the East.

What the Japanese did to the Christians in Korea they have been doing to the Christians in China.* The native Christians are not the only ones to suffer. The missionaries are bound to suffer as well. They have already suffered a great deal in China at the hands of the Japanese, but it is only a beginning. The worst is yet to come. To know what took place before is to know what may follow after. A story or two of mistreatment of missionaries in Korea, which happened after the Independence Uprising of 1919, will be of particular interest.

A most notorious case was that of Rev. Ely M. Mowry of Mansfield, Ohio. He was a professor in the Union Christian College in Seoul and principal of the Boys and Girls High School in Pyeng Yang. He was arrested on a charge of harboring "criminals" in his house. The "criminals" were five students of his college, together with his Korean secretary. He was tried one day after his accusation, thus making it impossible for him to secure a lawyer in his defense. After he was tried and convicted, his friends were notified that they could have obtained a postponement. He was sentenced to six months' imprisonment at hard labor. Later, the term was reduced to four months. Another appeal to a still higher court ended the case by payment of a one-hundred-yen fine. To add insult to injury, the Japanese police led the Rev. Mr. Mowry off to prison in the Oriental foolscap.

A similar case, differently treated, was that of Rev. John Thomas, a British subject. He was touring in South Choong Chung Province, Korea. On March 20 he was suddenly attacked by Japanese soldiers and civilians, without the slightest provocation, while he was quietly standing by the roadside. When he produced his passport, it was thrown on the ground and

* See *Readers' Digest*, July, 1938, "The Sack of Nanking"; October, 1938, "We Were in Nanking."

stamped on, as was also a preaching permit which had been given him by the Japanese government. Once a man of splendid physique, the beatings he received reduced him to a physical wreck. He displayed twenty-nine wounds on his body when examined at a Mission hospital. As a result, he withdrew from the Korean mission field, being no longer physically able to continue.

The British Consul General at Seoul promptly took the matter up with the Japanese authorities. The Japanese apologized for the assault and 5000 yen (\$2500) was paid as damages. This is a high tribute to the respect the Japanese government had for British subjects, when we consider that not even nominal apologies were offered when American women were assaulted by Japanese soldiers.

The comment made by the *Japan Chronicle* on "The Attack on Mr. Thomas" is worthy of note:

"Japanese correspondents in Korea, who are so fertile in reporting the misdeeds of the missionaries, were absolutely silent on the subject of the attack on the Rev. John Thomas of the Oriental Missionary Society, on March 20. . . . Mr. Thomas, on his release, was requested to sign a paper in Japanese, but sensibly refused to do so, as he could not understand its purport. It was evidently for the purpose of exonerating the culprits."

The manner in which this case was handled may be instructively compared with the sort of demands which would be made if such a thing had happened to a Japanese citizen in China or elsewhere, and the silence of the Japanese press on the subject may be compared with the storm which would have broken had the nationalities been different. Even the Seoul press heard nothing of Mr. Thomas's case.

If the Mowry case had taken place in 1940, the United States government would not have allowed a citizen of Mr. Mowry's character and standing to suffer without protest. But the attitude of the White House and the State Department toward the Japanese in those years was different, and it was not Mr. Mowry but the United States which really was humiliated.

Missionaries are human, like the rest of mankind. The persecution so persistently and systematically carried on was too cruel to be borne. They had either to yield or to leave the country. Indeed, a few left Korea later and some were expelled by the Japanese, while most of them remained as "friends" of Japan. Those who remain "speak for Japan," whenever they must. Those who left Korea say nothing openly against Japan, "for fear" the remaining missionaries may suffer. Yet it is to be hoped that no missionary will abandon his loyal friendship for China, even if he must leave the field for the time being. Public sentiment in this country will never be deceived as it was during those sad days in Korea.

There are many people who still believe that America has no business interfering in the affairs of other continents. A large number of people say that American war preparation is for national defense only and that Americans will defend themselves only when attacked. Those who say this do not know that the United States is already under attack. If you had been on the U. S. S. *Panay*, on December 12, 1937, and had escaped with your life, you would never forget that you had been deliberately attacked. If you were among the American refugees in one of the American-owned universities, mission stations, or hospitals in China during the Japanese bombing raids, you will never say that Americans are not under attack merely because as yet no enemy plane has come over and dropped bombs on the grounds of Yale, Harvard, or Princeton, or on Walter Reed Hospital. The only difference is that China is thousands of miles away, while Harvard, Princeton, Yale, and Walter Reed Hospital are here in our midst. So many Americans feel that they need not care what happens so far away. Yet no one can successfully assert that Americans in China are not Americans because they are far away, and that only those at home are the ones who count. Americans are Americans wherever they may be. The enemies who attack them over there are attacking the people here. Therefore, it is not true that America is not under attack, nor is it true that America is at peace with Japan and has no business to interfere in the Orient.

Furthermore, if Americans are really determined to keep themselves out of war, would it not be wise to keep the war from American shores, instead of allowing the war to come nearer and nearer? How can one fail to see the wisdom of sending all the material assistance possible to the Chinese and Koreans in order to enable them to keep the Japanese busy and hence unable to challenge the United States? Years ago the United States government did not protest against Japan's taking of Korea. Later, America did not stop Japan from taking Manchuria. Now Japan is engaged in trying to conquer China. Japan was permitted to embark on these ventures because the world did not then see through her design. Now the world understands. And Americans see clearly that if the United States packs up and leaves China, she will have to withdraw also from the Philippines, Guam, and her other Pacific possessions. Then her first line of defense on the West will be the Hawaiian Islands and the Pacific coast. Would such a withdrawal mean peace? No, it would lure Japan on to greater adventure. Those who still insist on such a policy are blind to the menace. A true peace policy for the United States to pursue at this juncture is to give all the material aid possible to every nation in Europe that will fight for its independence, and to the Chinese and Koreans in Asia.

On October 7, 1940, the Japanese government announced simultaneously in Seoul and Tokyo that all the denominational Christian churches in Japan and Korea were dissolved and placed under government supervision through a new organization to be known as the Association of Christian Superintendence. The main object of this move was declared to be "the elimination of all foreign influence and to condemn Communism, individualism, and all other doctrines inconsistent with the Japanese national policy.* The churches in China will soon be put under similar control by the Japanese government.

* An Associated Press dispatch of October 7, 1940, from Seoul, Korea, stated:

"Old denominational organizations embracing some 60,000 Korean Christians were dissolved today and a new organization was set up in keeping with Japan's policy of placing religious associations under government

supervision and eliminating foreign influence. A new program formulated for the organization, which took the name 'Association of Christian Superintendence,' stipulated that it would be free of foreign influence and would condemn communism, individualism, democracy, and doctrines inconsistent with Japanese national policy. All schools of the dissolved groups will be reorganized. Military drill will be enforced in all these schools and Christians will be encouraged to volunteer services during emergencies and to visit shrines of the Japanese national religion, Shinto."

The Washington *Evening Star* reported the following:

"Kansas City, October 8, 1940. On the eve of the opening of the general convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, the National Council took preliminary steps today toward reorganization of the church in Japan. The Council adopted resolutions . . . to approve such reorganization as might seem advisable. The transfer to the Episcopal Church in Japan of \$420,000 in endowment funds, now held in New York city banks by the National Council for St. Luke's International Hospital in Tokyo, would be permitted if the fund was found to belong to the Japanese branch. Under the new Religious Bodies Act adopted by the Japanese government the Episcopal Church is faced with the prospect of being forced to withdraw its sixty American ecclesiastical, missionary, and medical workers and stop its annual support of about \$500,000 for various institutions.

"There is no doubt, the Council stated, that a large measure of control over the institutions, including St. Luke's Hospital, will pass to official Japanese hands, but Bishop Tucker and bishops of the Japanese dioceses said they were hopeful that a way might be found to continue some financial aid to enable the eight hundred Japanese who staff the institutions to keep the work going.

"October 17 has been set by the Japanese government as the date when foreign financial support must stop and the church must appoint a liaison officer who is a Japanese."

VII

THE *LADYBIRD* AND THE *PANAY* INCIDENTS

ABOUT six weeks after the commencement of the Sino-Japanese conflict, the invasion troops had so securely established themselves in the occupied territories that they began to make wholesale attacks on foreigners in China. Of all the foreigners residing in China, the Americans and Britons were the hardest for them to subjugate. All the others, realizing their helplessness, succumbed to the inevitable and made little or no resistance. But the citizens of the two English-speaking powers were different.

These two nations have been enjoying the highest privileges socially, economically, and otherwise, and the Chinese look upon them as superior to Oriental peoples, including the Japanese. In their attempt to put themselves above the Chinese, the Japanese were determined to ride roughshod over the foreigners in order that the Yamato race would come to be regarded as superior even to the white man. Furthermore, the Chinese must be put completely under their control in the conquered territories, and it was essential for them to oust all those who refused to submit to their authority. Therefore, the English, who did everything they could to help build up the Island Empire, have had to take their medicine at the hands of their erstwhile ally, Japan. Of all attacks on foreigners, the three most serious cases are the wounding of the British Ambassador to China, the aerial attack on the British gunboat *Ladybird*, and the bombing and sinking of the U. S. S. *Panay*.

On August 26, 1937, the British Ambassador to China, Sir Hugh Knatchbull-Hugessen was machine-gunned and seriously wounded by Japanese aviators near Shanghai while he was traveling in his automobile, which was flying the Union Jack. The British government took a firm attitude and demanded an

apology, indemnity, and assurance against a recurrence. According to the Japanese version, in their first *ad interim* reply, two Japanese planes machine-gunned and bombed two motor cars after mistaking them for military motors and lorries carrying Chinese soldiers. Furthermore, they claimed there was "no actual evidence that the British Ambassador was wounded by the Japanese." The note further suggested that authorities in Shanghai should secure a permit from the Japanese army headquarters for passage through any of the war zones, so as to prevent the recurrence of such incidents.

This, of course, failed to satisfy the Foreign Office in London. Consequently, a second note was sent through the British Ambassador to Tokyo, Sir Robert L. Craigie, stating that the Japanese note was disappointing to the British government and that they were preparing to publish the "whole text of the Japanese reply." Public indignation in London toward Japan was growing tense at that time. Therefore, the Japanese Foreign Office sent a second reply, expressing its regrets over the incident in these words:

"Owing to the difficulty, in the present circumstance, of conducting an investigation on the spot, there has been some slight discrepancy in various reports received as to the position of the ambassador's motor car at the time when he was wounded, but it was ascertained that no Japanese airplanes made a machine-gun attack nor dropped bombs in the locality where the ambassador was first reported to have been wounded. However, a careful study made simultaneously by the Japanese and British authorities leads to the conclusion that the incident may have been caused by Japanese planes which mistook the ambassador's motor car for a military bus or motor lorry. As the wounding of the ambassador may thus have been due to the action, however involuntary, of the Japanese planes, the Japanese government desires to convey to the British government a formal expression of deep regret. In regard to the question of punishment of the aviators concerned it is needless to say that the Japanese government will take suitable steps whenever it is established that the Japanese aviators killed or wounded, intentionally or through negligence, a national belonging to a third country."

This reply quieted, to some extent, the tense feeling in London. The final British note to the Japanese government said this communication was satisfactory to the British government. Consequently, both declared the incident to be closed.

The "apologizing telegram from Japan" is typical of the oft-repeated story of the Samurai, who during the early feudal days carried three swords signifying the right to kill in one day three of his enemies. One day, while under the influence of sake (wine) he saw, at a distance, one of his enemies coming toward him. He pulled out one of his swords and waited until the other man came near. He then stepped forward and stabbed him to death. When he looked at the face of the dead man, he discovered that it was not that of his enemy at all. Alas, he had killed an innocent person! He bowed and apologized to the dead man, "Please pardon me." The proud Japanese, who fondly tell this Samurai story, may expect the world to regard them as the Samurai of old, having all privileges of killing with impunity three enemies a day, with an apology the only obligation in case of error.

Under ordinary circumstances, if such an international crime were perpetrated against Great Britain, in addition to the wholesale attacks made on British subjects and property, the entire British Commonwealth would have been up in arms, clamoring for immediate retaliation, if not war. Britain, however, has not been in a position recently to speak boldly to Japan, and Japan took the psychological moment to demonstrate her superior military strength.

H. M. S. "Ladybird"

On December 6, 1937, and again on the 13th, during air raids in Nanking and Wuhu, Japanese planes bombed the British gunboat *Ladybird* while she was anchored in the Yangtze about fifty miles from Nanking. One British seaman was killed and three were injured, including Commander H. D. Barlow and Captain George O'Donnel. At the same time, Japanese shore batteries fired on three other British gunboats, the *Butterfield*, *Cricket*, and *Scarab*. Three British-owned merchantmen,

Tatung, *Tuckwo*, and *Suiws* were also subjected to Japanese gunfire and aerial attacks.

Miss Wilma May, of Allentown, Pa., one of the nurses in the American hospital at Wuhu, described the scene as follows:

"Some planes had flown over a few minutes before, but I was busy in the hospital and paid little attention to them. Then I heard bombs, and dashed to the window. I saw four Japanese planes returning, dropping bombs one after another. I was horrified when I saw a direct hit on the *Tuckwo*. There was a great burst of flame, when the entire stern blazed up. Other bombs—there must have been sixteen—fell in the river, striking junks and smaller boats. The scenes which followed were almost indescribable. Scores of terror-stricken persons jumped into the river only four blocks from the hospital. Others rushed to their aid. The Union Jack was painted prominently on all the ships. The most horrible part of this thing is not the dead and wounded, but children crowding the hospital trying to find their parents and adults seeking children and relatives last seen near the water front. We admitted seventy patients to date and performed thirty operations, including three amputations; three operating rooms are still going full blast."

This was, of course, followed by the old story of exchange of notes between London and Tokyo. The Japanese were methodically following the same process of evasion and self-exculpation. After the bombing of the U. S. S. *Panay*, the British took the same stern attitude as did the United States, and dispatched a stiff note to Japan "emphasizing the seriousness of the situation," and demanding immediate preventive measures. Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden asserted before the excited House of Commons that "Britain is dissatisfied with yesterday's apology and considers Japan's explanation inadequate. The note defining Britain's attitude on the whole series of incidents will be published fully tomorrow." Public sentiment was so aroused that the Cabinet still refused to let the House of Commons debate on the Japanese question.

The note Secretary Eden referred to as "inadequate" was

the one addressed by Foreign Minister Hirota on December 15 as reply to the British protest. It was published in Tokyo the same day. It reads:

“I have the honor to state that the Japanese government profoundly regrets the incidents which occurred on December 12, wherein a British man-of-war, *Ladybird*, together with the *Cricket* and *Scarab*, had been subjected to gunfire and aerial bombing by the Japanese forces in the vicinity of Wuhu and Nanking by mistake and to express to Your Excellency on behalf of my Government our sincere apology.”

For the Japanese this note was more than enough. It was rather a condescension on the part of the Imperial government, which represents the Mikado, son of the sun goddess, to make a formal apology for such a small matter as the killing of a British seaman, the injuring of several British subjects, and the wounding of seventy or more Chinese, all by mistake. However, the British expected a better reply than this. They continued to protest, and on December 28 another reply was handed to Sir Robert L. Craigie by Koki Hirota, Japanese Foreign Minister. Informed quarters observed that it was similar in wording, almost word for word, to that given to the United States in connection with the *Panay* incident. The same day Captain Kondo of the Japanese navy visited Captain H. B. Rawlings, British naval attaché, and explained the circumstances surrounding the Yangtze River attacks. The Foreign Office made public an army statement re-emphasizing the military contention that the bombings were purely mistakes, and that the British and American vessels were taken for the Chinese troop encirclements and that the Japanese high officials had never dreamed that foreign vessels were within the fighting area.

Elsewhere more serious developments than the *Ladybird* outrage finally bolstered the general “appeasement” policy of the British Premier Neville Chamberlain, and this dispute was dropped indefinitely, with no public announcement ever being made as to its settlement. It was another instance of Britain’s friendly gestures toward Japan.

The "Panay" Incident

No one who is familiar with the Japanese system of military discipline and their strict sense of obedience to higher authority would think for a moment that the bombing and sinking of the United States gunboat, *Panay*, was either an accident or a mistake. The Japanese at first absolutely denied it, as though it had never happened. If United States authorities had been easy with them, as in the past, the Japanese might have succeeded in their efforts to get by with impunity. But the United States was firm in its attitude and made public all the reports of eyewitnesses, together with movie films of the actual scene, which left no loophole for an alibi. Step by step, the Japanese were forced to yield, until, finally, they confessed their guilt and paid an indemnity.

On December 12, 1937, Japanese forces moved their big guns nearer the Yangtze River and, after a short pause, poured terrific artillery fire on the Nanking defenders. Many shells landed in the river, some projectiles dropping near the U. S. S. *Panay*, while some fell uncomfortably close to several British gunboats anchored alongside. Lieutenant Commander J. J. Hughes, in charge of the *Panay*, ordered the gunboat to move further up the river, so as to get out of the shower of shells. While moving slowly up river, seven Americans, including a magazine writer, a Universal newsreel photographer, and a Movietone camera man, were picked up by a small boat and brought aboard. The British boats also were slowly moving out of range. It was soon discovered, however, that both the American and British boats were heading directly into the rain of shells. Huge splashes on the river, only a few hundred yards ahead, clearly showed that they were drawing nearer all the time. Now and then, at about fifteen-second intervals, shells hit both sides of the river. As the *Panay* slowly but deliberately steamed on, shells dropped and burst as if to warn against her going further. All this time the crew and passengers, who were mostly American refugees from the war zone, kept unusually cheerful and jolly, trying to take things lightly. Commander Hughes and his men were calm and unexcited. The newsreel camera men were

telling stories, and passengers listened with unusual jocularly. But the strain was evident.

The *Panay* was engaged under lawful orders in her immediate mission to protect United States nationals and maintain communications between the U. S. Embassy at Nanking and the Ambassador at Hankow.

At 9: 45 o'clock that morning, Japanese troops on the right bank of the river signaled the *Panay* and sent aboard an officer accompanied by sailors with fixed bayonets. The Japanese officer spoke broken English. He had a lot of questions to ask. Commander Hughes explained that the United States was a friend of both China and Japan and that he was convoying the Standard Oil tankers some twenty-eight miles above Nanking in order to keep clear of artillery fire. After a short interview, the Japanese left, giving no warning of possible attack or bombing.

The *Panay* had anchored before the incident in an open space of the river, clearly visible for miles on either side. At about 1: 20 P. M. a lookout reported bombers at a height of 4000 feet, which came rapidly lower, until the time of the attack, 1: 27 to 2: 25 P. M., the altitude ranging from 100 to 200 feet. Both planes went into power dives, and immediately released three bombs, two of which fell in the river near the ship, the fragments tearing holes below the water line. The third one was a direct hit, disabling the forward three-inch gun, and hurling Captain Hughes against the wheel and breaking his leg. The force of the concussion tossed furniture about in the ship's office, seriously wounding a clerk. Everyone thought the attack was a mistake. Horizontal U. S. flags were freshly painted on the top deck fore and aft. There were seven American flags on the boat, and, as the weather was perfectly clear, one could not help seeing at least one or two of them. After a short interval, the Japanese planes came back, swooping directly toward the ship. More deafening explosions rocked the gunboat, throwing splinters of glass, wood, and steel in all directions. There were at least twenty direct hits. Meanwhile, the planes machine-gunned the decks, causing more casualties.

Commander Hughes, with his broken leg, lay unconscious for

a few seconds. Lieutenant A. F. Anders had his throat badly gashed by a bomb fragment and was unable to speak. More planes swooped down and released more bombs. The crew of the gunboat rushed to the machine guns and began firing furiously at the attacking planes. Two men, including Anders, dropped to the floor beside their guns, hit by flying missiles. The diving planes soon took cognizance of the *Panay's* guns and kept at a respectable height for the rest of the half hour of bombing. The commander was unable to get up, and was still bleeding profusely. Anders could not shout his orders on account of his wounded throat. Seeing the gunboat sinking, he scribbled on a blood-smear chart the order to abandon ship. The most seriously wounded men were carried to one of the ship's motor sampans, which was rapidly lowered and sent ashore. One of the Japanese planes dived directly toward the boat with a burst of machine-gun fire. One wounded man was hit by a machine-gun bullet on that first sampan trip. The sampan was the only means of transportation; it had to make many trips for the men aboard the sinking vessel. When all the men had been landed, the upper deck of the *Panay* was under water. Two Japanese planes circled over the disappearing gunboat, while a Japanese naval vessel loaded with soldiers steamed hastily toward it. The survivors thought the Japanese were searching for them and hid among the reeds until the planes and launch turned away. They watched the *Panay* go down in the swirling Yangtze, stern first, with colors still flying. The casualty list included three known dead and eighteen wounded, eleven seriously.

In face of the Japanese contention, the United States left no stone unturned to obtain all factual evidence possible in order to avoid miscarriage of justice in the *Panay* dispute. A four-man Court of Inquiry was instituted and it convened on December 17, 1937, aboard the U. S. S. *Augusta*, further to investigate the incident. The court was instructed to examine as many of the survivors as possible and was empowered to subpoena witnesses if necessary. In case anyone examined proved to be guilty of offensive conduct, the court was to recommend a verdict

to Admiral Yarnell. All witnesses were to be asked if they saw any blameworthy actions during the incident. The sessions of the court were in secret, but the records of the procedure could be released in Washington if the Navy Department decided to make them public.

Japanese Version

The Japanese first attempted to confuse the issue by confusing the dates. The Japanese naval communiqué, dated December 13, Shanghai, said the bombing took place on Saturday the 11th and not Sunday the 12th. Mistaking three vessels belonging to the Standard Vacuum Company for Chinese boats, the Imperial aircraft bombed them, it said. Next day the Japanese authorities became involved in the meshes of their own deceit. The main object in destroying the lives and property of Americans in China was to force them to withdraw without bringing about a showdown. For that reason all the Japanese spokesmen were to insist that the bombing was unintentional or a mistake. A spokesman in Shanghai let the cat out of the bag by asserting that "American and British authorities had been informed that their most practical method of forestalling any repetition of the *Panay* incident was to remove all third party warships from the Yangtze River." By this assertion Japan's real motive in the *Panay* bombing was unintentionally disclosed. If the American navy authorities had taken the hint and calmly withdrawn from Yangtze waters the spokesman would have been honored for the victory won by that timely statement. Unfortunately for him, Admiral Yarnell saw through the scheme and immediately issued a statement saying that vessels of the United States navy then in Chinese waters would remain there for the protection of United States nationals as long as needed.

This put Japan at a decided disadvantage, and the spokesman, in an "interview" published by Domei News Agency, denied that he had made any such suggestion. He said, "If the statement gave the impression, the impression was wrong." In publishing this interview he evidently had forgotten that his original statement had already been released. Shortly after, "Japanese

authorities" telephoned all foreign correspondents asking that the original statement be withdrawn and "messages regarding it be killed."

A few days later Vice Admiral Hasegawa issued an official communiqué denying that the Japanese machine-gunned the sampan rescuing the survivors after the bombing. This is one point which most of them continued to deny. They knew that to fire on a sinking boat or rescue ship was shockingly repugnant to all sense of decency. For the last four decades their national ambition had been to place themselves on a level with civilized nations. This act of machine-gunning had exposed their barbaric instincts and brought them to the lowest stage in the world's esteem. For this reason the militarists in Tokyo had to deny this report, even for home consumption. The Japanese people will believe anything when the honor of the Emperor is at stake.

General Kumakichi Harada's report of December 20 purported to be the complete result of the staff officers' investigation. Published in Shanghai, it contradicted virtually every statement made by the Navy Department in Washington, and pleaded "self-defense" for the attack. Some of the salient points at variance with the American version were: the Japanese did not fire on the sinking *Panay*; the *Panay* fired three cannon at Japanese troops on shore; only three Japanese warplanes participated in the attack; and the gunboat was moving at the time of the incident. By this statement the Japanese general got himself hopelessly tangled when foreign news reporters grilled him with questions which he could not answer without contradicting himself. He admitted that he had conducted the investigation from Nanking and not at the scene of bombing. He was not able personally to question any of the officers involved; he conceded also that Japanese troops were on both sides of the river, and were using motorboats. This was contradictory to the previous statement that there were no Japanese surface craft in the vicinity. He insisted that the distance was too great to recognize the Stars and Stripes painted on the *Panay*. Later, he admitted that Japanese troops boarded the sinking *Panay*.

The following day the general issued another statement revising his earlier statement by saying that as a result of an investigation by Lieutenant Colonel Yoshiaki Nishi, who had returned to Shanghai the night before, it had become doubtful whether any shots actually were fired. At the same time *Nishi* reaffirmed Harada's denial that a Japanese launch machine-gunned either the rescue boat or the *Panay* itself.

No further testimony seems necessary. The Japanese were not seeking facts in order to rectify wrong. They were out to convince the world that whatever they say is the truth and the law, and everyone must regard it as such. Nothing else matters. No wrong or injustice they have committed will disturb their conscience.

Movie Films

Norman W. Alley of Universal Newsreel, and Eric Mayell of Paramount, both survivors of the *Panay* incident, took pictures of the actual attack. Their first concern was how to escape Japanese censorship and get the films to the United States. In this they had considerable difficulty. Japan's attempts to secure the film were noted by Alley on his arrival in Shanghai six days after the sinking of the *Panay*. A Japanese naval spokesman asked Alley to meet him that night at the Cathay Hotel, but Alley, knowing what they were after, did not keep the date. Two days later, on December 20, a Japanese plane overtook and circled a flotilla of four United States destroyers which were rushing Alley and his film to Manila, but did nothing further. At Manila he took the China Clipper and arrived in Honolulu three days later. He turned over the package to a naval lieutenant, who rushed it to Pearl Harbor. The navy supervised its dispatch aboard a specially chartered United Air Lines plane to California and thence to New York.

However, while Alley was still on the way to Honolulu, news dispatches revealed that a set of the *Panay* films had already reached the White House. The story of how these films got to Washington is as follows:

The pictures were taken by two camera men who later

managed to get to Shanghai. The Japanese learned about the films and tried to seize them. The photographers then claimed the protection of a United States naval lieutenant who was in charge of a landing party at the International Settlement. The lieutenant turned the films over to Admiral Yarnell, who sent them to Canton to catch the first clipper for the United States. That was how the United States government had ample time to study the films while Japanese and Americans both believed the only pictures of the bombing were still on their way across the Pacific.

The American people wanted to know the facts, and these films served their purpose by laying before the nation the pictorial evidence of the Japanese attack. Some pro-Japanese elements were quite frank in expressing their opposition to public exhibition of these films, for fear they would incite "war fever." However, that opposition failed to move the President, who was reported to have insisted that the American public had a right to see the uncensored films. He felt that it was up for the government to present the evidence and let the nation decide for itself.

Japan Pays Indemnity

At first, the Japanese assumed a stern attitude. They denied the bombing, machine-gunning, and everything that would count against them. They pleaded self-defense. They contended it was the Chinese and Americans who were to blame. By these tactics they were attempting to deceive the American people.

Had the United States followed the old hush-hush policy and tried to settle the *Panay* issue in a peaceful, amicable way, the Japanese method might have succeeded again. However, Washington gave them no chance to dilly-dally. They at once released for the press Commander Hughes' official report of the incident, thus giving the nation an opportunity to know what had actually happened. In answer to the Japanese version of the case, the State Department sent a copy of the Naval Court of Inquiry report with the statement that the United States government relied upon the findings of the said court.

On December 13 the President of the United States personally dictated a memorandum to Secretary of State Cordell Hull instructing the United States Ambassador in Tokyo as follows:

“ Please tell the Japanese Foreign Minister when you see him that the President is deeply shocked and concerned by the news of indiscriminate bombing of American and other non-Chinese vessels in the Yangtze river and requests that Emperor Hirohito be so advised. That all the facts are being assembled and shortly will be presented to the Japanese government. In the meantime, it is hoped Japan will be considering definite presentation to the United States of full expressions of regret and proffer of full compensation, as well as methods guaranteeing against repetition of a similar attack.”

A few days later, Secretary Hull announced that official reports of the Court of Inquiry confirmed press dispatches describing the machine-gun attack. The new information, that bullet holes were found in the *Panay's* motor sampan, and also that before the *Panay* sank, two Japanese army motorboats approached the ship and machine-gunned it, was incorporated into America's formal note of protest to Japan.

At the same time, the Secretary made a third indignant protest to Japan, pointing out that the Japanese had repeatedly given assurance there would be no repetition of such incidents, and concluded that, in these circumstances, the government of the United States requests and expects the Japanese government to make a formally recorded expression of regret, make complete and comprehensive indemnification, and give assurance that definite, specific steps would be taken to assure that American interests and property in China would not in the future be subjected to attack by Japanese armed forces or to unlawful interference.

The Japanese finally realized the futility of their attempts to bluff their way out of the embroglio. The Foreign Minister, Koki Hirota, presented to Ambassador Grew, on December 15, the following note of apology:

"The Japanese government will make indemnification for all losses and deal appropriately with those responsible for the incident. Furthermore, strict orders already have been issued to authorities on the spot with a view to preventing recurrence of a similar incident. The Japanese government fervently hopes that friendly relations between Japan and the United States will not be affected by this most unfortunate affair. The Japanese government has stated frankly its sincere attitude, which I beg Your Excellency to make known to your Government."

In this apology the Japanese would not frankly admit that the American version was correct. That would be too much; therefore, they wanted to allow the difference to lapse indefinitely. By so doing they would save face in the eyes of their people. They wanted to maintain "friendly relations." How? Judging from later events, friendly relations were to be maintained by a mutual understanding that Japan could continue to slap America's face while America would continue to offer the other check. In all events, the United States stopped sending notes and representations, and on March 23, 1938, sent to Japan its bill of indemnity, amounting to \$2,214,007, for deaths, injuries, and property damage done to the United States Gunboat *Panay* and three American oil tankers. The itemized note included property damages totaling \$1,945,770, and indemnity for deaths and injuries amounting to \$268,377. This bill was presented to the Japanese Foreign Office, together with Secretary Hull's message, which said:

"These figures were arrived at after careful consideration and they represent only actual property losses and a conservative estimate of damage resulting from personal injuries. The amount included no item for punitive damage."

Four weeks later, a Foreign Office spokesman announced that the United States Embassy had been presented with a draft for the required sum in full payment for the bombing. This brought down the curtain on this serious incident.

The most important guarantee of all is that against the re-

currence of such outrages in the future. Anxious as the Japanese were to allay the rising tide of American indignation, the Japanese government pledged once again, as solemnly as it had done before, to prevent every possibility of a repetition. Has it been living up to the pledge since April, 1938? The many indignities and contumelies heaped on America and the damages and injuries inflicted upon American citizens by the Japanese in China since that time are an open book. Things went from bad to worse after the settlement of this incident, and to such an extent that the State Department at last declared the abrogation of the American-Japanese commercial treaty. Let it be repeated here once again that in dealing with Japan nothing is more important than a show of force.

Admiral Harry E. Yarnell

It is true Admiral Yarnell was the one white man who knew how to halt the Japanese. If he had been allowed to handle the situation in his own way, he could, without doubt, have saved the situation with a handful of men at his command against a preponderantly stronger force. However, the government was not prepared to give him the necessary support, as the nation was not sufficiently informed of the true situation. His efforts were definitely limited. Yet, with his sheer courage, good judgment, and quick action, he repeatedly preserved America's interests.

All the Western powers, except Germany and Italy, did everything they could to preserve their interests, but to no avail. They did not know what was lacking. They did not realize that force is the only reality that Japan respects. Before she was fully prepared she might have been brought to terms by diplomatic protests or sternly worded notes. But that time was over, and nothing short of a superior force could get results.

Even if the powers could induce Japan to agree to the "Open Door" theory now, it does not mean much so far as the actual benefits of equal opportunity are concerned. No Westerner is capable of successfully competing with Japanese duplicity. Take beautiful Chinatown in San Francisco for an

example. It was absolutely "Open Door" under the laws of the United States. But eighty-five per cent of the business in the district is owned by the Japanese. The Japanese are nationalists wherever they are, and, as such, they all work together with one main objective—imperial expansion.

Though it sounds paradoxical, it is true that while the Japanese oppose anyone blocking their way, they respect him who has the courage to stand up for his rights. They have a strong propensity for hero worship. During the violent encounters which they started in their attempt to drive out the Westerners, they found one man who commanded their respect. This man was Admiral Yarnell, at that time in command of the United States Asiatic Fleet stationed in China waters. He was believed to be a man who would permit neither friend nor foe to stand in his path of duty. The Japanese believed that he would plunge the Asiatic fleet into war, regardless of consequences and without waiting for further orders from his government, if he deemed it necessary in the discharge of his duties. That was why he was so highly respected by the Japanese, who treated others with contempt and little consideration.

It seems perfectly natural for the Japanese to get everything they can under the cover of war, because when the war is over they may find many obstacles in their path. With this in view, wherever the army and navy have gone, their first demand has been for the evacuation of foreign nationals and the withdrawal of foreign ships, naval as well as commercial. These demands were generally worded in the form of a warning, ostensibly for the safety of foreigners, whose lives and properties might be endangered. Inexperienced and trusting souls took it as friendly advice, and moved from their homes and places of business, partly in order to keep out of danger and partly to show their willingness to comply with the invader's request. However, some foreigners were not so simple-minded. Their experience in the Orient told them that the invaders were not there for altruistic reasons. They knew that once they obeyed military orders, the Japanese would insist on obedience to their orders under all circumstances, and that as soon as they withdrew

their ships from the regions designated by the Japanese as danger zones they would never be permitted to bring them there again, even after the close of the war.

On various occasions, the Japanese naval authorities formally requested all foreigners to paint their vessels certain prescribed colors, because, they said, their naval bombers could not discern the ships' nationalities and might mistake them for enemy ships. They also requested that all foreign vessels desiring to enter the Yangtze river, or other inland waters, should secure a permit from Japanese officials. In doing this, they endeavored to make everyone obey their orders, military or otherwise. All Americans in the Orient or elsewhere who had had dealings with the Japanese should have known these things, and Admiral Yarnell certainly knew them.

In answer to a Japanese request to evacuate the Yangtze area because of the forthcoming Japanese drive on Hankow, Admiral Yarnell asserted on June 13, 1938, that United States warships would go "wherever Americans are in danger." He outlined principles guiding United States naval operations in Asiatic waters as follows:

1. To retain complete freedom of movement in the Yangtze and to proceed anywhere Americans are endangered.
2. Not to change color of American ships to conform to any Japanese suggestions. (Japanese suggested they be painted red.)
3. The United States does not regard Japanese warnings as relieving the Japanese of "the slightest degree of responsibility for damage or injury to American ships."

In regard to the painting suggestion, he said, "United States naval vessels throughout the Yangtze area are white, with large American flags painted on their awnings. For these reasons nationality of the vessels should be apparent to any aviator."

Japanese naval authorities were very much annoyed when Admiral Yarnell announced that he would go on a tour of the Yangtze river area to investigate the general conditions there, without asking the Japanese to open the river for his trip. In

addition to the risk of incurring the displeasure of the Japanese, who openly said they were "unable to interfere," it took courage for him to make this trip at that time, knowing that a thirty-mile area west of Kaifeng was flooded as a result of Japanese artillery destruction of the dykes before crossing the river.

Americans at home and abroad, as well as all foreigners in the Far East, were pleased that the United States government expressed its deep appreciation of Admiral Yarnell's heroic services during these stormy days. Representative Edith N. Rogers introduced in Congress a resolution commending the admiral's service, and Secretary of the Navy Claude Swanson heartily endorsed the resolution. When his term of service was to expire on October 1, 1938, the State Department publicly expressed its desire that the admiral might continue in the position "as long as it is diplomatically important," and high navy officers confirmed the reports that he might retain command of the Asiatic fleet after his term of service ended.

VIII

U. S. NATIONALS AND THEIR INTERESTS

THOSE who have never been abroad may not fully realize the meaning of Patrick Henry's ringing words, "Give me liberty or give me death." In many lands life without liberty is worse than death. There is no other land where people enjoy so much freedom as in this country. The Stars and Stripes stand for the protection of this land of the noble free. What price the early Americans paid for the enjoyment of this blessing should be remembered by every living American whose privilege it is to be a citizen under that flag.

Not to mention the supreme sacrifice made by the early founders of this republic and by all the patriotic men and women who followed their noble example in order to make this land free indeed, it will be worth our while to recall how many Americans gladly laid down their lives in the battlefields of Europe during the last World War, with the hope and determination that "the world would be made safe for democracy." That war failed to achieve its objective, it may be said; but it was not because "war never ends war," nor because the cause of democracy was not worth fighting for. That war failed because the Allies did not go far enough. They did not go far enough to convince the world that no outlawry, perpetrated either by a man or by a nation, should ever be allowed to go unpunished. So when Germany needed a breathing spell to regain her strength and indicated her willingness to stop fighting, the Allies, too eager for peace, consented and the war ended. Germany, perforce, accepted the humiliating situation, but soon began rearming. She used the period of peace to prepare for war, such a war as, in its quick successes, has staggered both imagination and prophecy. Some of the blame

attaches to the democracies. As soon as peace was declared, they began to be jealous and suspicious of one another. They forgot their common aim—to make the world safe for democracy. The peace they had patched together was a makeshift. The Germans, on the other hand, made use of necessity, and never lost sight of their national aim. The Weimar republic hardly survived its birth pangs. It was the Allies, then, who were defeated at Versailles. The brave men whose supreme sacrifice had made it possible to restore a temporary peace had died in vain, and the world was not made safe for democracy.

The Allies completely forgot that a gangster left unpunished would come back if he could. Instead of standing together in defense of their common cause, and watching the Germans, they busied themselves watching one another. The debt situation aggravated matters, and among Americans there was a rising tide of opinion that the United States never should have entered the war.

This was exactly the situation the gangster nations wanted. The Axis powers planned to divide the world among themselves, and the democracies were not prepared for defense. Japan, as one of the Axis group, was to control all of Asia and wipe out all communistic and democratic elements alike.

We have already seen how the Japanese treated the newspapermen and foreign missionaries. Under ordinary circumstances, these reports of outrages would have stirred the indignation of liberty-loving Americans to such an extent that nothing could have quieted the rising temper of the nation. But anti-war sentiment, as a reaction to the last World War, combined with much pro-Japanese sympathy, was strong enough to stem the rising antagonism against Japan. The result was that Japan was left free to destroy freedom of the press and freedom of religion.

China has been the home and scene of labor of many Americans who have loved it as their own country. There they lived with their families, conducted their business, and enjoyed the fruits of their labor, all under the protection of the American government, just as all other foreigners were doing under the

protection of their respective governments. Are there not the Open-Door treaties, the commercial treaties, and many other international agreements, guaranteeing them all equal privileges? Having no idea that Japan was preparing for another foray of brigandage while their own government was unprepared even for defense, the Americans thought their government was still capable of protecting their interests and safety.

But suddenly the island people appeared with bayonets, bombs and bullets, showering death and ruin from the sea, land, and air on cities, towns, and villages, creating an inferno of destruction wherever they went. This war on the Chinese is also a war on the white race. The Japanese slapped, kicked, and bombed, not only American men, but American women as well. With their renewed Pan-Asia cry for an "Asiatic Monroe Doctrine," they were determined to drive all Occidentals from that part of the world.

The most natural thing for Americans to do under such circumstances was to demand protection from their government. "What is our government doing for us?" This and similar questions were raised everywhere. As a matter of fact, the government in Washington did not know what to do, any more than did the people on the spot. Following the usual diplomatic procedure, repeated protests were lodged with the Tokyo government, demanding apologies, reparation, etc., but they were soon found to be worse than useless. It was humiliating to repeat these protests without obtaining proper response. There was a time when the Nipponese government would have left no stone unturned until they had satisfied any demand made upon them by the State Department in Washington.

Now all this is changed. The haughty militarists, or their foreign office tools, merely pigeonholed them and said calmly, "We will answer them when we have investigated." Arita, the Foreign Minister, said on February 15, 1940, that the Japanese government was investigating at that time 232 cases involving damage done to American nationals. The State Department in Washington was reported to have more than six hundred cases awaiting settlement by the Japanese government.

This phase of the problem will be dwelt upon more fully as a separate topic. Suffice it to say here that the President and the Secretary of State did everything they could diplomatically. When they came to realize that nothing short of outspoken protest could bring results, they publicly voiced their sentiments against this international outlawry. What was the result? While many people were greatly encouraged and expressed their support of the stand taken by their government, many opposition quarters declared that the President and the Secretary of State were trying to drag the country into war. This being the situation, the one thing still left for them to do was to take economic action of some sort, and Mr. Hull's announcement of the abrogation of the United States-Japanese commercial treaty, effective on January 26, 1940, was the first economic weapon the United States used against Japan.

The Japanese may be excused for some of the incidents on their plea that war measures, unlike those of peace time, cannot be kept strictly under control. It may be true, although all available evidence proves the contrary, that some of these things were done unintentionally and some of them intentionally but out of military necessity. At any rate, they may be given the benefit of the doubt concerning some of the cases charged against them, but not for the flagrant outrages repeatedly and deliberately perpetrated against official representatives, as well as properties of the governments of nations with which they were at peace. Civilized nations respect and protect diplomatic and naval authorities of foreign powers at all times. The Japanese, as the people of a so-called civilized nation, must remember that they owe to these foreign officials certain due courtesies and immunities in accordance with the code of international ethics, if not of international law. If the powers failed to keep strictly and impartially within the bounds of law as neutrals, Japan could have declared war on them and dealt with them accordingly. Instead of doing that, Japan purposely withheld a declaration of war even against China, upon whom she was waging a piratical total war. The Japanese knew that they were violating all the established usages of international war-

fare by so doing, but they did it because it was convenient for them to demand from the Western powers, on the one hand, all peace-time privileges, while, on the other hand, they employed all the unfair, underhanded methods they knew, in order to crush every vestige of the white man's influence and thus to establish their own supremacy on its ruins. If either of the two leading powers, Britain or America, had decided on positive action, or the people of the United States had united in a determination to stop this aggression, the Japanese could never have succeeded as they have. The keen-sighted Japanese saw that such resistance was unlikely. It was the opportune time for them to kick out the white man at the point of their boot. If the Chinese had forgiven and forgotten Britain's crime of the Opium War, and aggressions of the Europeans, the Japanese took upon themselves the "divine mission" of avenging these wrongs. When they undertook to carry out their long-cherished policy of crushing, once and for all, the prestige of the Western powers, they actually surprised themselves by discovering that it was not half so difficult as they had expected. As they marched on, the foreign economical and political structures, that is, foreign concessions, international settlements, the privileges of extraterritoriality, spheres of influence, and the like, hitherto respected as sacred and inviolable, fell like overripe fruit. Was it not the sun god, their ancestor, who so willed that Hitler and Mussolini would do in the West the very thing which would help Japan at the psychological moment with her plans in the Far East?

Next to the *Panay* bombing the slapping of John Allison was the most serious incident, because, as third secretary, he was in charge of the United States Embassy at Nanking after Ambassador Johnson had moved his headquarters to Hankow, temporary seat of the Chinese government. In this position Mr. Allison was entitled to certain diplomatic courtesies and immunities at the hands of both belligerents. All the diplomatic circles in the East, as well as in the West, were taken aback by the startling news on January 27, 1938, that he had been slapped by a Japanese sentry.

Mr. Allison's official report to the State Department revealed that he

"went with two other Americans, Professor M. S. Bates and Charles Riggs, to interview a woman who could identify a former priest's residence, then occupied by Japanese soldiers, and where she had been taken. While following Japanese investigators, a Japanese soldier rushed toward them, shouting in English, 'Back! Back!' Before we had time to get out, he slapped both of us across the face. A gendarme advised the soldiers that we were Americans. The soldier, livid with rage, attempted to attack Riggs, but the gendarme prevented him. However, he tore Riggs' collar and several buttons from Riggs' shirt. I reported the incident to the Japanese Embassy and obtained the impression that officials there believed the Americans outside their rights in entering the compound, and since the soldier ordered them to leave, he was seemingly within his rights in slapping us."

Mr. Allison was not mistaken when he reported that the Japanese Embassy was supporting the soldier's action. If the diplomatic representatives of that country took sides with the soldier, the militarist did so even more. A Japanese military spokesman in Tokyo said:

"The sentry who slapped the face of John Allison was only doing his duty, and would not be punished. Anyone disobeying the orders of a Japanese sentry could be shot. . . . An apology was tendered to Allison merely as a gesture of courtesy. Previously Japanese authorities were taking a serious view of his actions. . . . Last Tuesday a military policeman attempted to ride on the running board of Mr. Allison's automobile and Mr. Allison tried to push him off and called him an imbecile."

It is interesting to note here that, in the meantime, Japanese aliens resident in the United States have been free to move about and conduct their business without let or hindrance and that there has not been a single instance of retaliation. And let it be remembered to the everlasting credit of the American

people that on his visit to the United States this spring Toyohiko Kagawa was received with a warmth and acclaim that testified to the Christian character of his hosts.

To return to the Allison incident, after it was reported to him, the Secretary of State held a two-hour conference with the President, which was attended also by Norman Davis, United States Ambassador at Large, and under Secretary of State Sumner Welles. As a result, a strong protest was sent to Japan. The exact text of the protest was not available but it was generally understood that in this representation the United States rejected the Japanese version of the incident and indicated that unless the question was settled properly and promptly, the issue of the *Panay* bombing would be reopened. This was a diplomatic master stroke. Those in Tokyo knew what that would mean. If the State Department reopened the issue and made public the inside stories connected with it, the American public would be thoroughly aroused. The Japanese could not afford to take this risk.

The American note was delivered on January 29, 1938. The next day, the Tokyo government hurriedly changed its attitude and bowed. The Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs made a formal statement, saying that "under whatever circumstances the incident might have taken place, the slapping by a Japanese soldier of the American consul was an extremely unfortunate occurrence. Major Hongo, staff officer of Japanese forces at Nanking, went to the United States Embassy and tendered, in the name of the high command in Nanking, expressions of regret and apologies. It was said also that the Japanese government expressed profound regret and gave "assurance that upon completion of a strict investigation steps will be taken to adequately punish those responsible." On January 31, the State Department publicly declared the acceptance of the apologies and assurances of the Japanese Foreign Office, and the Allison case was declared closed.

Looking back, one wonders now whether it would not have served the purpose better if the *Panay* incident had been reopened and the American people fully informed of the increas-

ing strain on Japanese-American relations. The writer has no doubt that many of the "incidents" have been manufactured deliberately in order to test American patience and American unity. If Japan comes to believe that the United States will demand no more than diplomatic redress for gratuitous insult and injury, she may well decide that the hour has struck for a direct challenge to the American will. And we know that she is prepared for this step by her voluntary association with Germany and Italy and her treaty with Soviet Russia.

Flag Incidents

It is well known that the flag follows the missionaries and the merchant follows the flag. Indeed, it was the missionaries who went into all the forbidden lands to preach the gospel of salvation at the risk of their lives. Then the governments of their respective nations followed. Wherever the flag goes, merchants go to open trade under its protection. Therefore, the missionaries are, in fact, the pioneers in the opening of international intercourse, and their national flags stand for their personal safety. Yet, in many cases, missionaries prefer to risk their lives without the protection of their flag, because they are frequently regarded by the natives as tools of predatory governments.

The Chinese in Kiaochau had some trouble with German missionaries and killed two of them in November, 1897. The German seizure of Kiaochau followed a month later, and it became a German possession.

Many cases have been reported in which the Stars and Stripes served not as a sign of safety but as a mark of anathema. The larger and more conspicuously the emblem was displayed, the more frequent and terrific were the Japanese attacks. For instance, when the American Board of Missions in Fenchow, Shansi Province, was being raided, eight Americans and a thousand Chinese survived the four-hour bombardment unscathed in a bomb proof shelter prepared a month before. A Chinese gateman who felt safe under the protection of the large American flag was killed by a Japanese bullet.

While the Japanese have been deliberately and ruthlessly trampling under foot the law of the inviolability of foreign flags, they have been seeking every opportunity to force all nations to respect and bow to their flag. This is how they inspire the resisting people of Asia with fear and awe, until they are "willing and obedient subjects of the Mikado."

"Who can resist the power of Dai Nippon, which even America and Great Britain cannot withstand?" the Japanese say. "Have we not bombed and destroyed lives and property protected by the flags of the Western powers time and time again and yet encountered no more than diplomatic protests, most of which we proudly ignored? We have hauled down, torn in pieces, and even trampled under foot the national emblems, the sacred symbols of the United States and Great Britain, to which two great peoples of the West pay their homage and pledge their allegiance. Yet only a word of *Komenasai* [Japanese word of apology] said by any of our petty officers in the army, navy, or foreign office has been sufficient reparation. Who can refuse to bow to our all-conquering flag? Have we not made white men salute it?" This is the way they feel about it.

It is well-nigh inconceivable and incredible that any modern nation, however powerful, should ignore, haul down, or even trample upon, the flag of another nation more or less unfriendly to her, while forcing other people to salute and bow to its own flag. Yet that is exactly what Japan has been doing and continues to do. Out of numerous such incidents, a few are related here.

The State Department made public on November 30, 1937, the report of Clarence Gauss, United States Consul General at Shanghai, regarding Japanese disrespect for the Stars and Stripes at Shanghai. According to his report, a nameless Japanese tug, loaded with naval men, seized the American-owned tug *Feiting* while it was moored at the French Bund. The American flag was flying from it at the time of the seizure. The Japanese pulled down the sign of the ship's ownership, lowered the flag and threw it into the Whangpoo river. They

made no effort to recover it, and hoisted a Japanese flag in its place.

Another incident occurred the day after the *Panay* bombing. Japanese soldiers seized a boat owned by an American hospital, pulled down the American flag and threw it into the Yangtze. Hospital authorities salvaged the flag and brought the matter to the attention of the Japanese commander. The United States government made a strong representation to the Japanese on December 24.

On August 15, 1938, the British tugboat *Victoria* was boarded by Japanese sailors, who trussed up its captain with rope and unceremoniously replaced the tug's Union Jack with the Rising Sun flag. A British gunboat was hurriedly ordered to the scene to investigate the occurrence.

When the Japanese freighter *Yamura Maru* was slowly pulling into New York harbor on April 30, 1938, the Japanese flag was hoisted above the American flag at the vessel's forepeak. Internationally established usage, as well as United States harbor laws, require all foreign ships entering the harbor to fly the American flag at the forepeak and not to place any other flag higher than the Stars and Stripes. Coast Guard officers boarded the *Yamura* and ordered the flags to be changed.

All these and other incidents are a part of concerted and systematized efforts to gain recognition of Japanese superiority in every way possible. They try to make them appear as individual, sporadic, and isolated occurrences. However, they are all connected with and directed by the proper authorities in Tokyo. Every point they win or every foot of soil they gain, by fair means or foul, adds that much to their national self-esteem. One who wins such a victory, either by peaceful means or by force of arms, is rewarded with a military decoration or a promotion in rank. For that reason everyone tries to do something that will promote his racial status or enrich the national wealth. Every captain of Japanese boats knows the harbor laws and has to act accordingly. The action of the *Yamura Maru* was a violation of established rules and distinctly a slight to the honor of a great nation. Was it an oversight,

unintentional, inadvertent—a mistake by one of the subordinates? The Japanese are too punctilious, too meticulous in matters of decorum, to make mistakes of that kind.

So far we have seen how the Japanese are treating the flag of the United States in China as well as how they have treated it in New York harbor. Now we shall see how they demand that Americans treat their flag in America.

While the Japanese were deliberately insulting the American flag in China and elsewhere, they tried to force Americans to bow to their flag in American territory. It happened during the winter of 1939, when three Japanese naval vessels were "visiting" Hawaii. Every now and then these naval vessels make "official" and "unofficial" calls on these isles. Each time they arrive in Honolulu harbor, the piers and water front are thronged with hundreds of Nipponese, most of them American "citizens," who go out to welcome their visiting compatriots. The sailors and marines are received in the midst of the waving of their flag, and shouts of *Banzai* (flag waving and *Banzai* shouting now have been discontinued) by the enthusiastic crowd, which decks them with flowers and paper leis to demonstrate their warm and cordial welcome. The Territorial government, including the mayor of Honolulu, generally joins with the Japanese in extending a welcome. The Japanese consulate is the center of an official reception in honor of the visiting officers and men. The large lawns, beautified with tall palms and tropical flowers, are decorated with colorful lanterns and bunting for the great occasion. Invited guests are from the Federal and Territorial governments, United States Army and Navy Headquarters, as well as leading citizens representing the Chamber of Commerce and other business and civic organizations. They mingle with the visiting, as well as local, Japanese in expressing their good will and friendship. I remember some Americans refused to go on this particular occasion. They said they could not express good will to the Japanese while those in China bombed and sank a United States vessel and were destroying the Chinese civilian population by the thousands.

How many of the Americans in the territory have the same sentiment I could not ascertain, as they keep their sentiments under the surface. Sometimes after, and sometimes before, these entertainments at the consulate, comes the announcement by the Japanese entertainment committee that on a certain day they will take the visitors on an automobile tour around the island of Oahu, on which the city of Honolulu is located. The public is asked to help by lending automobiles for the day. American and Japanese private families, individuals, and organizations, wishing to show their friendly spirit, send their cars, with or without chauffeurs. During these visits the city streets are crowded with white uniformed Japanese carrying kodaks and cameras. Of course, it is nothing but an unofficial call by naval units of a friendly nation. There is no reason to doubt, and every reason to believe, that it is only a sincere expression of friendly feelings between two great Pacific powers. However, that is not all. Every Japanese is an empire builder. He is part and parcel of the great scheme of world conquest. The flag incident, for instance, is a part of their organized scheme and cannot be regarded as an isolated case, wherever it may occur. The latest of these incidents took place in Hawaii during one of these frequent visits of Japanese naval vessels to the island.

David Kamai, United States citizen of Hawaiian ancestry, representative of the Honolulu Board of Waterworks, started aboard the Japanese navy vessel *Yakumo* to collect the water bill on October 22, 1939. The Japanese sentry, standing with fixed bayonet at the gangplank, stopped and reprimanded him, in good English, for not wearing a coat. Then he told Kamai to bow to the Japanese flag if he wanted to go aboard. Kamai refused, saying, "I do not bow to anyone." As he was turning away he saw that several Japanese without coats had been permitted aboard. Because of the tropical climate, many people go about their business in shirt sleeves. Meanwhile, a local Japanese talked to the sentry, who then called him back and told him to go aboard and attend to his business.

The Honolulu *Star-Bulletin*, of October 24, editorially dis-

cussed the episode in a calm, dignified tone, and concluded by saying:

"It would be easy to manufacture an international incident out of the fact that a Japanese sentry on a Japanese warship ordered an American citizen, going aboard on official business, to salute the Japanese flag. . . . If it was only a misunderstanding, the ship's officers can adequately take care of that. If it was an illustration of arrogance, the relatively brief but adequate publicity given to the story will carry its lesson to the appropriate quarters."

This was followed by a statement issued by the Japanese Consul General firmly and almost indignantly denying the *Star-Bulletin* report that the sentry demanded that David Kamai bow to the Nipponese flag. According to the statement, it was entirely a false report. "Of course, no one would believe a word of this report," said the Consul General, "because the Japanese never did it."

The following week, however, the visiting squadron left Honolulu and made a similar visit to the city of Hilo, the capital of the island of Hawaii, largest of the islands. While there, the whole incident was repeated. This time some one was clever enough to get ahead of the Japanese by quietly taking a snapshot of the sentry standing by an improvised gate with a sign on it in both English and Japanese. The picture was printed in the Honolulu *Advertiser* on October 30, 1939, and it is reproduced here just as it appeared in the Honolulu paper, with the following editorial:

"Austere, aloof stands this sailor HIJM Yakumo, a silent, solemn emissary of the Son of Heaven, Japan's Emperor Hirohito. Traditional military and naval etiquette demands all Japanese show respect to the emperor by either bowing, tipping the hat or saluting sentries. To Japanese in Japan this is known. To others it has no meaning. Twice within the past week, in two American ports, Honolulu and Hilo, Americans boarding the HIJM Yakumo have been met with demands to salute the sentry and bow to the Rising Sun flag. Both were refused. In the above photo taken

at Hilo, the instructions to salute the sentry are seen in both English and Japanese characters. A few moments after this picture was taken, however, the sentry turned the sign around so that it couldn't be photographed."

The State Department awaits reports on the Japanese "incident" at Hilo.

The Hilo trouble started when a United States customs inspector, Mr. H. Stanley Wilson (white) boarded the *Yakumo* at Hilo to present to the Japanese commander the courtesies of the port. As he started to go aboard, a sailor at the foot of the gangplank gripped him by the arm and gruffly demanded who he was. When he said he was a customs officer, the Japanese pointed to an armed sentry and told Mr. Wilson to bow to the sentry. He refused. The sailor said indignantly, "This is a Japanese boat." Finally, a Japanese officer was called, and he descended the gangplank. Wilson handed the letters to him and left.

The following day Jonah Burch, collector of the Hilo Waterworks Department, was refused permission to board the *Yakumo* to collect a water bill when he declined to bow to the Japanese flag on the ship. He was ordered by the sentry to keep out if he would not bow. Later, Emil Osorio, chief clerk of the Hilo Waterworks Department, went to the ship with a Japanese and was admitted without ceremony. The Japanese Acting Consul in Honolulu and the United States customs officer had a consultation and smoothed it over.

As a face-saving measure, Tomoji Matsimura, chairman of the Hilo reception committee, issued a statement on November 10, 1939, assuming the entire responsibility for putting up the Japanese sign. He said he ordered the Japanese signs written, but not the English. It said that those going aboard the ship must *Kei-rei* (bow) to the sentry. To use a common phrase, Matsimura made himself the scapegoat for the Japanese Consul General. The one who really started the trouble was the photographer who took the picture of the Japanese sentry; otherwise, the Consul General easily could have dismissed the difficulties by simply issuing another official denial.

IX

NINE-POWER PARLEY

THE Sino-Japanese war has placed the United States government in a most embarrassing and trying situation. During the last three decades, and up to the present crisis, the United States maintained peaceful relations with Japan, and there were no serious differences between the two nations. Now the United States has come to a point in the road where it must decide what course to follow, whether to accept Japan's challenge or to about face. An unsettled situation is always a trying one.

More than that, the United States government finds itself bound by the Nine-Power Pact, as well as by other international agreements, which guaranteed the territorial integrity and political independence of China, now being attacked by Japan, another signatory. When the Japanese invasion began, China demanded that the signatory nations consult with one another upon what action to take. This they have not done, although public sentiment in America, as well as in the entire world outside of the Axis powers, has rapidly changed unfavorably toward Japan. Japan's bold challenge to the civilized world revealed, without a shadow of doubt, the fact that she is a real menace to all nations in general, and to the United States in particular. This being the situation, the President and Secretary of State should have felt it their duty to take determined action in carrying out the American treaty obligations. It is true that material assistance in the form of loans, equipment, and supplies is being furnished to China by the American government and the American people, but more positive action in the beginning might have halted Japan in her tracks and saved China from her sore suffering and anguish. It is quite safe to say that had the United States government been solidly supported by

the nation in the beginning, peaceful means could have been found to arrest international banditry either in Europe or in Asia, or both, without dragging the nation into war. However, party politics and indifference and apathy of the mass of the people toward the true world situation had to be taken into consideration, and it was found necessary to move slowly. Now world events have convinced the American public that its own safety is in danger.

The Nine-Power Treaty was an outcome of the Washington Conference of 1921 and was ratified in 1925. It was submitted to the conference in the form of a resolution by Elihu Root.

By this instrument the powers agreed to:

1. Respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial and administrative integrity of China.
2. Provide the fullest opportunity for China to develop and maintain an effective and stable government.
3. Use their influence effectually toward establishing and maintaining the principle of opportunity for commerce and industry to all nations.
4. Refrain from taking advantage of present conditions to seek rights and privileges which may abridge the rights of subjects or citizens of friendly states.

Another treaty, known as the Four-Power Agreement signed at the same conference by the United States, Great Britain, France, and Japan, provided that should any dispute arise between any of these powers in the Far East, the powers concerned would consult together at a conference before resorting to war. Of these two international instruments, the Nine-Power Treaty, the main object of which was to check any trend toward the dismemberment of China, was the keynote. For the ensuing ten years China benefited by it, because the powers abandoned all ideas of territorial aggrandizement or economic concessions by their solemn covenants. At that time Japan had to give up her notorious Twenty-one Demands on China.* In effect,

* The Twenty-one Demands made by Japan on January 18, 1915, can be summed up in five groups, as follows:

1. In Shantung, China was to agree to any transfer of German posses-

Japan was the contracting party most benefited by this arrangement. Just as the Open-Door policy helped Japan by holding Manchuria intact during the first period of her military preparation, the Nine-Power Pact held China intact during Japan's second period of preparation. When, in 1931, she found herself armed to the teeth, Japan scrapped the Open-Door agreements, rushed into Manchuria, and slammed the door against the others. Secretary of State Henry L. Stimson urged action to halt the Manchurian invasion, but Sir John Simon, British Foreign Secretary, could not make up his mind to do anything, and the first opportunity to enforce the law was lost. Japan walked out of the League of Nations in open defiance of all the powers present. Now again she is on the march for the conquest of a continent. A belated effort was made to stop her. On September 20, 1937, in Geneva, the British delegation proposed the application of the Nine-Power Treaty for the settlement of the Sino-Japanese conflict. It was believed that the move would bring the United States into full co-operation in peace efforts and that Japan could not refuse to attend a conference of the treaty signatories.

sions to Japan that the latter might obtain. China was not to alienate to a third power any territory in the province; she was to declare additional cities to be open ports and was to grant certain railway privileges.

2. In south Manchuria and eastern Inner Mongolia, the lease of Port Arthur, Dairen, and of the railways was to be extended to ninety-nine years, and anywhere in these regions Japanese might lease land and travel or reside. There were, too, demands for mining and railway privileges and for the Japanese control of loans and the employment of Japanese official advisers.

3. The Han-yeh-p'ing Company, the largest Chinese iron-mining and smelting concern, was to be made a Sino-Japanese enterprise, and China was not to sell her interest in it without Japan's consent.

4. China was to promise not to cede or lease to any third power any harbor, bay or island along the coast.

5. China was to employ Japanese as advisers to the central government, and the police departments in certain districts were to be jointly administered by Japanese and Chinese; China was either to buy fifty per cent or more of her munitions from Japan or to establish a Sino-Japanese arsenal, which was to use Japanese material under the direction of Japanese; Japanese were to be granted the privilege of buying land in the interior for schools, hospitals, and churches; certain railway concessions in the Yangtze valley were to be promised, and Japan was to be allowed to scrutinize all proposed loans of foreign capital for mines and works in Fukien.

Japan's Attitude Toward the Nine-Power Parley

Japan signed the Nine-Power Treaty when she was not strong enough to enforce her will. When she felt that she was sufficiently powerful to attempt the conquest of China she proceeded to do so. Most naturally, the other powers decided to call her to a conference table to answer questions. The formal invitation to attend the Nine-Power conference to be held in Brussels on October 30, 1937, reached Tokyo on October 21. Nearly three weeks before, the *Asahi Shimbun* editorially remarked that the invocation of the Nine-Power Pact might be acceptable under reasonable conditions, though, properly speaking, it was virtually a dead letter, or, at least, entirely unsuitable to the present Far Eastern situation. This editorial was an unofficial expression of the real attitude of the Japanese government. Results have proved it.

The Japanese government formally replied to the invitation on October 27, only three days prior to the opening of the conference. The reply, declining to attend the parley, was made by issuing a public statement to the effect that the League of Nations inspired the conference in order to "put serious obstacles in the path of a just and proper solution of Sino-Japanese disputes," that Japan is fighting a "defensive war," and that "the Nine-Power Treaty is obsolete anyway." The newspaper *Okugai Shogio* said editorially on November 5 that Japan acquired political superiority in the Far East through "the holy war" and that other powers lost their qualification to discuss East Asia without Japan's understanding. Finally, a few days later (November 12), the Japanese Cabinet again rejected the second invitation to be present at the conference. The following day the delegates at Brussels dispatched a final appeal to Tokyo, suggesting: (1) acceptance of an immediate armistice, (2) a settlement through mediation, and (3) a proviso that the underlying principle of the Nine-Power Pact should govern peace efforts.

The "final appeal" seemed to be in perfect order as a peaceful means to a peaceful end. Only one thing was lacking—there

were no teeth in it. And that is why the diplomats in Tokyo had a good laugh up their kimono sleeves over the "stupid fiasco" of the League of Nations.

Japan has said the Nine-Power Treaty is a "dead letter," and "obsolete." Germany has said the same thing, that a treaty is "a scrap of paper." The difference is, while the United States fully realizes the danger of the German menace, it does not yet fully realize the danger of its Eastern prototype, Japan. That is where the danger lies. Any nation, even the United States, which enters into a treaty relationship with these nations is only courting disaster.

The Japanese asserted: Japan is fighting a "defensive war," a "holy war." It is not easy to perceive where the "holy" part of it comes in, unless it refers to their claim that the rulers of Japan were direct "sons of the sun goddess." The term "defensive" is somewhat incomprehensible to the Occidental mind. Japan's way of looking at things is quite different from the Occidental. For instance, if you were forcibly to enter your neighbor's house, he would naturally attempt to put you out by force, wouldn't he? In such a case, you would have either to get out or to fight in "self-defense." This was the Japanese psychology when they said, in reference to the invitation of the Nine-Power Parley, "that the difficulties can be solved only between the two powers." That is, between the burglar who stands with a pistol and the victim prostrated at his feet, and no one else.

It is significant to notice how carefully American diplomats worded their statements so as to avoid any criticism at home that they were trying to drag America into the affairs of other nations. At the same time, they could not turn a deaf ear to the cries for help reaching them from all parts of this troubled world, which in its distress and agony looks to the United States, the biggest and most influential power, for succor. Furthermore, in reference to the protection of China's sovereignty and territory, the United States, as signatory to the Nine-Power Treaty, has not only moral but legal obligations to make every effort to help China. For this reason, if for no other, the government

should be willing to do anything short of war to stop Japanese aggression. Yet the American people, who determine national issues both foreign and domestic, were, because of the influence of pacifists and propagandists, and the experience of the last war, absolutely opposed to anything smacking of foreign entanglement. This being the situation, the government found itself in a very embarrassing position.

Secretary Hull's repeated assertions condemning Japanese aerial bombardment of undefended civilian areas seem to have furnished the basis of a hope built up by the League of Nations for the possible co-operation of the United States in bringing international pressure on Japan. His note of September 22 to the Japanese government clearly set forth the view that "any general bombing of any extensive area in which resides a large populace engaged in peaceful pursuits is unwarranted and contrary to principles of law and humanity." This note Japan did not answer. A week later, Hull reiterated the American protest, thus, without mentioning the League, indirectly endorsing the League resolution which condemned Japanese bombing of civilian populations. The United States could not officially associate itself with the League because it was not a member nation.

Leland Harrison, United States Ambassador to Switzerland, was instructed to attend committee meetings of the League to remind the League of the fact that the United States could not attend the conference which the League was about to call. That is why the Brussels Parley was called in place of a meeting under the auspices of the League. The other powers, without the co-operation of the United States, could not entertain any hope of success, and the United States, as one of the signatories, could not decline to attend. Now that the position of the United States was made clear, Secretary Hull announced that Norman Davis, United States Ambassador-at-Large, would represent the United States at the session. Mr. Davis was accompanied by Dr. Stanley K. Hornbeck, chief of the Far Eastern Division of the State Department, an outstanding authority of Far Eastern affairs, Robert Pell, as press officer, and Charles Bohlen,

secretary. The delegation sailed for Brussels with very little enthusiasm.

However, the world was not ready for genuine international co-operation, which is essential to any degree of success. Frank Kellogg, former Secretary of State, and coauthor of the Kellogg-Briand Pact, must have had this in mind when he said in a statement at this time that

“governments believing in the sanctity of international obligations should consider most carefully steps which can be taken to make effective the principles of the pact. I still believe as I did in 1928, that world peace depends upon observance by all signatories of terms and principles of the pact. I can reconcile the present policy of Japan in China neither with the letter nor the spirit of the Paris pact. It is a matter of definite regret that any government should show disregard for its pledged word, for such is destructive not only of the pact but of the mutual confidence on which alone the society of nations can exist. The alternative to such confidence is international anarchy.”

To all the peace-loving peoples of the world, who had pinned sincere hopes on the conference at Brussels, came the disheartening and humiliating news of its first session on November 4. At that session the British delegates, realizing the helplessness of the parley because of Japan's refusal to join the discussion, tried to save face by “flirting with Japan.” Soon after this meeting, Sir Robert Clive, British Ambassador to Belgium, conferred with S. Kuruse, Japanese Ambassador to Belgium, and attempted to learn whether Japan would agree to attend a different conference to discuss a Sino-Japanese settlement on a broader basis. Other conferees openly remarked that this offer was designed to enable Britain to sidestep the embarrassing necessity of considering coercive measures against Japan. The American delegate, Norman Davis, warned, in his brief address to the conference, that cessation of the conflict was essential to world peace. French Foreign Minister Yvon Delbos followed Davis's speech by emphasizing the sanctity of the Nine-Power Treaty. Count Luigi Aldrovando Marescotti, Italian delegate, struck a dis-

cordant note by saying that the conference could not do any more than invite China and Japan to participate in discussions. "It cannot quarantine Japan" was a direct reference to President Roosevelt's Chicago speech in 1937. No doubt most of the delegates left the first session quite discouraged and somewhat disgusted.

The conference continued in session until November 20, 1937. The British and French delegates definitely realized that the United States would not take the lead in halting Japan and did not even attend the sessions regularly. During all this time the main questions discussed at the meetings were: how to censure Japan, and how the leading conferee powers could supply arms to China on credit as a "last resort" to halt Japan. When the former question came up the Italians bolted, in accordance with Mussolini's friendly relations with Japan. The conference overrode Italian protests and approved the declaration charging Japan with responsibility for failure of peace efforts and continuance of bloodshed in the Far East.

As to the latter question, it was agreed that signatory powers might join in a proposal to aid China through munitions credits. The conference adjourned, *sine die*, on November 20. Delegates openly charged that the American policy of "strict neutrality" had killed international efforts to mediate the Far Eastern conflict.

It is interesting to observe that it was Great Britain which proposed the Nine-Power Parley though she had failed to follow Secretary of State Stimson's lead in protesting Japan's conquest of Manchuria and refusing to acknowledge Japanese sovereignty over that unhappy land.

However, the United States is not free from criticism. If the United States government was either unwilling or unable to take the lead in coercive measures against aggressor nations it was a mistake to participate in the parley at all, for, so long as it was only a friendly gesture, the parley was doomed to failure before it opened. There was no nation but the United States which could wield moral or economic weapons sufficiently effective to make Japan feel the pressure. That was the hope of the world

then, as now. At the same time, it should be remembered that the American people were opposed to any entanglement. They still believed the United States should keep out of everything. Perhaps, this accounts for the refusal of the American delegation to go any further. Thus the parley ended.

The failure of the parley was neither a surprise nor a disappointment, since there was not much hope for it from the beginning. The nations represented were far from being ready. On the report of the subcommittee condemning Japan as the invader three nations abstained from voting. Why? Was it because they were not sure whether Japan should be condemned as such? It seemed most likely that they refused to vote because they did not wish to hurt Japanese feelings. If the small nations were so influenced, as every evidence indicated, the great powers apparently were similarly influenced. Great Britain, as has been pointed out, was the first one at the conference to seek a way out without losing face. In other words, all the nations, powerful and weak alike, acted as if they were treading on thin ice. Had they all come with the full conviction that if they failed to stop international piracy at once they would be victims of that piracy, the situation would have been different. The tendency of all the nations was too narrowly individualistic to be willing to do anything for collective security.

The powers underestimated Japan's military strength. They still regarded Japan as the second- or third-rate nation that she was thirty years ago, little realizing that Japan had reached a stage where she could stand out boldly in defiance of the whole world. They judged that Japan would still respect the public opinion of the nations of the West. Counting too much on their belief that Japan could not afford to ignore her treaty obligations, they came with the hope that they might succeed in halting the war by "friendly" persuasion. Of course, they had never thought of the need of force, moral or economic.

It was suggested at the parley that either economic sanctions be applied against Japan, or an understanding be reached among the leading signatory powers to sell arms and war materials to China on credit, thus backing China in her struggle for existence.

But neither course was possible, because the Japanese said: "If Americans and others make further representations based on the Nine-Power Treaty, which savors of pressure against Japan, Japan definitely will demand correction of their views."

Japan thus frustrated all the peace efforts of the Brussels Conference simply by refusing to participate in the discussions. Meanwhile, her army and navy were steadily proceeding toward the realization of the Tanaka predictions, not only in China, but in other parts of the world.

X

JAPAN'S MARCH OF CONQUEST AND ITS REPERCUSSIONS

WHILE Japan was struggling to conquer the rest of China and seeking to grasp everything within the ever expanding radius of her empire, the repercussions of her military movements were felt all over the world. Through her Axis alliance she was rendering helpless the British, French, and Dutch possessions in the East, and indirectly augmenting the Nazi threats to the United States on the Atlantic side. On the other hand, her attempts to monopolize China's vast material resources, man power, and foreign market, and her claim to the mastery over the Pacific, menaced the peace and security, not only of the United States, but of the entire Western hemisphere.

Shanghai

Japan's original plan to take over the French Concession and the International Settlement was stalemated by the refusal of the United States to abandon its treaty rights, backed by the speedy concentration of its naval fleet in Hawaiian waters and its intensive preparations for national defense. No doubt this maneuvering of power in the Pacific has slowed down Japan's war machine in China. Threats by Tokyo war lords failed to create the desired reaction in America, and they consequently decided to go easy for a while. That does not mean, however, that they will desist from further aggression. They are resourceful and relentless so long as their army and navy have the upper hand. If they discard one method, they can employ another just as effective and less noisy, perhaps.

Whispering campaigns and vernacular newspaper drives have

been going on in metropolitan Shanghai for months. During the latter part of September, 1940, strikes and violence spread to the International Settlement. Bus and street car employees quit their jobs, tying up the city's transportation service for several days. The strike soon threatened to paralyze every industry in the city. The municipal garbage collection employees soon joined the strike. Agitators threatened to harm the families of workers unless the employees of gas, electric power, and water-works walk out within a week after posting of the notice. Japanese newspapers stated as news, but intended as an order, that taxicab drivers would join the strike soon. They said, further, "The United States Marines will soon be withdrawn, because the force is too small to preserve order." Foreign observers feared a crisis that might culminate in a Japanese move to seize control of the French Concession and International Settlement. This situation was created by the Japanese to give them an excuse to seize the municipal government under the guise of "restoring order." The Utilities Company directors insisted on remaining indoors and avoided contacts during the disturbance for fear of personal attack.

Thirty years ago this underhanded method was used in Korea with great success when the Japanese were driving out all foreigners engaged in business in Seoul, Chemulpo, Fusan, and other places. The Koreans told their American friends that it was the Japanese and not the Koreans who were the real instigators of the trouble, but very few foreigners believed it. They could not believe that the Japanese, who were so friendly to foreigners, could be capable of such duplicity. Of course, the Japanese were more careful in carrying on agitation then than they are now. Many Americans are now aware of the fact that most of the violence of the last thirty years in Korea occurred at the direct instigation of the Japanese.

While tension in Shanghai was thus growing higher all the time, Fu Hsiao-en, Japanese-directed puppet Mayor of Greater Shanghai, was killed at his home in Honkew. Japanese military headquarters immediately declared martial law, and searching parties ransacked the entire sector. The assassins escaped.

No doubt, the crime was a part of the militarists' own plan to precipitate trouble. Just at that time a report was circulated that a Japanese officer had been shot and severely wounded near the foreign sector. This intensified the tension, and the entire city felt as if it were sitting on a pincushion.

Consequently, the State Department at Washington again ordered American women, children and men not in essential business, to return to the United States as soon as possible from China, and also from Japan and Korea. Anti-American movements were spreading all over Japan and it was impossible for any Westerner to feel safe and secure there. Owing to the lack of transportation, Washington arranged for two American steamships, the *Mariposa* and *Monterey*, to expedite the evacuation of the American refugees from the Orient. On October 10 there were still over 4000 Americans in Shanghai. Some of them were ready to leave but they had to wait months before they could make reservations. In addition, many more hundreds in North China and Indo-China could not leave because of lack of transportation facilities. It was decided later that two more American liners, the *Manhattan* and the *Washington*, would sail immediately for the Orient to help bring Americans home.

Indo-China

During the middle of September, 1940, everyone in Indo-China was expecting war to descend upon them at any moment. However, the Japanese at first attempted to attain their ends by peaceful means. With the French government at Vichy doing Hitler's bidding, the Japanese felt that they could force the French authorities in Indo-China to obey their orders. If they could "kill a mosquito without drawing a sword," so much the better. In the meantime, Britain's successful resistance against Germany and the presence of the United States naval fleet in Hawaiian waters were anything but reassuring to the Japanese. The Vichy government had to comply with their requests, willy-nilly, and had already granted them the use of the three Tonking air bases and also permission to transport 20,000 troops on the French railway to China's border. Now they wanted permis-

sion to move 40,000 more troops and the free use of Saigon, the French naval base near Singapore. This, they thought, would be easy by making direct demands upon the French authorities in the territory rather than dealing with Vichy.

On a September midnight, when the Governor-general of French Indo-China, Admiral Jean Decoux, was in bed at his official residence in Hanoi, the Japanese Major-general, Issaku Nishihara, arrived and demanded an immediate conference with him. The irate admiral indignantly shouted, "I am not getting up. If the Japanese want to declare war, they can do it tomorrow morning." The Japanese were taken aback by the blunt rebuff of this undaunted Frenchman. This event was soon followed by the announcement of General Julian François René Martin, Commander of the Indo-Chinese forces, that he would resign if the Vichy government yielded further to Japan's demands. The Japanese decided then that peaceful means would not work here.

By the end of September, Japanese planes rained bombs on French positions and also on certain sections of the city of Hanoi, inflicting many casualties, and the attacking troops encircled the defense forces about eighty miles northeast of the city. Heavy fighting raged along a fifty-mile front. As the French poured machine gun and artillery fire into the advancing columns from fortified positions, Japanese casualties were reported quite heavy. However, the French forces were forced to withdraw from the city.

The French troops had started on their own initiative to fight the invaders, in spite of their government, from which no reinforcements or even encouragement could be expected. The invaders, on the other hand, with a full force of 30,000 men, were irresistibly advancing. Under these circumstances, the French could not help being pessimistic. They discovered that they had been tricked by the Japanese negotiators, headed by Nishihara. In the negotiations at Hanoi Nishihara succeeded in concluding the Franco-Japanese-Indo-China pact, which was signed a week prior to the clash, limiting the Japanese troops to 6000. By this pact, the French were led to believe that the

Japanese would land no more troops than this limited number. A larger number would put their own French force in an inferior position. It was not until after the fighting was nearly over that they learned to their amazement that they had been fighting 30,000 Japanese instead of 6000. It may be repeated again that to make any agreement with Japan and attach any importance to it is not worth the trouble. The French sustained a number of casualties, including an air force officer. Then women and children were hurriedly evacuated to Haiphong, the port of Hanoi.

In a combination of political and diplomatic forces working together to bring pressure to bear on the authorities of Indo-China, the French had to take orders from Vichy and fell back without further resistance. A reinforcement of 20,000 Japanese troops landed in Indo-China, September 26, 1940, marched under the powerful but silent French guns, and occupied Haiphong without resistance. Meanwhile, Japanese planes dropped bombs, damaging several buildings, killing fifteen and wounding eighteen civilians. As usual, the Japanese army spokesman stated that the bombing was "a mistake." It was a sharp contrast as the little brown soldiers proudly made their triumphal entry into the city, while the crack battalion of the French colonial infantry, their artillery and machine guns muzzled, moved out as if on a funeral march. Another undefeated army yielded fortified positions to their enemies without firing a shot.

The Japanese occupation of Indo-China is no concern of ours, many Americans say; but it is their concern. The United States has relied on Indo-China for rubber supplies which are essential to the automobile and other industries. A Japanese economic mission was expected to arrive in Hanoi on October 13, 1940, to take over the entire rubber supply for Japanese military use. It cuts the United States out of at least this one material, which is necessary not only for American industries but for national defense as well.

Hong Kong

China's Open Door is now barred to Occidentals. The "Asia

for the Asiatics" cry has changed to a still louder cry of "Asia for the Japanese." The only footholds Westerners still claim in China are Hong Kong, the British Crown Colony, and the International Settlement. Since the fall of France, the French Concession has been virtually under Japanese control. The status of the International Settlement is still unsettled, because of the firm stand taken by the United States.

As the Westerner's strongholds in the East were crumbling like toy houses before this rapidly spreading fire, the white men had to flee, as the little brown men watched with satisfaction. Wives and children of British naval and army personnel began to evacuate in June, 1940. Other foreigners, not fully realizing the seriousness of the situation, would not move unless the official families started first. Gradually, most of the women and children were sent to Manila, leaving their homes and men behind. About three hundred Americans, mostly women and children, were among the refugees, while there were over nine hundred British women and one thousand British children. This exodus kept up until the latter part of October, when the British government ordered the complete evacuation of all British women and children from Hong Kong to Australia, with the understanding that their living expenses would be paid weekly by the London government through the Commonwealth government. Meanwhile, the Colonial government at Hong Kong made preliminary appropriations of one million Hong Kong dollars for the purpose of constructing air defenses as well as underground shelters which would eventually accommodate a million persons. In conjunction with this program, a number of tunnels were bored in the hillsides. This indicates that, so far as the British authorities in Hong Kong are concerned, the Britons will, to all intents and purposes, remain.

The danger lies not with the British Colonial government in Asia but with the British government in London. The irresolute and wavering attitude of the British Cabinet in the early years of the crisis served to strengthen Japan's position in later years, even when Great Britain was relatively in a much stronger position than she is today. Now, in this most critical situation, she

may feel obliged to yield almost anything in order to appease Japan. In such a case, although it is hardly probable, the guns of Singapore, like the guns of Indo-China, may fall into the enemy's hands without having a chance to fire a shot, and English troops in Hong Kong, like the French in Indo-China, may be ordered to march out without having a chance to fight in their own defense. If this danger seems imaginary, see what the Prime Minister had to say on October 9, 1940, to the House of Commons: "We must avoid a showdown. We are not at war with Japan."

So it is that Britain is paying today for yesterday's failure to see that Japan was definitely embarked on a nationalistic venture that was bound to bring about a clash with British power.

Burma Road

Indeed, the most discouraging feature in the world crisis was Britain's vacillation. Sometimes it has been difficult to ascertain whether or not she had any definite policy. At the beginning of the conflicts in Asia and Europe Prime Minister Chamberlain's appeasement policy made the British position more precarious than ever before. When Churchill took up the leadership in the new government, it was hoped that he would adopt a firm and perhaps more definite policy toward the Nipponese. But lack of preparation, of trained forces, and of *matériel* forced him to restraint and caution. Then, too, there was the great enigma of Russia to consider. The attempt to woo Stalin to the British cause ended in a major diplomatic defeat for Britain and victory for Germany. On top of all this came the alignment of Japan with Germany and Italy and, later, her pact with Russia.

However, the Rome-Berlin-Tokyo line-up brought a new determination to the British, who then began extensive aerial attacks on German bases and the city of Berlin. In spite of all the raids, London has met the attackers with stubborn counter-attacks. Hitler has been somewhat disconcerted. Now all those who wish the British well are much encouraged by the successes lately scored by them. It is to be earnestly hoped that Britain

will from now on forge ahead in the task of defeating the Axis powers.

While the London government was still continuing with its policy of uncertainty, Mr. Churchill offered, on July 12, 1940, to close the Burma Road to China, which was at that time the main thoroughfare by which China was importing most of her war supplies necessary for continued resistance to the invaders. Japan had repeatedly demanded that Britain close this road. Finally, Churchill quietly complied. Originally, it was to be closed for two months, but later, when the order was extended to three months, Japan accepted the offer. This was hard on China, because it was the main route to the outside world. Britain closed it in order to placate Japan. However, this did not satisfy Japan, who, instead of showing appreciation, kept on with her anti-British campaign. Meanwhile, the Axis triple alliance definitely proved to Britain the futility of further friendly gestures.

On October 9, Churchill, speaking to a packed House of Commons, said that the Burma Road would be reopened on October 17, the day when the period of three months expired. He said, further, that Japan's allies would not be able to help her so long as the British and American fleets control the seas. This stand by the British Prime Minister was reassuring to all friends of Britain.

The Burma route was reopened at the scheduled time, to remain China's only Open Door. Long before the date of opening, Japanese militarists threatened to blow up the bridges, the highway, the railroad, and freight. As a matter of fact, they did much bombing along the Chinese section of the road, but did little damage. In spite of all the threats, thousands of Chinese operators assembled American motor trucks and freight at stations between Rangoon and the Chinese border in anticipation of its opening. Two days before, 300,000 gallons of gasoline were transported to the border, and 5000 trucks were in use by October, 1940.

China is now getting war supplies necessary for the continuation of its resistance against the invaders. Ten days after the

opening, on October 28, 1940, the Japanese army announced that it was withdrawing from Nanning, strategic communications center in Kwangsi Province, which it had held nearly a year. The South China command at Canton, referring to the Japanese withdrawal, said, "The Japanese forces are evacuating Nanning because of the steady pressure of the Chinese forces which have been attacking the Japanese in Kwangsi." This alone proved that the Chinese can defeat the Japanese, if they only have sufficient supplies. America is the only nation which can give these supplies, and it has every reason to give China this essential support.

Dutch East Indies

Anyone in this scientific age of ours who still believes that we have nothing to do with anything that takes place on other continents, does not realize what a small place the earth has become. There is hardly an event anywhere in the world of which we do not feel the effects. The fall of Holland and France had direct and profound effect upon the Sino-Japanese war, as well as being almost entirely responsible for getting America's defense program really under way.

The Japanese expansionists had long been casting greedy eyes upon the Dutch East Indies, Holland's "treasure chest." These islands produce many raw materials essential for war supplies, as well as numerous commercial products such as oil, tin, rubber, tea, gold, rice, lead, quinine, copra, tobacco, etc. As a noted writer has well said, "With the Dutch East Indies, Japan could thumb her nose at the rest of the world."

The Japanese government announced on May 11, 1940, that notification had been handed to the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, and Italy that Japan would "insist on the maintenance of the *status quo* in the Netherlands Indies, in spite of Holland's involvement in the European war." That was the time when rumors were circulating to the effect that the United States might take them over until a final settlement of the situation was reached. This notice was purported to be a "hands-off" warning to the United States. So far as the United States was concerned, it was quite satisfactory, because Japan, by warn-

ing others, voluntarily pledged herself to maintain the *status quo*. Whether or not Japan really meant to include herself in the warning, it was quite convenient for the United States to assume that she did so, and it thus accepted the notification as a *bona fide* expression of Japan's intention.

Japan formerly imported a relatively small amount of oil from the Dutch East Indies. Her annual purchase was usually not more than 30,000,000 barrels. Soon after the fall of Holland, Japan sent a special mission to Batavia and notified the Netherlands government that Japan desired an oil concession in the islands. The mission quietly expressed their desire to take over the oil refineries that were operating under Dutch control. The Dutch authorities were unable to resist and authorized the Netherlands Indies delegates and representatives of the oil companies to negotiate with the Japanese mission. They met October 14-16, 1940, under the chairmanship of the Japanese Minister of Commerce, who said at the opening of the negotiations that "Japan strongly desires to maintain and promote friendly relations with the Netherlands Indies." Under the contract which was dictated by Japan, forty per cent of Japan's oil requirement for the following six months would be supplied by the Netherlands Indies. In addition to this supply, Japan gets the balance of her needs from American oil companies.

It seems that Americans are determined not to learn from the bitter experience of the Dutch East Indies. It seems that the whole world helps Japan to continue its aggressive expansion. Governments seem to speed up this suicidal tendency of mankind. Take the case of the American embargo, for example. The United States government shut off exports of high octane gasoline to Japan. It was clear then that the government apparently intended to stop arming Japan. Every American citizen and every American organization, commercial or otherwise, should co-operate with the government in its efforts to withhold further material aid to the aggressors. Yet Japan continues to get shipments of low test gas, crude oil, Diesel oil, kerosene, and other petroleum products from America. As has been said elsewhere, steel rails, as well as many other raw materials without

which Japan would be unable to carry on her international brigandage, still find their way into Japan uninterrupted.

Henry H. Douglas made a startling report when he said in a recent article in *Asia* magazine:

"In spite of the fact that in 1939 Japan bought from us more of these products than ever before, a comparison of our exports of some products for the month of October in 1939 and 1940 will be an eye-opener to many.

	<i>Oct., 1939</i>	<i>Oct., 1940</i>
Gasoline	148,000 bbls.	627,000 bbls.
Iron and steel scrap	259,000 tons	148,000 tons
Iron and steel bars and rods, including wire rods	1,715 tons	17,623 tons
Steel sheets, black	43 tons	1,554 tons
Copper refined	11,148 tons	27,815 tons

"In many products there were astonishing increases in exports in August, 1940, as against August, 1939, because in July, 1940, the Japanese thought we really meant business and intended to shut off her vital supplies, but they decided in a few weeks that we were only bluffing after all. The embargo action of October 16, 1940, probably brought about by the announcement of the Three-Power Pact, reduced our November exports of scrap iron to Japan to twenty-five tons."

How long are Americans going to continue to give Japan weapons with which to assail them? When are they going to use their intelligence and their products for self-defense instead of self-ruin? If they use their heads now they will not have to use their arms later.

Thailand

Thailand, or Siam, one of the old Asiatic countries, has been subjected to Japanese diplomatic intrigue and is now practically a Japanese protectorate. The country is about the size of France, with a population of 14,000,000. Vast resources are still undeveloped, and "peaceful" Japanese penetration has reached

far into the interior. All the works of river dredging and harbor construction are being conducted by the Japanese. Thailand is learning that Japanese intervention in her affairs is but another means to Japanese expansion.

In an address at a Lion's Club luncheon in the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., Mom Rajawongse Semi Pramoj, Thailand's Minister to the United States, sketched the background of the conflict between Thailand and Indo-China and the settlement of the dispute by Japan as mediator. After the speech, he was to answer questions. One of the Lions asked him about land-hungry Japan in the rôle of mediator. "Wasn't it like a fox coming in to arbitrate a dispute between two rabbits in a cabbage patch? Wasn't the fox likely to fatten up the rabbits and then eat both of them?" he was asked.

Minister Pramoj looked over the questioner and smilingly replied: "What would you do if you were a rabbit?" The audience roared their appreciation of the riposte.

Philippine Islands

Early in March, 1938, the War and Navy Departments were considering withdrawal of the United States first defense line from the Philippines to Hawaii. This was based on the observations of some strategists that the American defense front should be drawn closer to continental United States so as to strengthen the security of the Pacific coast.

Admiral William D. Leahy, chief of the naval operations, informed the Naval Affairs Committee nearly a year before that it would be almost impossible to defend the Philippine Islands against a first-class sea power, even with the twenty per cent naval increase proposed by the Vinson Bill at an estimated cost of \$800,000,000.

Japan demanded a share in the development of economic resources in the Philippine Islands. The Japanese Chamber of Commerce of Manila filed with the Commonwealth government on October 20, 1937, what is known as "a surprise brief" advocating an establishment of joint economic relations in the islands. The brief said, "The commerce between the United

States, the Philippines, and Japan furnishes an excellent example of 'triangular' arrangement."

The embargo declared by the United States on exports of war materials to Japan seems meaningless. The war lords in Tokyo have been constantly warning against the embargo enforcement. The shipments of strategic war materials to Japan have been greatly increased recently. In order to evade legal technicality, some of these articles are being shipped from mainland ports to Manila and reshipped thence to Japan.

In addition, the Japanese are purchasing all iron ore from private owners of mines in the Philippines. In January, 1938, "a most attractive offer" was made by the Japanese to the Commonwealth government to lease and develop rich iron reserves in Surigao province. Such a lease would violate the Philippine constitutional provisions, but the offer was so tempting that the Philippine authorities had given it "a lengthy consideration" before they finally decided to turn it down.

The story of "a mystery flotilla" of twenty-two vessels sighted off Davao Bay kept the American public agog from April 12 to 23, 1938, when it was disclosed that "the hostile fleet" was nothing but a few Japanese whaling ships. The collector of customs reported that they were either destroyers or submarines. Some said it was "established beyond doubt warships entered Davao waters." A retired army officer was positive that he "saw around seventeen warships in column formation," while many others "watched the ships maneuvering at night and displaying varicolored lights."

On April 23, the commander of a Japanese whaling fleet calmly announced that he had stopped off with his depot ship, *Nishi Maru*, to fuel the whaling ships in the fleet. And all was quiet again in the western Pacific front.

Guam

Early in August, 1938, Japanese officials informally intimated to the United States authorities that they desired to apply for permission to land their planes in Guam, linking with the Pan-American Airways trans-Pacific route. About this time the

American commercial attaché at Tokyo reported that the Japanese were seeking an appropriation of nearly \$2,000,000 for this project.

However, this project failed to materialize. The American authorities refused even to consider such a proposal. The Japanese should be reminded that their laws permit no foreign air lines landing rights in their territory. Furthermore, whenever the United States proposed to fortify the island of Guam, the Japanese government strenuously objected on account of its propinquity to their naval bases. The Japanese appeared to blink the fact that Guam's propinquity to the United States naval base in Manila is of prime concern to the United States naval authorities.

On February 2, 1941, a bill asking for \$898,392,932 for new naval bases at Samoa, Guam, and other American outposts in the western Pacific was put before Congress. This included \$8,100,000 for fortification at Tutuila, Samoa, and \$4,700,000 for "fleet operating facilities" and bomb-proof shelters at Guam.

During the two previous years Congress has twice refused the requests on the ground that it was an "aggressive move" against Japan. Admiral Harold R. Stark, Chief of Naval Operations, declared, "If Japan is offended, her protest should be totally disregarded. After all, Guam is United States property and it seems to me our actions should be determined by what is best for the United States and not dictated by any foreign power."

On February 19, the move was revived in Congress and it was passed without a single voice being raised against it.

Mandate Islands

Under the mandate given her Japan was not allowed to fortify the group of islands which the League of Nations granted her to hold for a term of years. Yet she deliberately built fortifications and naval bases there, and evidenced no intention to relinquish them. When the term of the mandate expired, she frankly informed the League that she intended to keep the islands "at any cost," and denied that she had fortified the islands. When the League proposed to investigate the situation, Japan announced

that no foreigner was allowed to visit any of them and that if the League refused to believe her word she would take it as an insult. Other nations were fearful of creating trouble and the matter was dropped then and there.

On November 30, 1937, the Japanese Communications Ministry announced that Japan's long planned commercial air line linking her with her mandate islands would come into existence in December. According to this announcement, two trips a month were scheduled between Tokyo and Palao in the Caroline Islands, some two thousand miles apart. The island Saipan, which is almost within sight of Guam, would be one of the stop-over points. It was purely from a strategic standpoint, as a counterbalance to the military importance of Guam and the Philippines, that she determined to tighten her hold on them.

On April 2, 1938, the *Hochi*, a Tokyo newspaper, reported that a mysterious warship, believed to be American, entered the harbor of Truck Island, one of the mandate group, after midnight, flashed its searchlight around the harbor and then disappeared.

Meanwhile, another news dispatch was widely circulated, causing a profound sensation all over Japan. The dispatch said the United States navy had concentrated ten capital ships, five hundred warplanes, an armada of aircraft carriers, and other vessels in the areas between Wake Island and American Samoa, along the Phoenix group and Howland and Baker Islands. Admiral C. C. Bloch, Commander in Chief of the United States fleet there, issued a statement saying that "the concentration referred to has no foundation in fact," and the *Hochi* at once admitted that "the boat was not even identified, . . . and it might have been a fishing boat."

Hawaii

If Japan's invasion of China had taken place a century ago it would hardly have been noticed in territory as far from the Orient as the islands of Hawaii. In this machine age of ours, when continents are no longer divided by water and air but

connected by them, Hawaii seems almost to be the very centre of events. Suffice it to say that Japan's war on China affects Hawaii's present chances to win admission to the Union as a state, for which it has applied to the United States Congress. However, the question of the Japanese population in the territory puts the territory in a dubious position.

The Japanese-Americans have been reaching voting age rapidly, but when they vote for territorial legislators they are known to vote almost exclusively for their own Japanese candidates. This is particularly true on the island of Hawaii, the largest in the group. This experience has been repeated a number of years. At all events, the Japanese-Americans are gradually getting into key positions in the territorial government, and it is difficult to stop them.

Some of the far-sighted citizens in Hawaii have been watching the rapid development of this anomalous situation with silent but serious forebodings. The former Governor of Hawaii, Charles McCarthy, was one of them. When he was serving as a delegate from the territory to the United States Congress, he quietly approached the Interior and State Department authorities with the proposal that a limited number of Koreans be admitted to the territory as laborers. At that time the sugar plantations in Hawaii were in need of a fresh supply of cheap labor. The main purpose for which he submitted this proposal was, however, to have an equal number of Koreans settled side by side with the Japanese, in order to safeguard the peace and security of the territory, the most strategic insular possession of the United States. Koreans and Japanese are hereditary enemies, and Governor McCarthy saw the wisdom of such a move. As a result, the Korean Commission in Washington was advised by the Interior Department that any Koreans who were outside of Korea in 1910, the year in which Japan formally annexed Korea, would be permitted to enter the Territory of Hawaii. The Korean Commission at once took the matter up with the immigration authorities, who informed them that the Immigration Bureau could not act upon it unless the State Department issued similar instructions to that effect. The State Department

authorities frankly stated in their reply to the Korean Commission that the United States could not allow Koreans to enter without Japanese passports, because that would violate the so-called "gentlemen's agreement." That ended the negotiations.

Since there was no special restriction against Koreans, Korean students used to receive lenient treatment at the hands of the United States Immigration officials and steamship companies. Once or twice, several political refugees managed to get aboard American steamships in one of the Oriental ports, and the ship's captain, or some other officer, protected them from the Japanese police. When the refugees arrived in America, the United States authorities permitted them to enter as soon as they proved themselves to be Korean students. This special favor was too irksome to the Japanese to bear. To plug this loophole, the Japanese made a special effort to put a separate clause in the so-called "gentlemen's agreement" to the effect that Koreans, being subjects of the Mikado, should not be permitted to enter the United States without Japanese passports. Passports, so freely obtained by Japanese, were about the last thing possible for Koreans to secure. Thus Japan managed to bar Korean students from the United States. According to the Korean interpretation of this clause of the agreement, the Koreans who were not in Korea during the time of annexation, and still refused to be classified as Japanese, as most of them did and still do, should be treated as men without a country and be exempted from the passport requirement. The Interior Department readily accepted this interpretation, but the State Department in those days was anxious not to displease Tokyo, and the matter was dropped.

Now, to go back to the Japanese in Hawaii. The question of Japanese dual citizenship has been a subject of public discussion for many years. Under the Constitution of the United States, Japanese, born on American soil, are, like all other native-born, American citizens. Japan, on the other hand, claims that a Japanese is a subject of the Empire irrespective of the place of his birth. The crux of this question is to which country does an American-born Japanese owe allegiance and for

which flag will he fight? In this controversy, if the Japanese government had insisted on claiming that such a person would fight for Japan, the American government would have classified him and thousands of others as aliens, a decided disadvantage to Japan. Therefore, the Tokyo government finally agreed to give the Japanese in this category an opportunity to expatriate themselves. This arrangement was accepted as satisfactory to all concerned.

Under the alien registration act of 1940, the United States Department of Justice, granting the petition of Kilsoo Haan, representative of the Sino-Korean league, ruled that Koreans be allowed to register as Koreans, not as subjects of Japan. Earl G. Harrison, director of alien registration in Washington, announced a similar ruling. It was reported that under this ruling 2276 Koreans in Hawaii were to register as Koreans. The rest of the Koreans, some 6500 in all, according to the last census, are American citizens. The Japanese were highly dissatisfied with this ruling. Kiichi Gunji, Japanese Consul General, openly declared that American citizens of Korean parentage are still dual citizens and must be expatriated from Japan by filing their applications with the Japanese consulate in Honolulu. This stupid statement stirred up the Korean community in Honolulu to such an extent that a mass meeting was promptly called by the Korean Civic Association, and after indignant speeches and denunciations a resolution was unanimously adopted reasserting that Koreans had never recognized Japan's forcible annexation of Korea, that they never allowed themselves to be called Japanese, that they owed no allegiance to any country but the United States, and that they would take in the future, as they had taken in the past, their full share of obligation as worthy citizens of the United States.

The Japanese Consul General in Honolulu knows that Koreans born under the Stars and Stripes will never go to the Japanese for expatriation, and the Japanese in America have no way to force them to do it. No one except the Japanese would think for a moment that these young Korean-Americans should be expatriated because the Japanese are required to do it. The

reason why the Japanese are required to renounce their Japanese citizenship, if they want to become American citizens, is because under the old dual citizen law they would have been free to voluntarily take up arms for Japan in case of war. But no such requirement is needed for the Koreans, because no Korean would fight for Japan against the United States or any other nation. They would welcome an opportunity to fight Japan. The very fact that a Korean army, fully equipped and organized, is fighting the Japanese in China is significant. There is no Korean army, except in Japan's propaganda, fighting for Japan. That the Japanese dare not trust the Koreans with firearms speaks eloquently. The following instance is another evidence of Japanese animosity toward the Koreans:

The last year witnessed one of the worst famine disasters in Korea. In fact, the famine condition was so bad that it was widely reported in the American press, despite the strict censorship in Korea. If such suffering were going on in China, India, or Japan, appeals for relief would have reached the philanthropic hearts of Americans immediately and repeatedly. It is proverbial that Japan's policy of repression in Korea has built an almost impenetrable barrier between that unhappy land and the outside world.

In the early spring of 1940 the Koreans in Hawaii and the mainland made whatever contributions they could to help alleviate the famine in their mother country, and with the aid of their American friends in California and elsewhere appeals for contributions were made to the general public. Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, First Lady of the nation, graciously included the Korean famine situation in her weekly radio broadcast and also in her daily column. In conclusion, Mrs. Roosevelt said:

"I tell you all this because, while Korea is far away, perhaps you will send an occasional check to the American Red Cross, marked for these people who are just one more addition to the world's suffering people. It seems hard to sleep at night these times because the stress of homeless, hopeless people haunts one's dreams."

This touching plea in behalf of suffering humanity was bound

to bear fruit. Voluntary subscriptions increased the total of the Korean relief fund substantially. Naturally, the Koreans were made happy and grateful.

The next question was how to distribute this fund to the famine sufferers without going through a Japanese agency. If it was turned over to the Japanese consulate, to be handled by the Japanese, it would not have appeared so objectionable to the Japanese, perhaps. But the Koreans would not think of such a thing, and subsequently they made arrangements with the American Mission Board in Korea to distribute the fund among the most needy ones. This was too much for the Japanese to keep quiet about. The Japanese Consul General in Honolulu made another misleading statement, asserting that there was no famine in Korea. He said, in part:

“It is unthinkable that Korea today is suffering from a large scale famine as some reports reaching here have stated. . . . I have never heard or read of such disastrous famine yet. If there were such famine, the Japanese government would have taken immediate steps to remedy the situation.”

By making that statement, the Japanese Consul General made the situation all the worse for Japan. The outside world had learned through more trustworthy sources than the Japanese consulate that the suffering was worse than was generally known. One would like to know the reason why the Japanese so strenuously objected to American relief funds going into Korea. Was it in pursuit of the policy of repression? If so, the policy does not seem to kill or even dampen the Korean spirit. On the contrary, that spirit grows stronger inwardly as the pressure from without becomes harder. Yet the Japanese blindly refuse to see this.

In connection with the Sino-Japanese war, it is evident that Japan has to recruit her man power, not only at home, but abroad as well. Instructions were issued last year by the Tokyo government to all Japanese consuls abroad to conduct a census of all Japanese subjects everywhere. Under the guise of census taking, they were to recruit Japanese males who were subject to service

in the Japanese army. Somehow American authorities in Washington learned of this and started an investigation. Upon inquiry, the Japanese consul in New York replied, "This is the routine official census of our subjects living in all foreign countries, as well as in Japan, compiled by our government every five years." In this connection, the consul unwittingly made the significant statement that the instructions issued from Tokyo had "no special reference to those born between February 2, 1920, and December 1, 1921, because these persons, under Japanese law, would be subject to service in Japan's army in 1941." It was an indirect admission that those born in America are subject to Japanese military service when they reach military age, and are to go back to their country for service voluntarily. This admission is directly contradictory to the statement which Japanese diplomats and propagandists had so constantly repeated, that Japanese born in America are not subject to Japanese military service. It is clear, then, that all the Japanese fishermen along the American coast and in Hawaiian and Philippine waters, who have surveyed and charted these waters, as well as those who are otherwise employed elsewhere in America, would attempt to go back to their country should Japan call them to contribute their unique services in the cause of empire building. They would be invaluable assets to the Nipponese militarists, especially should there be an attack upon the United States.

Alaska

American navy and aviation experts seem to agree that of all the strategic possessions of the United States in the Pacific covering the vast distance from Manila, Guam, and Hawaii, Alaska is, from the military standpoint, the most strategically situated. From there to the nearest Asiatic coast is only twenty-five miles. With sufficient equipment, the American forces there could easily check both Russian and Japanese bombing planes should they attempt to fly over American territory. Russia's attitude toward Japan remains highly uncertain, even though Foreign Minister Matsuoka succeeded in signing a pact with Russia on April 13,

1941. The interests of the two countries are too diametrically opposed for any agreement between them to have much substance. In any event, American fliers could sweep down upon the islands of Japan from this base much more quickly than from any other point.

The navy has ordered material costing \$4,305,000 for the construction of air bases on Kodiak and Unalaska islands, which are United States territory the closest to Japan. Meanwhile, the United States navy has reinforced its land forces with infantry, artillery, and anti-aircraft troops in these bases. Hundreds of planes are being delivered there for defense purposes.

Australia

The Australians, in their lonely outpost of the British Empire, have had very little to do directly with Japan. To the Japanese expansionists this was an unbearable attitude. As one of the "have not" nations, suffering intensely because of lack of land for her surplus population, Japan regarded it as an injustice that such a vast continent as Australia, inhabited by a relatively small white population, should close its doors to Japanese immigrants. Japan long ago included all the South Sea islands in her military and naval blue prints. Her plan was to leave them alone, without raising questions as to their political status, until the Japanese navy was strong enough to control the Pacific; then all these problems would automatically be settled by the Japanese. That is what Baron Tanaka referred to in his memorial when he said, "The South Sea countries will surrender to us."

It is noteworthy that as early as August 18, 1940, Premier Robert G. Menzies, of the Commonwealth of Australia, announced the appointment of Sir John Greig Lotham as Australia's first Minister to Japan. He expressed the hope that a Japanese Minister to Australia would arrive shortly, because "this exchange of diplomatic representatives was the culmination of a desire of both countries for more direct and intimate relationship."

This diplomatic gesture on the part of Australia at this juncture was by no means voluntary. It was due either to pressure

from London or fear of Tokyo that the Commonwealth government changed its policy and slightly relaxed its immigration restrictions. Instead of saying "No" outright to the "friendly and neighborly" advances made by Nipponese diplomats, it was considered wise to let them in. That is how Japan forced a "white man's country" to open its doors while she is bolting down every possible door against the white man.

Nevertheless, Australia's opening of intercourse by the exchange of diplomatic representatives with Japan augurs ill. The situation of Australia is not altogether dissimilar to that of Korea in 1876, when Korea was induced to open her doors to commercial intercourse with her island neighbor. It is like the story of the camel, which, permitted to stick its head inside the tent, finally moved its whole body in and became the sole occupant. Japan is the sole ruler of Korea, although the Koreans still refuse to recognize her as such. It is hoped, however, the Australians will learn a lesson from the Koreans' experience.

Mexico

Mexico is one of the twenty-one republics of America which pledged at the Pan-American Conference in Havana to co-operate with the United States in protecting the Western hemisphere under the principles of the Monroe Doctrine.

In its policy of friendship and collaboration with the United States, the Mexican government has been enforcing a strict embargo on exports of war materials and foodstuffs to Japan. Secret agents of the Federal Attorney General's office have impounded thousands of tons of such items as oil, flour, molybdenum, scrap iron, mercury, antimony, and fibers, which were ready for shipment to Japan in various Mexican ports. Later, it was announced in Mexico City that this embargo would be lifted, "because the ban on the exports of war materials to Japan threatened to upset the nation's economy at this time." However, a government spokesman made it clear that if international developments make it necessary, "Mexico would co-operate with the United States and the other republics by officially proclaiming such an embargo against Japan."

Argentina

It will be remembered that when the twenty-one American republics were represented at the Havana Conference under the leadership of the Secretary of State of the United States of America, Argentina presented the first "discordant note" to the proposed hemisphere policy. About that time Japan made special efforts to tie up, commercially at least, with some of the Central and South American republics in opposition to the United States. She had little success, except in Argentina and Uruguay. Whether or not this has any connection with the dissenting attitude of the Argentine delegates at the Pan-American Conference is hard to determine. At any rate, during the latter part of April, 1940, Japan concluded two treaties of trade and navigation, one with Argentina and the other with Uruguay. On May 5 of that year, both Tokyo and Buenos Aires announced the ratification of the pact. When the import license regulations published by the Argentine Government covering the operations of the treaty with Japan were disclosed, it was seen that there was much more discrimination against the United States in favor of Japan than originally had been supposed. In most cases Japan received preferential treatment decidedly better than that accorded the United States. In the fifty classifications of import articles in which the United States was discriminated against, thirty-one classifications were items considered most important in United States trade with Argentina. The importation of these goods from America is now either embargoed entirely or highly restricted.

In the matter of textile goods Japanese exports to Argentina were limited by quota, but American importation has been embargoed. Furthermore, since Japan has obtained the privilege of issuing import licenses, the United States has been singled out to the extent of "what amounts to a virtual black list," as observed by a well-informed commentator.

Uruguay

The Japan-Uruguay treaty, signed about the time the Japan-Argentina treaty was signed, contained nearly the same stipula-

tions. There is, however, one exceptional proviso, which excludes the privileges granted by either of the contracting parties to its neighboring countries and also the privileges based on customs unions. While this treaty contained an "unconditional" most favored nation clause, the privileges enjoyed by the members of the customs union were not to be extended by either of the contracting parties to the other. By this proviso Japan kept herself free to make any arrangement. In short, Japan's new commercial ties with independent states in the Western hemisphere at this time are ominous, to say the least.

It should be remembered that America's main artery of communication between its navy in two oceans is the Panama Canal. A large Japanese population in Brazil and some other South American countries may furnish some Trojan horses in time of stress. All they need is a connecting link, commercial or otherwise; hence these new "treaties of trade and navigation." America's hemispheric policy focusses its attention mainly on Nazi activities on this side of the Atlantic and may overlook the Japanese threat.

Tokyo and Berlin have repeatedly echoed and re-echoed their shouts for "a new world order," saying that if the United States recognized a Monroe Doctrine of Asia for Japan and a Monroe Doctrine of Europe for the Nazis, they would recognize the Monroe Doctrine of the Americas for the United States. To "recognize" now a doctrine that even they themselves had never challenged was of a piece with the crass ignorance of American history and American character which the dictators have displayed.

By this method, however, the Japanese hoped to be left alone in building their Asiatic empire. By dividing the West they hoped to conquer Asia now as the Germans are attempting to conquer Europe. It is an insane hope, we may say. But let us remember that all militarists are crazy when they are drunk with the glory of conquest. That is where the danger lies. Many people regret that we have allowed this insanity to go so far.

XI

THE UNITED STATES NAVAL INCREASE

THEODORE ROOSEVELT, as President of the United States, stated in 1905, in defense of the Japanese treaty rights against California anti-Japanese legislation, that "if we want to fight Japan, we must have the navy of the United States combined with that of Great Britain." It was an open acknowledgment that, since the United States navy was not strong enough, the United States must yield what Japan demanded. That was the time of President Roosevelt's famous phrase, "Speak softly but carry a big stick." Since that time, when the United States navy was not so strong as it is now, American statesmen have undergone many humiliating experiences. There was no awareness until Hitlerism awoke the nation to its peril. The people, ignorant of the world situation, self-satisfied and self-sufficient, would never tolerate any tendency toward an increase of the nation's war strength. Peace-loving citizens throughout the country, trusting Japanese diplomatic and propaganda assertions, saw no need of national preparedness. All this self-imposed American naval weakness of an earlier day served to amuse and gratify the proud militarists in Tokyo, for thus, they thought, they could hold the United States while they themselves rapidly forged ahead. The more successful they were, the haughtier and more menacing they became, and now and then boldly stated, "If Americans fail to respect the national susceptibilities of Japan, there will be 'grave consequences,'" and "If they do not desist from meddling in Far Eastern affairs they will soon see the Rising Sun flag flying from the top of the Empire State Building," and the like. Americans who understood what it meant generally took it good-naturedly, while most of them, not knowing what it really meant, paid no attention.

There were a few American statesmen, far-sighted enough to

be apprehensive of the growing danger in the Pacific, who tried to check it before it was too late. They observed, with some apprehension, that the alliance between Great Britain and Japan was still in force and that it might be productive of a delicate situation. Sentiment against the alliance was aroused among the British people and in Canada, too, and it was terminated by mutual consent at the Washington Arms Limitation Conference of 1921. It was succeeded by the Five-Power naval pact with the 5-5-3 building ratio. By scrapping some of its battleships and voluntarily setting a limit to its naval construction program, the United States set a self-denying example in the hope that others would follow. Japan followed only in words. Carrying on her own construction program under cover, she soon succeeded in approximating the strength of her rivals, and when her secret preparations for war reached their scheduled height in 1935, she threw off her mask and started another invasion of helpless China, in open defiance of the entire world and in violation of all treaties with other powers.

At a late hour, then, Americans learned to their sorrow that they might have prevented the present crisis if they had been more observant and less trusting in the days when Japan was beginning to design her pattern for tomorrow. More than any other incident, the *Panay* bombing thoroughly awakened the American nation to the fact that Japan will do anything as a means to an end.

At the same time the Nazi threat, the western counterpart of Japan, emerged bigger and nearer to the Western hemisphere, while Nipponese expansion drew nearer to the Pacific side of the United States. The President's national defense program requiring huge naval appropriations met with little opposition. The mission of the United States is clear. The Open-Door principle in China must be maintained, treaty rights of Americans in the Orient must be protected, and Japan's dream of expansion in the Pacific must be limited. If the Japanese become convinced that the United States is both willing and able to carry out its policies, regardless of the consequences, this can be achieved without firing a single shot.

Despite the strict censorship enforced in Japan, the United States navy learned that Japan was constructing a powerful "hit-and-run" fleet capable of forty knots. In comparison, the heaviest cruisers in the United States navy were only 10,000-ton ships, armed with 8-inch guns. In addition, Japan was reported to have authorized construction of three dreadnoughts in the 46,000-ton class, five aircraft carriers, forty-three destroyers, eight light cruisers, and eight submarines. If this information were correct, Japan's fighting force would be tremendously more powerful than any American or British force. American and British naval experts agreed that these new Japanese ships would represent, perhaps, the most powerful offensive sea weapon in existence, and that, with their speed, they could scourge the shipping lanes of the world.

The United States and Great Britain requested Japan to furnish information about her secret building program. Japan refused to comply. The United States and Great Britain decided to compete with Japan in the naval race. Since Japan refused to keep any longer within the 5-5-3 ratio, and had started to build beyond that limit, the only course for America and Britain was to increase their own navies proportionately.

On April 2, 1938, the American and British governments simultaneously made public an announcement that they would build dreadnoughts greater than the 35,000-ton limit established at the London Conference of 1935. They revealed also that they based their decisions on the refusal by Japan to inform them whether or not she intended to build or was building dreadnoughts bigger than 35,000 tons. The British announcement concluded:

"In view of the refusal of the Japanese government, on being formally approached, to give assurances that these reports were ill founded, His Majesty's Government had no alternative but to regard them as substantially correct."

Senator David I. Walsh, chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, made public on April 3, 1940, the State Department's response to a Senate Naval Affairs Committee's

request for a statement of policy for maintaining a fleet sixty per cent more powerful than that of Japan. The statement observed that "it is believed to be in the interest of security for us to adhere to the principle of 5-5-3 naval ratio," that "Japan refuses to give assurances she would comply with any restrictions in naval construction, and the United States must build accordingly." It was clearly set forth that the term "national defense only," which was inserted in the naval expansion bill, included defense of the homeland and outlying territories from invasion or aircraft attack, protection of citizens' legitimate business abroad, protection of commerce and the merchant marine to maintain the American standard of living. This was decidedly a change in the American naval policy, and came as a blow to Japan's secret plan to become the mistress of the Pacific. The military leaders of Japan had fully expected that peace-loving America would shrink into its shell of isolation. Now they were disappointed and perturbed.

Whenever the Japanese made a propaganda statement relating to some important international issue, they found, almost without fail, that the reaction in America was more or less satisfactory to them. It was perhaps nothing but a coincidence, but when such coincidences were repeated time and time again, it seemed rather strange. Notice the two following instances, for example:

(1) *Naval conference.* When the Japanese delegates withdrew from the London Naval Conference in December, 1935, the military leaders in Tokyo began to bluster toward the United States. On January 16, 1936, Vice Admiral Takahashi, commander of the battle fleet, said, "If the Japanese navy is called to fight the combined power of America and Great Britain, I am confident we will win, even if the ratio is 10 to 1." Rear Admiral Kiyoshi Noda, chief of the Japanese information bureau, said on January 20, "Japan still is ready to participate in a limitation conference, provided that she will be assured a policy on nonaggression, nonmenace, and a common upper limit with other world powers."

This was a deliberate attempt to mislead the American public

to the belief that it was the American and not the Japanese government which had started the naval building race and that, therefore, the American people should urge their government to halt the construction program, regardless of whatever the Japanese might feel necessary to build. Comparatively few people in America knew, or even cared to know, that the Japanese in their efforts to outbuild the United States and Great Britain tried to wipe out the naval ratio 5-5-3 or 10-10-7, and when that failed, they broke loose from the naval conference of 1935. Noda, knowing this fact, deliberately made this appeal to the peace sentiment in America, and he was not disappointed. Letters and telegrams pressing the government to call an international conference for the reduction of armaments went out. The State Department found it necessary to explain the situation in its statement of policy, made public April 3, through Senator Walsh, that "the United States would welcome an agreement to reduce naval arms, but a world conference now would be untimely." This ended the naval reduction issue for the time being. Whenever the leaders in Tokyo could see any advantage in digging up this question again, the discussion on this topic would surely revive in America.

(2) *The question of naval frontier.* Japan has for years regarded the Pacific ocean as "Japan's lake" or "Japan's back yard." Her diplomats and propagandists have declared this openly and repeatedly. Each time Japan claimed her supremacy over it as if it were her own, Americans overlooked the claim. Since no one objected to their saying it, the Japanese kept on repeating it, until it gradually became a habit for them to look at it as such, with the tacit approval of the United States. Thus having established, according to the Japanese way of thinking, undisputed claim to mastery of the Pacific, all American activities in the Pacific were regarded as an encroachment upon Japan's sphere of influence. This was the reason that the Japanese raised strong objections whenever the question of naval maneuvers in Hawaiian waters, an air base at Manila, fortification of Guam, or some other such undertaking, was taken up in the United States. In their minds all these actions were at Japanese suf-

ference. When Japanese naval strength reached a certain stage, they would stop. Was this not predicted by Baron Tanaka? Thus American complacency and tolerance allowed a molehill to grow into a mountain now impossible to remove without a clash.

It is noteworthy that an attempt was made in the United States Congress to establish a naval frontier between the United States and Japan. The idea was to draw an imaginary line somewhere across the Pacific, to be regarded as a boundary line between the two nations. The proposal shows there were some persons in Congress who still believed that the trouble among nations was due to lack of agreements. They seem to have forgotten that there had once been boundary lines between Japan and Korea, between Korea and Manchuria, and so on. To allow Japan to destroy the old lines one after another, and, as she advances, to keep on establishing new lines always nearer to American coasts would not be sound policy. The State Department blasted this idea by declaring in its statement of policy already quoted that "any efforts to establish a naval frontier would circumscribe activity of the navy behind an imaginary Japanese wall and expose American citizens to attack everywhere in the world."

This was a little too much for the Japanese to accept without objection. So long as American naval expansion was limited to the California coast, Japan would acquiesce, but this statement of policy has extended its scope. It included the Hawaiian Islands, the Philippines, and other American possessions in the Pacific. More than that, it was intended to protect United States nationals and their legitimate business abroad, which meant treaty rights of Americans in the Far East. The Japanese gathered that the United States did not intend to give up everything in the Orient or in the Pacific.

K. Noda, official spokesman of the Japanese navy, commenting at length upon the Japanese navy's conception of the western Pacific situation, on April 7 declared:

"Formerly America regarded her defense area as near the coast

line, but Secretary of State Hull's letter to Senator Walsh indicated America's defense line is advancing westward. . . . If American policy means sticking to the 5-5-3 naval ratio among Great Britain, the United States, and Japan, and opposing establishment of a definite naval frontier, we are watching with very grave concern."

Is it not clear, then, that the contention between the United States and Japan is over the mastery of the Pacific Ocean? It is up to the American people to decide whether they shall let Japan control the Pacific in order to maintain peace until Japan gets ready further to advance her expansion or insist, even at the risk of war, upon keeping the great ocean as an international highway.

When the Senate Naval Affairs Committee reported, April 18, 1940, on the naval expansion bill, urging prompt passage of the \$1,156,546,000 program, Senator Gerald P. Nye condemned it as a "challenge to other nations to increase their shipbuilding." He said, "We are basing our plans on rumors or gossip of what the Japanese may be doing." Senator Walsh replied, "Every government has certain official staffs in foreign countries which supply it with information of foreign activities." Senator Nye responded, "Those who would profit by large shipbuilding activities may be eager to convince us other nations are doing certain things that will induce us to undertake large programs. If we do this, we are only throwing a challenge to other nations which have no intention of building large navies. Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg asserted that a navy within the terms of the Vinson-Trammell act "will be thoroughly adequate for our defense if we mind our own business and stay out of other people's wars." Of course, this was just the attitude Japan wanted to create in this country. Because of the general awakening of public sentiment, however, the senators' statements could not halt the steady progress of naval development.

Former United States Ambassador to Canada J. H. R. Cromwell reported in a lecture at the University of Chicago that early in December, 1940, the Japanese Foreign Minister, Yosuke Matsuoka, said, in effect, that if Japan decided the United States

was giving too much help to Britain, Japan might attack this country. Japan, in other words, notified the United States that if its foreign policies did not meet her approval she would make war against the United States. At that time the United States fleet was in Hawaii, the British completely controlled the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and Singapore, and important allied forces blocked Japan in the south. Also hostile Russian aircraft and well equipped troops were stationed in the north, and determined Chinese armies faced hundreds of thousands of Japanese soldiers in the west. If Matsuoka did not hesitate to threaten the United States under such circumstances, what might be expected if all these deterrents were swept away, as they would be if the British were defeated and the United States fleet had to be moved to the Atlantic?

XII

JAPANESE PROPAGANDA SHOULD BE CHECKED

IN the beginning of commercial intercourse between the East and the West the general tendency among the rank and file of American people was to ridicule and discriminate against the Orientals. The Chinese were the first group of the Orientals to come to the United States. Children in the streets insulted them openly. Barber shops and restaurants refused to serve them. Books, magazine articles, newspaper stories, and public lectures were characterized by jokes at the expense of the Asiatics. Neither the government nor any of the civic societies paid any attention to this practice. The Chinese, having no alternative, took it as a matter of course.

Later the Chinese immigration laws barred them from entry into the United States. Then the Japanese came in in hordes, especially after the Sino-Japanese war of 1894, by which Japan won the admiration of the American people. This influx of immigrants soon resulted in anti-Japanese labor agitation on the Western coast and anti-Japanese legislation in California. The proud Japanese resented all this and sought to stop it by the following two methods:

The first was a retaliatory measure. One of the labor rioters who had taken part in one of the anti-Japanese mob gatherings near San Francisco was seized by a Japanese at a trolley car station and was stabbed to death. Two or three other cases more or less similar to this were reported in different sections of California almost simultaneously. Every Japanese attacker subsequently surrendered to the local police. Then appeared Japanese newspaper statements which said in substance, "The Japanese, having no way of redress, are forced to resort to direct action to avenge themselves. Any person or persons who would

deliberately offer either an insult or injustice to a Japanese without cause shall meet with the same measure of punishment. The Japanese as a people would rather be feared and respected than patted and abused."

This story spread all over the country like wild fire, and created at once a shocking and startling effect throughout the country. Unconsciously a sense of fear, perhaps more mental than physical, gradually affected the consciousness of the American people, who began to regard the Japanese with a certain degree of respect. And that feeling of fear thus created was so deeply implanted that it still persists in some sections of the country, where one often hears it said that "to do or say anything hurtful to the Japanese is dangerous and unwise." This was the beginning of the Japanese conquest of American public opinion.

The second was the inauguration of the Japanese propaganda movement in America. It was reported in the American press in May, 1940, that Japan spends at least \$5,000,000 a year in this country for propaganda, according to a United States Intelligence Official's estimate. Practically every large city has one or more Japanese propagandists, it was said. This activity was openly inaugurated nearly thirty-five years ago with an annual appropriation of not less than \$1,000,000. This appropriation has fluctuated from time to time, in proportion to the gravity of the situation. How the money has been spent or how the executive work has been carried on are known only to those in the inner circle. But the result could not escape the attention of close observers. All the Japanese agencies, wherever they were, were controlled from Tokyo. Whatever was said, orally or in writing, had to come from the same source, and the uniformity of the idea embodied or information disseminated was most effective. The charm of the people, the beauty of the country, the silk kimonos, cherry blossoms, and the ancient culture, which "excelled" Western civilization, were fascinating themes for newspaper and magazine articles.

All this, together with prepared statements, or news dispatches or interviews made public by Japanese diplomats, visiting admirals, viscounts, tourists, and good-will parties, coming out

almost every day in many newspapers throughout the country, was bound to produce the desired effect. One very important objective was to win over the most influential person or persons in every organization in America. And anyone whom the Japanese could not win over would be branded as "anti-Japanese" and when he went to the Orient would be so inhospitably treated that he would refrain from saying anything unfavorable to Japan. Of course, everybody considered to be a friend of the Japanese would be treated royally, with entertainments, and some persons would receive decorations. Everyone who had means to travel would expect to visit the Orient some day, and he would not want to be considered an enemy of the Japanese. And on top of all this, most of the big concerns in America had business connections in Japan and would not do or say anything that would displease the Japanese.

During the early stage of the publicity organizations, it was a common practice, if a newspaper came out with any article derogatory to Japan or the Japanese, to have many letters addressed to the editor and also many telephone calls criticizing and condemning him for publishing such an "anti-Japanese" story. This method taught the editor such a lesson that he would refuse to print anything, true or false, which might annoy the Japanese or their friends. At the same time, anything that would flatter the Japanese occupied the front page or a prominent place. Through this process, the Japanese gradually succeeded in creating a peculiar psychology in America, so that any anti-Japanese sentiment was generally tabooed, except among labor groups. Anyone who was branded as an anti-Japanese was regarded as a fanatic or as badly informed. Yet when Japanese propagandists or their paid agents publicly made humiliating jokes at the expense of the American people, their government, or policy, most Americans seemed to enjoy it immensely, and few there were who showed resentment. Freedom of speech and a spirit of tolerance are two of the great democratic principles of America, and the Japanese took full advantage of them. But how far a democratic nation can permit a militaristic neighbor to come and conquer domestic public

opinion is a question which the American people must consider quite seriously.

So long as the American policy ran parallel with that of Japan, as it did during the early part of President Theodore Roosevelt's administration, the Japanese propaganda agencies had no difficulty with the American government. If the two nations followed opposite directions, these agencies worked for the interest of Tokyo against that of the American people. Most naturally, they would line up with the political party, antagonistic to the administration in power, and also with any other elements that would help undermine the policy of the President or the Secretary of State. Even today they keep in touch with the military and civilian officers in Japan and check up exactly the changing pulse of the nation. Tokyo issues instructions and these agencies carry them out. Through the daily newspapers, public addresses, and quiet whispering campaigns, they attempt to swing public opinion whichever way they desire. And on many an occasion these subversive activities have forced the administration and the Secretary of State unconsciously to alter their policy.

Some of the stories illustrating how Japan succeeded in winning the support of the American people during the establishment of a puppet government and ultimate annexation of Korea (1910) will give an idea of how Japan tried to win American support in her China campaign.

Professor Ladd of Yale was invited by Prince Ito to visit Korea and write a book, *With Marquis Ito in Korea*. When he returned to America, he lectured extensively in the interest of the Japanese regime in Korea. However, the book was so obviously pro-Japanese that Ito himself became disgusted with it and remarked that the author had overdone it, and the book has no propaganda value.

George Kenon was sent to Korea as a special correspondent for *The Outlook* magazine, of which Dr. Lyman Abbott was the editor and President Theodore Roosevelt was a corresponding editor. Kenon did his job thoroughly. He wrote a series of articles describing how corrupt and helpless the Korean govern-

ment was and how beneficial it would be to the Korean people to be under the rule of Japan.

During the Japanese invasion of Manchuria, George Sokolsky wrote article after article for a New York paper, replete with stinging remarks on China, and advocating every move Japan was making in her invasion. The purpose was, apparently, not only to hurt China, the victim of military conquest, but also to combat the Far Eastern policy of Secretary of State Henry Stimson. Many influential Americans, deeply exasperated, wrote letters to the editor of that paper, but to no avail. There was no possible interpretation for this, except that the American press in those days still believed that it was the way to serve America best.

Even during the present Sino-Japanese conflict, it is generally believed that American sentiment is ninety or ninety-five per cent for China. To all appearances, every newspaper throughout the country is more or less against Japan. If this is really so, why is it that Japan gets ammunition from America with which to crush China, while China secures comparatively very little support to carry out her defensive war?

The United States is the only nation that has no national propaganda machinery of its own. Every other nation has such machinery, and seems to be benefited by it. All the totalitarian countries have their agencies in this country, and leave no stone unturned in trying to get what they want. And, generally, they get it at the expense of the United States.

It is high time for the American patriotic societies to start a nation-wide propaganda machinery, independent of political creeds or religious faiths, to counteract all the un-American and subversive propaganda influences. If the United States is to face all these odds, it is up to the patriotic citizens to exert their concerted efforts to protect its interests, institutions, and principles in time of peace as well as in time of war.

There are many periodicals in America that are American in name only. Japan spends millions of dollars annually in this country for the purpose of misleading the American public. Unless every true American journalist makes it his patriotic duty

to guide public opinion in the right direction and to fight the sinister alien influence of falsification, the United States will be greatly handicapped in establishing a just and lasting peace.

Recently some of the leading newspapers began to show a tendency not to publish any Japanese articles that bore the marks of propaganda, without comment or explanation of them. For instance, the *Washington Star* on May 4, 1941, printed an article by Felix Morley, who suggested a careful study of Tokyo's proposal to negotiate peace on a basis that would leave Japan supreme in Asia, the Axis powers master of Europe and Africa, and relegate the United States to the position of a third-rate power. The editor of the *Washington Star* said in a note: "The *Star* does not accept Mr. Morley's thesis or share his conclusions. And it should be pointed out that 'a negotiated peace' even approximating the terms of the Japanese proposals would be tantamount to capitulation not only by England but by the United States, and a clear-cut victory for the Axis powers."

Such an analysis should be made of every newspaper article or dispatch emanating from Japanese or pro-Japanese sources. For, without such guidance, most of the news readers would blindly follow the course cleverly mapped out by the war lords in Tokyo. Uncensored news from Japan or the Japanese-occupied regions is almost impossible. Any correspondence passed by the Japanese censors most likely contains in it something sugar-coated which Japan wants the American people to swallow. Therefore, it should not be permitted to reach the news-reading public without exposing the poison concealed therein.

XIII

PACIFISTS IN AMERICA

IT was in 1934, when I was living in a downtown hotel in New York City, that I found my good friend Dr. S. S. stopping at the same hotel. For several days he had been asking me to go with him to call on a couple of friends, peace-loving people, who had asked him to bring me along to one of their afternoon teas. One afternoon I went with him to a beautiful residence on Park Avenue. As we were ushered in, I noticed the elegant and tasteful arrangement of the furniture and ornamental art pieces which reflected the refinement and culture of the occupants. It was a pleasure to find myself in such quiet serenity in the heart of that hustling and bustling metropolis. I was introduced to the lady, who was full of gentle grace and charm, and then to her husband, who was a perfect gentleman. They were perhaps a little beyond middle age. Both were very cordial to me and made me feel really at home. If I remember correctly, he was editing a peace magazine of his own. As we were being seated, the gentleman surprised me by asking me the following question: "Dr. Rhee, if your enemies were to invade your country, would you take up arms and go out to fight them?"

"Yes, I would," I replied, without a second thought. Then he bent down to look me full in the face, as if to watch my reaction, and said, "You are a militarist." I blushed, but managed, with some effort, to restrain myself. After a little while I excused myself and left. From that time to this I have never learned what sort of an impression I left on those good people, but I know they left me with a poor opinion of the fanatical pacifists in this country.

I used to have, and I still have, a high respect for the peace advocates who, like the Confucian philosophers of the Orient,

condemn war as an evil which every civilized man should shun and spurn. I hold in high esteem the "conscientious objectors" who, for the sake of religious convictions or humanitarian principles, refuse to take up arms against their fellow men. But those militant pacifists who are opposed to any and every kind of war, whether for national defense, national honor, or national independence, are, to my mind, just as dangerous and subversive as any "fifth columnist." Their motives may be different, but the results will be the same. They are, though unconsciously, courting disaster for their nation. While they make no effort to keep war-making nations from waging aggressive wars, they try to keep their own nonaggressive nation from preparing even for defense. If Americans are to condemn all the wars their country has ever fought, they should destroy the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial and do away with all the liberty and justice, the fruit of the wars, which are their priceless heritage. Therefore, any man who refuses to fight for his country because he believes in peace has no claim on my sympathy.

As I have said before, I was, and still am, a man of peace, but to be called by an American a "militarist" was an intolerable insult. The good people who called me such did not know of my experiences in Korea, or, perhaps, it was just their usual way of preaching their peace ideas to everyone they met. To tell the truth, if I had been a militarist thirty-five years ago and if the rest of the world had not stood idly by while militaristic Japan destroyed nonmilitaristic Korea, I would not have become "a man without a country," as I now am. A brief account of how the peace-loving Kingdom of Korea lost its independence and how the 23,000,000 Koreans have become slaves of their hereditary enemies, the Japanese, may serve a useful purpose.

The Koreans had managed to maintain their independence for nearly forty-five centuries, despite all the wars of invasion by their warlike neighbors, including that of Hideyoshi, "the Napoleon of Japan," which was more devastating and more inhuman than the recent Nazi invasions of Norway, Denmark, Holland, and France. The Koreans were satisfied with their

own rulers and were determined to defend at any cost the peaceful life of their ancient kingdom. They were enjoying a standard of Oriental civilization which was claimed to be even higher than that of China, especially since the Manchu conquest of China in the early part of the seventeenth century. At that time the Chinese were forced to forego the early influence of the Tang civilization, the golden age of the Confucian world, and to adopt in its place the Manchu culture, of which the wearing of the queue, instead of the topknot, and heavy robes of the North are examples. Meanwhile, the Koreans were left unmolested to retain the old customs of the Tang dynasty, among which was the wearing of large round hats and loose white garments, which some of the ignorant Western tourists find so much fun in ridiculing, in spite of the fact that they are to Koreans the very badges of their bygone glories. At any rate, the Koreans made no trouble for others and wanted none from the rest of the world. However, the Korean isolationists were not left alone to enjoy their peace after 1882, when the Western powers, led by the United States, began to make commercial treaties with Korea. Will the American isolationists of today be left alone to enjoy their peace? Probabilities are overwhelming that they will not.

During the latter part of the nineteenth century, America was casting about to find new markets for its products. Following the footsteps of Commodore Perry, who succeeded in forcing Japan to open her doors to intercourse with Western powers, Admiral Shufelt knocked at the door of the Hermit Kingdom and asked its government to open treaty relations with the United States. The Korean government declined the offer on the ground that they "had had too much trouble with their neighbors, especially Japan; and chose to remain detached." America promised its assistance in case of trouble. With that understanding, Korea made the treaty of 1882, containing the "amity clause" (see page 24), which was destined to make a lot of mischief and misunderstanding later. That treaty was, however, welcomed in America because it proved to be advantageous to American commercial interests.

When Japan began to "deal unjustly and oppressively" with Korea, the Korean Emperor asked the American government to "use its good offices," as had been promised. But nothing came of the request, and Japan had her own way. The American failure to take some action was excused on the ground that the Emperor was weak, the government officials animated by corruption and intrigue, and the Korean people ignorant and supine. But all this does not alter fact. The truth remains the same; the more attempt was made to change it, the more it remained the same.

Willard Straight's diary covering that period of history is regarded as an authentic and authoritative version of the death of Korea as a nation. Herbert Croly, author of *Willard Straight*, revealed many important facts in his ninth chapter, under the heading, "The Murder of a Nation," based on that diary. Straight was in Korea at that time as a reporter and observer with the new United States Minister, E. V. Morgan. He was not in complete sympathy with the Korean policy adopted by the Administration, but he had to follow the crowd.

By briefly quoting from his book I will try to prove how unsound and void were some of the arguments made in defense of the American policy of that time. At one place he says:

"In their foolish agony the Korean rulers appealed to the American diplomats in Seoul as the representatives of the only power which might come to their assistance. Doubtless it was a foolish promise."

If it was really foolish, the Koreans were not alone responsible for it. The United States Senate and the President of the United States, as well as the State Department, all gave their approval and affixed their signatures to the treaty, thus making it a law of the United States. President Chester A. Arthur proclaimed of the Korean Treaty, that "every clause and article must be observed and fulfilled with good faith by the United States and the citizens thereof." No one then seemed to have noticed the "foolishness" of it. When the Korean Emperor and the Korean government were granting special privileges and

concessions to citizens of the United States, such as the franchise for the first railway lines in Korea, the first trolley car lines, and the richest gold mines in Korea, no American saw Korean un-wisdom in any of these. But now that Americans were asked to do something in the way of keeping their promise, they saw nothing but the ignorance and idiocy of the Korean people. This did not absolve them from their treaty obligations, but they acted as though it did.

"They were advised to make an open protest, but the Koreans did not do it," said Straight in the diary.

What was meant by an "open protest"? The Koreans did not make a secret of their attitude. With the exception of one or two traitors in the Cabinet, as in the French government under Nazi control in 1940, all the ministers were absolutely against the Japanese occupation, and Prince Min's suicide as a protest was evidence of it. Senator Newland's advice to the Emperor, to "engage the service of an international lawyer and to make a dignified protest," was not acceptable, because the lawyer might join hands with the Japanese, and it would only make a bad situation worse. The reason the Americans insisted on open resistance was because they knew that the faint-hearted Emperor, who was constantly in fear of being assassinated by the Japanese, as had been the Queen, did not have the courage to make a bold stand against the Japanese. The ministers and the Korean people did all they could to resist, but the Americans were not in a position to know it. Let us grant that the Koreans failed to make a successful resistance. Does this alter the fact that America failed to act? Not in the least. There is no provision of any nature in the treaty which required Korea to resist successfully before they could ask America to take action. All that the treaty required was that ". . . upon being informed of the case, the other shall exert its good offices to bring about an amicable settlement." Straight said in his diary, "The Emperor sent word that he had a letter that he wanted sent to the President. Morgan refused to have anything to do with it." How could he, as the United States Minister Plenipotentiary to Korea, refuse to convey a formal letter which the

Korean Sovereign requested him to send to his President? But he knew that the Emperor's letter would, if presented, place the President in an embarrassing position, and, therefore, he "refused to have anything to do with it."

The Emperor entrusted Professor Homer B. Hulbert * with a letter to be delivered to the President. Mr. Hulbert was one of the three well-known American educators in Korea, having been recommended by the State Department at the request of the Korean government soon after the opening of diplomatic relations between the two countries. He informed Mr. Morgan of his secret mission. When he arrived in Washington, he found difficulties in presenting the letter, and the delivery was very much delayed.

"The American Minister had no authority to translate this promise into substantial assistance," said Straight. Who asked the American Minister or anyone else to interpret the treaty? It was written in plain English that the United States was to use its "good offices"—and that was all that America was asked to do, as it had promised. No one asked for "substantial assistance." All that Korea asked America to do was simply what the "good offices" implied. I challenge any American to say that the United States lived up to its obligations.

The argument that the Koreans could not help themselves, and, therefore, it was useless for the United States to do anything for them, has no logic in it. If they were completely able to help themselves, why should they ask the United States or any other nation on earth to help them? When does one need friendly help the most? Does he need it when he is stronger than his enemy?

"McLeavy Brown was willing to publish many facts which he knows with regard to them [the Japanese]," said Straight in his diary. "There is one thing I want to do, that is, to give people some idea of what the Japanese occupation of Korea really means. The thing that must be done is to unbluff the world," he said further on.

* *The Passing of Korea*, by Homer B. Hulbert. Doubleday, Page and Company.

Why the promise was not kept the book does not reveal. It was not kept because it would have spoiled the Administration's plan to help further Japan's program in Korea. President Theodore Roosevelt had an understanding with Japan by which the United States was to recognize the Japanese occupation of Korea and Japan was to recognize the American possession of the Philippines.* Morgan had been sent out with instructions not to let any of these things happen before the success of the plan had become a *fait accompli*. Brown was adviser to the Korean Treasury Department, and also in charge of the Customs House, a very influential man. Straight, with all his connections in China and the United States, was also a man of considerable influence, even though he was young and at the beginning of a great career. Either of these men could have done a great deal in the way of disclosing to the world how the Japanese were bluffing in Korea. That might have opened the eyes of the President and changed his policy entirely. Morgan was fearful and opposed the disclosure. He succeeded, and what was done was to the full satisfaction of the Administration.

The truth is that Korea's fate had been definitely fixed in Washington long before Morgan's appointment as the United States Minister to Korea.

The heroism of the Japanese soldiers in the battlefields of Manchuria and also the Japanese diplomatic finesse had a fascinating influence upon the President of the United States. Through Baron Kaneko, the President's personal friend and Japan's liaison man in America, the White House was in constant touch with Tokyo and gave the Japanese government friendly aid and advice. It was the American policy not to allow any Western power or powers to deprive Japan of the fruit of victory, as France, Germany, and Russia had done ten years before in the case of the Liaotung Peninsula. Japan should get what she deserves, was the American point of view.

* See the text of the agreement, dated July 29, 1905, in "President Roosevelt's Secret Pact with Japan," by Tyler Dennett. *Current History*, October, 1934. See also page 605 of *History of the United States*, by Ralph Volney Harlow. H. Holt, New York City.

What Japan needed was, of course, "an outlet for her surplus population." That was her repeated plea, and Americans thought it well founded. Also, to win the loyal friendship of a modernized and progressive Japan would be a permanent safeguard for American interests in the Far East, they thought. What territory should be given to Japan as a fruit of her victory was the question in the minds of American statesmen. It appeared that she needed Korea more than any other territory. The United States, sponsor of the Open-Door policy for China, could not afford to let Japan occupy any part of Manchuria. If the Japanese were let alone to take Korea, they would be satisfied and would have no further territorial ambitions. It would solve the Japanese emigration problem, which was beginning to cause a lot of trouble in California. This whole scheme appeared to the United States as the best solution. Of course, there might be some Americans who would object to making a pawn of the ancient Kingdom of Korea. That could easily be taken care of by publicity in the United States through the press and particularly through *The Outlook*, which was one of the most influential magazines of that day. The United States went so far as to suggest to Kaneko the idea of an Asiatic Monroe Doctrine. This was published in *The Outlook* more than once. The independence of Korea was to be sacrificed.

However, things did not turn out as expected. The Administration soon discovered that it had made a mistake. The Japanese, taking advantage of the pro-Japanese sentiment in America, sent shipload after shipload of emigrants, who descended on the California coast like swarms of locusts. Californians undertook to check this influx by a series of anti-Japanese laws. The Tokyo government demanded that Washington protect the treaty rights of Japanese subjects in this country. California, insisting on its state's rights, refused to let the Federal government interfere. By way of answering Japanese demands, Washington explained the constitutional conflict between federal and state authorities. The Japanese boldly threatened to deal directly with the State of California, as with an independent nation. This, of course, was a direct insult to the United States. It came as a great

shock to American statesmen and brought them to the realization that they had made a mistake by helping Japan to such an extent, and that Japan could never be counted on for loyal friendship. This is the inside story, and comparatively few people knew about it. It was during this time that President Theodore Roosevelt ordered the United States navy to cruise the Pacific ocean as a sort of warning to Japan. Japan invited the fleet to her shores and entertained the American sailors royally in an effort to win back the President's good will.

Now, to go back to the Korean question: E. V. Morgan was appointed as United States Minister to Korea to replace Dr. Horace Allen. Dr. Allen was one of those who believed in the fulfillment of treaty obligations. He was decidedly an obstacle to the Japanese conquest of Korea.

Before he left for Korea, Morgan was in Washington for his credentials, etc. I called on him at his suite in the Arlington Hotel. He wore a varicolored kimono over his business suit and was attended by a Japanese valet. His appearance and a few words from him were sufficient to convince me that in Korea he would not be in harmony with the influence which such good Americans as Drs. Allen, Underwood, Appenzeller, Avison, and other leading pioneer missionaries, had taken years to build up.

Dr. Allen, pioneer medical missionary, became one of the most highly respected foreigners in Seoul. Tall and dignified, he was a perfect gentleman in every respect. He, with a number of other Americans, was most influential in palace circles, as the Emperor often called him in for friendly advice and medical service. After the murder of the Queen by the Japanese in 1895, all the foreigners in Korea, with the exception of the Japanese, were overwhelmingly in sympathy with the Emperor. Since he was a weak-minded person, the Japanese had thought they could make a puppet out of him through fear. They decided to do away with the Queen, highly intelligent and strong-willed, known to be the power behind the throne. To consummate the plan, the Japanese Minister, Viscount Miura, brought from Japan a group of professional assassins, who penetrated the palace gates, dragged the Queen away from the

Emperor, chopped her to pieces, wrapped the body in tarpaulin, and burnt it to ashes. Meanwhile, another group of murderers went to the Emperor, brandishing their weapons and uttering threats. The Minister of the Household Department, who fled to the presence of the Emperor, was stabbed before his eyes.*

This most hideous international crime was committed for the purpose of winning the Emperor to the Japanese side. But it did not work out that way. Instead of throwing himself on the mercy of the Japanese, as they had expected him to do, the Emperor, thinking that they might assassinate him as they had his wife, tried to get away from the Japanese and their hirelings. He became so frantic and nervous that he could neither eat nor sleep. He could not trust even his own Cabinet Ministers. The Americans were the only friends he had faith in. He sent for Dr. Allen, then the American Minister to Korea, for in his presence he could relax and rest. Every little noise frightened him, and he begged the Americans not to leave him. Some of the missionaries arranged to take food to him, with their personal assurance that it had not been poisoned, and to stay with him at night. During these quiet hours, he asked the American Minister, "If I come to your Legation, can you not give me a room where I can rest in safety?" Allen, sympathetic and willing to do anything within his power to help the unfortunate man, could not accommodate him to that extent. Then he asked, "What should I do to protect myself and my kingdom against these treacherous Japanese?"

Of course, every American in Korea knew about the United States-Korean treaty, and none of them could believe that their government would not live up to it. By way of comforting the unhappy man, he was told that he need not worry about his personal safety and the independence of his kingdom, because, if the Japanese went too far, the United States would surely keep its promise. In his agony and fear, these words were a great strength and comfort. He believed them implicitly.

One dark night the Emperor and the Crown Prince quietly

* See *Current History*, September, 1919, and F. A. McKenzie's *Tragedy of Korea*.

slipped out of the palace gate in closed chairs used by court ladies, and went to the Russian Legation, as previously had been arranged. Safe under Russian protection, he at once issued an Imperial edict ordering the arrest of all his Cabinet Ministers as traitors. Once again Japanese ascendancy in Korea collapsed, while Russian political influence dominated the Korean court.*

Meanwhile, the Japanese in America used this episode to their great advantage. Press reports criticized the Koreans for taking sides with the Russians. The President and the general public all believed that the Koreans had made a mistake in joining the Russians, who would ultimately destroy their independence, instead of joining hands with the Japanese, who were represented as fighting for the protection of their independence. This was a crowning success for the Japanese diplomatic and propaganda activities. In fact, the Korean people were for neither the Russians nor the Japanese. The Independent Society, representing Korean nationalist sentiment, demanded the Emperor to return to the old palace immediately, even at the risk of his life. It insisted that he make the Imperial Privy Council, of which I was a member at the time, a national parliament, and let it organize a government, subject to his approval, which would stamp out all the corruption of the old conservative officials, safeguard the Imperial family, and protect the independence of the nation. But the Emperor, suspicious of everyone, did not dare stand up and speak out his mind. The more the people tried to bring him back under their own protection, the further away he got. A revolution would only have made conditions worse. The Japanese and Russians, in turn, kept the Emperor in subjection, and the Emperor kept the people in subjection. Therefore, the people had no chance to do anything, and so deserved none of the criticism. However, the tension was somewhat lessened when the Emperor finally returned to his temporary palace, which was a makeshift arrangement in the Foreign Legation centre. Straight ironically remarked in his diary, "It's rather attractive, you know, to have a really truly Emperor as near neighbor, where you can look over and see."

* *Passing of Korea*, by Homer B. Hulbert.

When Morgan arrived, Allen left. The new Minister and his official staff were all new to the situation. They needed no information and they sought none. The American statesmen were persuaded to believe that by sacrificing Korea they were saving China. Yet during all the past centuries Korea had been a very bulwark of peace standing between these two nations, and to destroy that bulwark in order to protect the adjacent people proved to be the height of folly. Everyone who knows what has happened in Manchuria and China since that time, knows now that the destruction of Korea was but a prelude to all the later developments in that part of the world.

The path of duty for the United States at that time was clear. America, with all its influence over the Japanese, should have said that the United States was under treaty obligation to help Korea and that Japan also should act in accordance with her treaties with Korea by respecting her political independence and territorial integrity. Instead of following the straight line of duty, they disregarded the American treaty with Korea and thus also assisted Japan to destroy her treaties. By so doing, they unconsciously introduced an era of treaty violation, one of the direct causes of the chaos and disorder in Europe and Asia today.

This is, indeed, a blemish on the glorious pages of American history. Korea paid heavily for being a peace-loving nation and putting her trust in the sanctity of international treaties. Now she is ridiculed by the very people who betrayed her. If any one dubs me a "militarist" because I would take up arms and fight for my country, I must confess I lose my self-restraint.

To wind up a gloomy story with a ray of sunshine, I wish to quote here a few words from the President's recent speech in reference to Italy's declaration of war on France. The President declared in that speech: "The hand that held the dagger stabbed France in the back." This did not save France, to be sure, nor was it meant to do so. But it did put on record that the government and the people of the United States have handed down their verdict, condemning a criminal nation as a criminal nation. If all good men and good women, the world over, have courage to follow that example by treating any and every law-

breaking nation as they would treat any and every law-breaking individual, there would be hope that some day courts of justice, not military might, would be the final arbiter in all human relations.

XIV

PACIFISTS ARE LIKE FIFTH COLUMNISTS

WHEN I say that pacifists who are opposed to war regardless of purpose are as dangerous and subversive as fifth columnists, I have my reasons. Here are some of them:

The Nazis, Fascists, Communists, and other subversive elements are here, as I understand it, for the purpose of overthrowing the American form of government, and to establish in its place whatever system the strongest of these groups stands for. This is not the purpose of the pacifists, of course. They all stand loyally, let us say, by the Republic of the United States. In that respect, the latter should not be compared with the Nazis, Fascists, and Communists; the one is for America, the others are against America.

But when they come to the question of war, they all agree. They are all one in demanding that the United States shall not prepare for war. They say, in effect, "We do not want war; we want peace, and peace at any price." Suppose Americans should follow the demands of these organizations and drop their defense program. What would happen? The enemies of America would take advantage of her unpreparedness and attempt any means to subvert the American system of government. What would be done then? One thing Americans might do is what the little kingdom of Rho, in Oriental history, did nearly 3000 years ago. When a large army of Chin Moon Kong, armed with swords, spears, bows and arrows, and many other instruments of war, poured into the capital city, they were surprised to find all the city gates opened wide, without a soldier to be seen. The invaders roamed the highways and byways in search of soldiers to fight with, but in vain. Then they went from

house to house to investigate. Men, women, and children were busy with their routine duties, as usual. Students were learning their lessons, scholars were studying the classics, poets were chanting their poems, and musicians were playing their instruments, as if nothing had happened. The invaders got together and said among themselves, "This is certainly a Confucian kingdom, the most highly civilized spot in the world. We must not harm these people."

So they packed up their weapons and went away, leaving the little Confucian Utopia unmolested. The difficulty in this is that nowadays modern mechanized troops do not roam about in the city streets to find out whether the people whom they have come to conquer are Confucian, Democratic, Nazi, or Mikadoist, before they attack. In fact, they are generally too high in the air even to see pacifists below them before they have destroyed half of the city and half of its population. Modern "civilized" barbarians are infinitely more bloodthirsty and savage than those in the time of Confucius, and their habit is to burn and kill, and then make the entire nation their captives and slaves. In such case, although the motives of the pacifist and the fifth columnist are vastly different, the ultimate result is practically the same.

There is another thought. If the anti-war apostles are so earnest and sincere in their belief that war should be ruled out of human life and that peace should be maintained at any price, why do they not go to the war-making nations to preach peace, as early Christian missionaries went to heathen lands to preach their religion? No one can justly call America a militaristic power. Instead of spending millions of dollars to preach the gospel of peace in this non-militaristic country, they should spend the money in sending and maintaining peace missionaries in Berlin, Rome, and Tokyo, because those are the places where wars are made. Germs should be destroyed at the source, not at the tributary. The pacifists who try to tie the hands of peace-loving America are just as destructive of the cause of peace and democracy as are the active anti-American elements.

Good Christians, like the disciples of the Prince of peace, are true peace advocates. They are not lip-service pacifists, but

devoted, conscientious followers of Christ, who came to this world to teach the principles of peace on earth and good will toward men. If these enlightened and consecrated men and women were only to lead in the right direction, this confused world of ours would be greatly benefited. Unfortunately, the peace structure they have been building all these years has been on a weak foundation. Instead of pursuing justice and righteousness, at whatever cost, many sought a solution in the worldly wisdom of appeasement, and in the time-serving policies of men, considered as "realistic," "expedient," and "practical." Their idea, however, is to compromise principles in order to meet halfway the popular demands of the times. The result is that, while they should guide the world to the light, they follow it into darkness. This does not mean to imply that all Christian leaders are blind leaders. But no one can deny that it is true of some in reference to the Japanese situation.

When the Japanese militarists were tightening their grip on Korea, Dr. L., one of the most beloved and influential leaders of the Methodist Church, and editor-in-chief of a well-known church weekly, spoke in the great Methodist auditorium in Ocean Grove, New Jersey, one Sunday morning, in July, 1905, to an audience of 11,000 people about his recent tour of the Far East. The tour had been arranged for him by the Japanese, who were afraid at that time that public sentiment in America might rise against the destruction of Korea. In the course of his address, Dr. L. declaimed, with all his energy, "May Korea be under Japanese rule forever and ever, Amen." The next day I happened to be in Ocean Grove, and a friend of mine said to me, "I am glad you were not here yesterday, for I know you would have felt badly." Then she produced a copy of the *Asbury Park Press*, from which I am quoting the above. I wrote a long letter to the speaker, asking him why he, as a missionary, who was supposed not to talk politics, should have spoken as he did; why he was so ardent in defense of Japan's violation of treaty agreements, contrary to the American idea of justice, liberty, and humanity; contrary to the spirit of American independence, American love for freedom and equal rights,

and contrary to all Christian ideas and ideals. A copy of my letter was published on the front page of the same newspaper the following morning. Later I received letters from many parts of the country, expressing their appreciation, but not a word from Dr. L. He simply ignored my letter and went on delivering the same address all over the country.

When the Koreans inaugurated the peaceful, non-violent revolution of March, 1919, the first passive revolution known in history, even antedating that of the more well-known Gandhi movement in India, the overwhelming sympathy of Christendom was with them. Harrowing stories of barbarous atrocities committed against Korean Christians and their churches stirred up indignation among the civilized peoples of the world. How was the revolution started? Thirty-three men representing the whole nation quietly gathered together in one of the hotels in Seoul, the capital of Korea, signed a memorable document known ever since as the Declaration of Independence of Korea, demanding that the Japanese withdraw from their country, and declared Korea to be an independent republic. They then telephoned the Japanese police to come and get them and sat down to await arrest.* As previously arranged, people assembled in public squares in orderly manner, read the Declaration of Independence, and waved the Korean flag, the possession of which was a crime, and shouted *Mansei*, meaning "Long Life for Korea." They were armed with nothing but their national emblem and were strictly ordered in the printed proclamation, which had been distributed secretly all over the country, not to commit acts of violence or disorder. Three hundred cities throughout the country simultaneously held similar gatherings in the same orderly manner. The heroism and patriotism demonstrated by Korean men and women, boys and girls, during this time was equalled in degree only by the barbarism and bestiality of the Japanese soldiers, gendarmes, and police in their efforts to suppress the peaceful uprising of an unarmed nation.

Public sentiment in America was deeply stirred against the

* *Korea's Fight for Freedom*, by F. A. McKenzie; *The Case of Korea*, by Henry Chung; *The Rebirth of Korea*, by Hugh H. Cynn.

ruthless military suppression of the uprising and particularly against the wholesale massacre of Christians and the burning of their homes and churches, in many cases with the congregations inside the churches. The United States Senate repeatedly took up the Korean question and the *Congressional Record* during that time is full of reports on speeches made and bills introduced in Congress in support of the Korean national movement. For example, a resolution introduced by Senator Selden P. Spencer on June 30, 1919, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs reads as follows:

“Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested, if not inconsistent with the public service, to inform the Senate as to whether the situation in Korea at the present time is such in connection with its relation to other nations as to indicate the necessity and wisdom of the United States exerting its offices in behalf of Korea under the provision of the treaty between the United States and Korea, etc.” (quoting the amity clause of the treaty of 1882).

And again, on March 18, 1920, Senator Charles S. Thomas offered as an amendment the following reservation:

“And the United States, also adhering to the principle of self-determination, declares its sympathy with the grievances and aspirations of the people of Korea for the restoration of their ancient kingdom and its emancipation from the tyranny of Japan, and it further declares that when so consummated it should be promptly admitted as a member of the League of Nations.”

Many churches in the United States also passed resolutions expressing sympathy for the Korean people and denouncing Japan's brutal measures of repression and oppression.

It was during these stirring days that the Korean students in America organized the League of the Friends of Korea for the purpose of expressing their sympathy for the struggling patriots, to protest against the Japanese atrocities, and to raise funds to alleviate the suffering following the independence movement. In this connection, they approached some of the outstanding leaders

of various foreign mission boards in New York and elsewhere and asked them to speak in their public meetings and to give their support to the Korean independence movement, morally and otherwise, through their organizations in this country. One and all declined to have anything to do with it, because, they said, it might have political implications. They said they had to be careful not to furnish grounds for accusations that the mission boards were getting involved in politics. A well-known Philadelphia clergyman, Dr. Floyd Tomkins, said in an address given in behalf of the League of the Friends of Korea, "Where there is brutality there can be no neutrality. I am not the kind of Christian who if he saw his sister attacked by a thug, would go to his closet and pray God to protect her. I would knock down the thug, save my sister, and then go to my closet to pray." Would to God that there were many more Christians of this kind.

It is true that missionaries must stay out of politics, and they do keep out, as a rule. The Korean students were, at first, disappointed when the mission boards declined to speak for the suffering Christians in Korea on the ground that it might give color to political implications. But the students soon understood their position. So long as the missionaries kept strictly neutral there would have been no complaint. But how could they keep neutral? They have to keep in the good grace of the ruling power. The Japanese constantly brought pressure to bear on them until they felt forced to commit themselves one way or another. Christians are taught by the Bible to obey them that have the rule over them, and to submit themselves. Although their sympathy was with the Korean Christians, they could not afford to be openly antagonistic to the Japanese rulers of the country. Now and then, some missionaries were found to speak openly for Japan on purely political questions. Non-Christian Koreans charged the missionaries with being inconsistent and pro-Japanese, and the missionaries had no way to disprove it.

It is, of course, repulsive to the democratic idea even to think of such things as a big navy and a big army, the largest battle-ships in the world for the United States, compulsory military

training, national conscription laws, and all that. Americans have been in the habit of criticizing militarism, imperialism, war-mongers and war-makers. Often we have heard it said, "Everyone must refuse to fight"; "I shall not risk my life for the profits of munition manufacturers"; "I will go to jail before I will go to the front"; "We will insist that the President lead the army in the march"; "We will not pay war taxes," etc.

On April 7, 1940, anniversary of the day following America's entry into the first World War, a California minister said in a sermon delivered at a church in Washington, D. C.: "Do not add to the list of the war deaths. . . . I am thinking as a father of my children. . . ." This does not sound quite so bad as some others. At least, he was thinking of his children and the children of other Americans. There are some people in America, as in all other countries, who would not think even that far ahead. Here is a story told by Montaville Flowers in his book, *The Japanese Conquest of American Opinion*, George H. Doran Co., page 54:

"One day an old gentleman attended a lecture at a Chautauqua where this problem [Japanese] was presented. After the lecture, the speaker was walking up the street behind this old gentleman, who was talking to two fine ladies. This is what he said, and it fairly represents a great body of Americans: 'Well, well, ladies, I did not get much out of that lecture. No, I didn't; no, I didn't. . . . Anyway, the Japanese will never give me any trouble in my day and generation, and I'll just let the next generation take care of itself.' That man and all of his like should have appeared on this earth in a form to permit them to be in pasture eating green grass and tin cans."

Another story, from an entirely different point of view, concerns a Japanese mother. She was carrying her child in her arms, watching the military procession in which the ashes of the "Unknown Soldier" were being brought home from the battle front. "Look, my son," she said, "your father died gloriously like that for the Empire; you too, when you grow big, should die in glory like your father." This Japanese story is not an

isolated instance, but represents the general ideology of the entire nation. In comparing this with the other two, we are not discussing the moral side of these cases. We are interested rather in their results. The Japanese story sounds to the American ear just as strange as the American stories sound selfish and unpatriotic to the Japanese. By these, the Japanese militarists judge America as an empty shell so far as self-defense is concerned. To their military scientists American preparations for national defense mean little, because they know that Americans, having been raised and educated in a pacifist atmosphere, are not war-minded. This apparently inherent weakness appears to the Japanese on the one side and to the Germans on the other as a great temptation. Those who are raised on the idea of war find themselves at home in the atmosphere, while those who have been raised on the idea of peace are hampered by their subconscious unwillingness to engage in war unless they are driven to it as a last resort.

Of all this mental and moral confusion the Japanese have taken full advantage. The continued declarations of the totalitarian powers that they have no designs against either of the American continents and that all will be peace and harmony after they have established their "new order" on the European and Asiatic continents are echoed by American pacifist and isolationist organizations, and the echo sounds pleasantly in totalitarian ears. Through their mouthpieces, Charles A. Lindbergh, Senators Wheeler, Tobey, Clark, and others, the isolationists insist that there can be a negotiated peace, and that the lion and the lamb can lie down together in a Fascist Zion. The pacifists insist that "war never settles anything," and that it is against Christian doctrine. They identify pacifism with Christianity, which is like identifying the policy of *laissez-faire* with the principle of action. Does the command that one should love his enemies mean that he must condone his enemies' crimes and supinely submit to wrong?

Christians should realize that pacifism is but an escape from reality, that the conscientious objector, however sincere he may be, evades the issue between right and wrong and but encour-

ages the aggressor with his compliance. As a policeman must subdue a ruffian bent on murder before attempting to reason with him, so Christians must take a stand against the gangster nations and draw the sword in defense of those things which God has given into their possession. It is true that many noble Christian leaders have undergone an emotional revulsion since the World War, when they advocated hanging the Kaiser and exacting every penny of penalty from Germany for having brought on the conflict. Now they have gone to the other extreme and proclaim that all wars are evil and of the devil's making. Yet the issue is more sharply drawn today than it was in 1917, and civilization and Christianity itself are more imperiled than they were when the Kaiser hurled his helmeted legions into France and Belgium in the summer of 1914.

These attitudes represent dangers from within. Another example is the action of the Oxford Group Movement, which adopted "Moral Rearmament" as its most recent slogan. That noble idea was preached up and down the length and breadth of the land at the very time that Hitler and Mussolini were preaching that war is the proper state of mankind and while Japan was venting all her savagery on the prostrate cities of China. Now the voice of the Oxford Group Movement is drowned in the din of battle on three continents. The struggle for life and right is not limited to a mere mental struggle between ideas. It requires physical fortitude, blood and sweat, toil and tears.

The present European conflict has clearly and unmistakably demonstrated this. Therefore, if Americans mean business in preparing for national security, the national spirit should be awakened, the educational system be revised, and a uniform defense policy adopted and supported by every citizen and all parties.

Patriotism must transcend partisanship. When a uniform national foreign policy is adopted, every citizen should be willing to sacrifice his individual freedom, his wealth, and even his life, if necessary, for the nation's good, since a divided nation cannot stand. If the nation falls, what is there left?

The fire is closing in. Americans can no longer ignore it. Some of the public utterances of certain persons in America sound so utterly un-American, or anti-American, that it is strange that these people still call themselves Americans. It seems never to have occurred to them that the United States, like all other nations, has its enemies both within and without, that it needs protection against these enemies, that it is the first duty of every citizen to protect the country, its system of government, its safety, and its honor; and that if they fail to do their duty, the nation cannot survive. Even in the life of animals the first instinct is to protect their homes, their young ones, and their own groups. But some human beings do not seem to possess even this basic instinct. While their fellow citizens are slapped and spat upon, kicked about and killed, their homes and institutions destroyed, their naval vessels bombed and sunk, and their national flag hauled down and trampled upon, they show no concern. Instead of showing any sign of indignation against the ruthless destruction of civilization and humanity, they openly reprimand their own government for "public castigation of foreign nations." If the verbal attacks on Japan by the United States in retaliation for the physical attacks on Americans by the Japanese soldiers are considered to be too much, it is evident that defense of the United States and its nationals is not in their program. The general public will no longer be influenced by men of this type.

XV

DEMOCRACY VERSUS TOTALITARIANISM

ONE who believes in the democratic principles of government is essentially an individualist. The power of the government is derived from his citizenship. Therefore, his personal rights and personal freedom are the fundamental basis upon which the structure of the nation is built. Different from totalitarian ideology, which holds that the people should obey the government, a democracy, on the other hand, insists that the people's rights should be protected against any possibility of the government's usurpation.

According to this principle, the American government, federal or state, must not be allowed to exercise too much power, which may lead to encroachment upon the constitutional rights of the citizen. The executive, legislative, and judiciary branches are to check and counter-check one another in the exercise of their authorities. Congress itself, with its upper and lower houses, was organized on that same basis—to watch and check each other. The political parties, working against each other, also are based on the same theory. In short, they are not to work together in harmony, with a common objective for the good of all. Instead, they are to work at cross purposes in order to weaken the collective power, or the power of the state, else the result might be the overthrow of democracy and the establishment of a dictatorship in its place.

Side by side with the development of this extreme individualism, a strong under current of sectionalism has come gradually into existence, which tends to divide rather than unify public opinion. Some citizens insist on their own liberty and rights, even at the expense of their government, without stopping to think that without a government there would be no democracy and that without democracy there would be no

freedom. Too much freedom is like too much of any good thing. People do not appreciate it and often abuse it. They do not realize that America is one of the few nations that still have the blessings of freedom, that it must be paid for dearly, and that unless the people make constant and concerted efforts to uphold it, this heritage will no longer be theirs. But most of the people are too busy with their own affairs to think of these things. Consequently, national defense has been neglected to an incredible degree, and patriotism and nationalism are condemned in certain quarters as a cause of international conflict and war.

Meanwhile, foreign powers find a fertile field in America for the propagation of their totalitarian ideas. The Soviets, the Japanese, the Nazis, and the Fascists have their organizations in this country; according to recent reports most of the subversive activities are due to these groups. Some of them are alleged to have declared their intention to overthrow the government of the United States in order to establish a new government similar to their own. There is no question but that this is a direct challenge to American democracy. These "isms" which attempt to undermine the United States government are connected with the bandit powers of the old world and are threatening the very foundation of democracy, both from within and without. Abraham Lincoln's famous statement that "the government of the people, by the people, and for the people must not perish," etc., and Woodrow Wilson's phrase that "we are fighting to make the world safe for democracy," seem to have been forgotten by many Americans. Many people would not allow any of these things to disturb their tranquillity. They are perfectly satisfied that the United States is the richest, and most powerful nation in the world and that nobody would dare attack it. "Uncle Sam will take care of everything," they say. They little realize that Uncle Sam would be helpless without their united support and that this great republic would be another China, France, or Greece in the face of mechanized armies and navies of bandit nations. Far-sighted and patriotic leaders must redouble their efforts to waken those care-free

Americans who still believe that the United States could maintain its political and economic independence in a world dominated by the totalitarian nations.

When the government of the United States becomes at loggerheads with a foreign government, it frequently happens that certain citizens sufficiently influential to be heard speak forth in favor of the foreign government, thus weakening the position of their own. When they do this, they have no thought of being unpatriotic; they think rather of being democratic. Their idea is that democratic people should not be so narrowly patriotic as the totalitarians, who, however, have no regard for right in pushing their claims. From their standpoint, the United States is not a coherent nation, solidly unified for its defense. Thus this weakness of American democracy in the eyes of nations that are seeking territorial expansion by military conquest is potentially disastrous.

If all the nations of the world become democratized, it will be a different world. Since Japan, Russia, Germany, and Italy are virtually in control of nearly all but the Western hemisphere, American democracy is but an island in a sea of totalitarianism. All the isms are seeking every possible chance to establish themselves in this continent by the familiar means of peaceful penetration, if possible, or by violent aggression, if necessary. After this great republic was established, the hope of the American people was that the "Spirit of '76" might be awakened among all oppressed peoples of the world. They were sympathetic toward any subject race struggling for freedom. Many statesmen expressed their sincere hope that some day the world would rid itself of the shackles of tyrants and oppressors.

This spirit prevailed down through the period of the Spanish-American war. As a result of that war, the United States took over most of the Spanish possessions, including the Philippine Islands, in order to liberate them. This was no mere gesture, for the American government undertook the task of educating and training the peoples of these territories and setting them up as free, independent states so that they, too, might

enjoy the blessings of freedom. The Philippines would have become an independent state long ago, had not the Japanese problem altered the entire situation. It was sincerely hoped that the noble example set by the United States would be followed by all the nations, so that the medieval practice of exploiting weak nations would be ended, and all races would be able to look forward to the day of emancipation.

However, this idea soon lost its force. The development of the vast material resources of the new world and the opening of new markets for mass production gradually took the place of humanitarianism, and "dollar diplomacy" supplanted altruism. The individualistic view of life was expressed in such phrases as, "Let other people take care of themselves; we are not our brother's keeper." This narrow view soon developed into a national policy of isolationism, which can be expressed in the oft-repeated admonition, "Mind your own business and keep your nose out of other people's affairs." Democracy has lost ground because the United States failed to play its rôle of leader in international relations.

The present chaotic and anarchistic state of affairs in Asia and Europe is almost entirely due to lack of wise leadership. Human society requires leadership for peace and order. No totalitarian organization is possible without a dictator. No democratic society can function without an executive head. The family of nations is but the family unit extended. If leadership is essential for the well-being of a nation, small or large, democratic or totalitarian, it is equally essential for the well-being of a combination of nations. It is clear, then, that the society of nations, as well as the society of men, is bound to suffer when it has no leadership to direct its affairs for the general welfare of all its members.

The world has been in need of leadership, especially since the East and West came together, and has been constantly looking for this leadership. The Far East and some of the small nations of Europe looked to the United States, but were disappointed. They knew that the United States was the only power that had no territorial ambition. Its ideas of liberty, equality,

and justice for all were the source of great inspiration to all mankind. With its material wealth, its unhampered development of mentality and genius, and its unlimited influence among men, America easily could have introduced a new order into the old world. Through the processes of revolution or evolution the United States could have gradually brought an end to the old practices of predatory nations, and in the course of time would have succeeded in emancipating shackled humanity from its oppressors.

Cuba and the Philippines are shining examples of the new era inaugurated under the sponsorship of the United States of America. In the Far East, the Open-Door policy for China, the application of the Boxer indemnity funds to the education of Chinese, and a number of other equally generous acts proved to Asiatic peoples that the United States alone was capable of making large sacrifices for the uplift of mankind. And in the Western hemisphere all the Central and South American states naturally turned toward the United States for assistance and guidance, since they were under the protection of the Monroe Doctrine. In those days and under those circumstances, the United States ran no risk of war in introducing a new order. All that was necessary for the United States to do was to fix a definite policy and to follow it up by encouraging in legitimate ways the practice of the democratic principles of "liberty and justice for all." The liberty-loving peoples of the world would have done the rest.

But the Americans became more concerned with trade increase and declined to assume more international obligation. Immediate and practical commercial profit, rather than the realization of an idea, came to be their main interest. This American mentality could not grasp the idea that American leadership would mean world markets for American products. Central and South American republics were disappointed and gradually lost confidence in the United States. The Germans saw their opportunity and established financial footholds in various strategic South American centres. The strong pro-German and anti-American feeling in some of these states was due

largely to German propaganda. Later, the Japanese also saw the opening and quietly built up colonies side by side with the Germans. The time came when the United States found these problems difficult of solution.

Great Britain never enjoyed the whole-hearted confidence of the Orient, but for many years she had been looked up to as a leading power among the nations. The Anglo-Japanese Alliance was regarded by Asiatics as the beginning of the decline of the British Empire as a world power. Unfortunately for the democracies, Great Britain, instead of co-operating with the United States in maintaining the joint supremacy of the two democracies, competed with it for world trade. For years many Americans did not know it, but the Chinese treated the British as pro-Japanese and anti-American. Then came the first World War. The Allies did all they could to draw the United States into the war as a last means of saving themselves. Woodrow Wilson went into it with the slogan "Make the world safe for democracy." If the Americans had done nothing but declare war on Germany, it would have had a moral effect on all the belligerent powers. But the Americans did more than that. Financial and material supplies poured into the allied nations, and American troops fought in France. At the close of the war, the world looked to the American President, instead of a British or French Premier, for leadership in the peace conference. But opposition at home, coupled with poor statesmanship on the part of European leaders, spoiled America's great opportunity.

Then sentiment in most of the European nations after the war became unfriendly to the Americans. There was dissension over payment of the war debts to the United States. European nations did not realize what a misfortune they were bringing upon themselves. No doubt this has a great deal of influence in America today against American intervention in behalf of the democracies of the old world.

While the people of the totalitarian countries, either because of political training or military compulsion, seem to be willing to fight, and even die, for their respective governments, those of

democratic nations generally maintained an attitude of indifference toward the welfare and safety of each other until all were imperiled.

It was during the Japanese diplomatic aggression in China, which culminated in the Twenty-one Demands, that Dr. Sun Yat-sen made personal appeals to the United States for moral support in China's struggle for democratic principles in the Far East. Generally speaking, the people of the United States were in sympathy with the Republic of China, but the influence of Japanese propaganda was much stronger and nothing was done in response to Sun Yat-sen's request. China, like a drowning man, grasped the helping hand held out by Soviet Russia. This was the beginning of the movement toward Communism in China. Dr. Sun has been constantly criticized for this, and the Japanese used it as a trump card in their propaganda. Had he lived a little longer, Sun Yat-sen would have made clear to all his followers his renunciation of the Marxian principle. While lecturing on his "Three Principles" he came into possession of a copy of *The Social Interpretation of History* by Dr. Maurice William. This influenced him so profoundly that he retracted his advocacy of Communism. Carl Crow has said in an article in *Dynamic America*, that "the United States holds unique ties to China," that "truly some beneficent fate has linked the Chinese and the American people through the personalities of Sun Yat-sen and Maurice William. Abandoning Russian Communism in favor of American Democracy, the Chinese are today shedding their blood in defense of the American form of government. . . ." This fact has not been sufficiently known to the mass of people in China, and many of them still hold to the Soviet system as a means of economic salvation, thus furnishing the ground for Japan's propaganda agitation. The Foreign Office spokesman in Tokyo has repeatedly declared that should China's teeming millions turn Red, it would create the gravest menace to the United States, and that Japan was fighting in defense of America. This story produced in America the effect desired by Japan.

When the World War ended, Germany, Japan, and Italy

began busily to engage themselves in preparing for the next war. France, overconfident in the impregnability of her Maginot Line, and England, secure in the preponderancy of her armada, paid no attention to what the others were doing. Instead of getting every citizen lined up, organized, and equipped for the defense of their home lands, they were busy with petty bickering and hair-splitting parliamentary debates. When their enemy was ready to launch total war, they were so completely ignorant of what was coming that they were still trying to avert the clash by resorting to all sorts of appeasement policies. When the German steam roller started to roll, one nation after another disappeared, and more than half of France was occupied by the enemy. Marshal Petain, the French commander-in-chief, said in a radio speech, "We have too few men, too few allies, and too few munitions to keep up further resistance."

Why too few men? What became of all the men of France? They are there, but they are individualists. They are human, like the rest of us. Everyone likes to enjoy liberty, but few are willing to fight for it with their lives. Why too few allies? Where are the European nations that were standing against Hitlerism? They, too, are there, but they are also individualists. They want peace—with or without honor—but no war. In time of peace they were all allies. Just like a great fire, consuming one house after another, the German steam roller started in Central Europe, turned north, swept westward along the coast line, and came swiftly south through the heart of France, destroying every nation in its path. In this sudden onslaught, each nation had to fight its own battle single-handed, because others thought they could save themselves by keeping out.

This explains why the allied nations were easy prey for the Nazis. France's turn came, and she found "too few allies" to fight for her. Yes, it is a cold world. In 1910 the Koreans went through it all. It was hard for them. Where were the powers which had promised to help them? They were all there as spectators, but, instead of showing a sign of sympathy, they turned away and made jokes at the expense of the "cowardly and degenerate Koreans." Yes, it was hard for them. The

treaty powers, the United States and most of the leading European nations, thought that Korea was the last victim offered as a sacrifice on the altar of world peace. Unfortunately, this was not so.

While Japan is seeking every possible chance to expand her empire in the Pacific, and Germany and Italy are pushing their line of conquest toward America on the Atlantic side, certain leading citizens in America are still opposing active help for Britain. They refuse to support anything beyond a purely defensive program, in spite of overwhelming public sentiment in favor of active assistance. They still stand pat, demanding that it should be known to the world that these preparations are for defensive purposes only. That is, Americans are to do nothing until the enemy is within their gates and war is upon them. It seems strange that the democratic nations hold to the defensive idea until it is too late. During the campaigns waged between the Allies and the Nazis in Belgium and France, as well as in the northern countries of Europe, the Allied troops found they were not equipped to meet the assault. It was reported that the Maginot Line was helpless because it was built only for defensive, and not for offensive purposes. If potential enemies know that the United States will not attack them until they land in its territory and declare war, they will not fear America, even if America has enough battleships to cover half of the Atlantic and the Pacific, and bombing planes enough to darken the sky. The biggest guns mean nothing so long as the enemies know that the United States is either unwilling or unable to make use of them.

With the co-operation of Great Britain, free France, and other liberty-loving nations, the United States should take the lead, not in the way of an imperialistic overlord or dictator, but as a big brother, and use its great influence in bringing about peace and good will among nations on the basis of international justice and equality for all. The efforts made by the United States in recent years have already produced the desired effect of welding together the twenty-one American nations in the common cause of collective security. In the light of such suc-

cess in this hemisphere, it is apparent that timely effort might have secured co-operation among all the democracies of the world and have stayed the totalitarian program.

However, the democracies failed to take the leadership, and Germany, Italy, and Japan have already demanded that the world be divided into three spheres—Europe to be under the Axis control; Asia, including the Pacific up to the California coast, to be controlled by Japan, and the United States to content itself with the two American continents, all under the principle of the Monroe Doctrine. Whether we agree to it or not, they are determined to carry out this program as a first step toward the ultimate conquest of the entire world.

To a casual observer, this may sound fair and reasonable. If the totalitarian powers agree to let the Western hemisphere alone, why should they not be let alone in their own spheres? But a further study of the subject will reveal that it is not quite so simple as that. It is only another propaganda snare for the American public.

Following are three reasons why this suggestion should be refused:

1. Actually, it would be the beginning of the end of the Monroe Doctrine. The totalitarian powers would observe it only until such time as they were prepared to destroy it. Their present promises would have no more sanctity than their past pledges. Can they logically now withdraw their recognition of the Monroe Doctrine because Americans refuse to recognize their claims to close the markets of Europe and Asia against American products in violation of commercial treaties and the Open-Door agreements? Can they offer to the United States what is already its own as their price for consent to their exclusive authority over the rest of the globe, as if the security of the Western hemisphere depends upon their words?

2. It would be a death blow to the cause of democracy and a grave injustice to the cause of humanity. To surrender Europe and Asia to the domination of the dictators would mean putting all liberty-loving peoples under the bondage of slavery. There would be no end to bloodshed under the Nazi

regime. The proposed Japanese hegemony in the East is no less tragic to half of the world's population. Japan holds Korea, Manchuria, and the conquered portion of China at the bayonet's point. What the Japanese fondly call "the New Order in East Asia" is nothing but a reign of horror and terror. Her thirty years' rule in Korea is a record of a gigantic policy of extinction, which she tried to achieve by an economic stranglehold on the 23,000,000 disarmed and prostrated Koreans, even to the extent of wholesale starvation. The Japanese know too well that they can never win their fallen foes by a show of mercy or magnanimity and that, therefore, they have to depend on other means—that is, brutal military force. The moment Japan withdraws her troops from the mainland of Asia, the Koreans, Manchurians, and Chinese will wipe out every remaining Japanese. Their cry of "Asia for the Asiatics" means nothing more nor less than "Asia for the Japanese." It would be the greatest of international crimes to let her extend her medieval barbarism to the entire continent of Asia.

3. It would be a great mistake on the part of the United States to let bandit nations divide the rest of the world among themselves on the promise that they would never invade the Western hemisphere. Who can believe what they say, except those who are blinded by fear? The Japanese will promise anything, so long as a promise will bring them what they want—legalized ownership of their stolen goods. With all the material resources and man power Japan and Germany are now capturing, they will soon be far stronger than the United States, and will say, "The Monroe Doctrine also is a dead letter."

The best way to deal with them is to make no promises and to take none from them. If the United States cannot invoke economic sanctions, embargoes, or a nation-wide boycott against them until they disgorge everything they have taken from their neighbors by force, the United States should at least treat them as it treats those who are known to be public enemies. Let the United States act—and act now.

CONCLUSION

IN conclusion, I wish I could leave the reader with a feeling of hope and encouragement over the outlook in the Far East. But, frankly, I see no possibility that the United States and Japan can avoid conflict, or even long postpone it. As I have attempted to show, Japan is engaged in a long-term program to establish hegemony over Asia, and, eventually, to dominate the world. To this end she has ordered her whole national life, from the cradle to the grave. She has cultivated a spirit of militarism among her people and indoctrinated them with the belief that they are especially endowed of the Creator and that unremitting allegiance to the Emperor, who is of divine descent, is rewarded with a seat among the gods. It is impossible, then, from their point of view, for the Japanese to brook interference with their heaven-directed program. Every form of opposition, however innocent in intent, must be viewed with suspicion, and nations whose shadows lie athwart their path must be destroyed. He who challenges Japan insults heaven. And it is one of the great ironies of history that Japanese animosity is now directed particularly against the very nation which broke the shell of her insularity and introduced Japan to modern civilization. When, in 1854, Commodore Matthew C. Perry negotiated the treaty which marked the first step in opening Japan to foreign commerce and residence, he helped, all unwittingly, to set the people of the Rising Sun into a path which later was to bring them full tilt against the American people.

The remorseless subjugation of Korea was but the beginning of Japan's invasion and conquest of the Asiatic mainland, which she euphemistically designated as a policy of "peaceful penetration." While the League of Nations was trying to make up its mind what to do to prevent it, Japan seized Manchuria and set up a puppet regime in what it was now pleased to name the

State of Manchukuo. This conquest has never been recognized by the United States government.

It would require much space to narrate the successive steps of Japan's policy of "peaceful penetration." The world is thoroughly familiar with the undeclared war on China and with the merciless barbarities the Japanese armies have practiced on China's open cities and on her defenseless citizens. The world is familiar, too, with Japan's intervention in Indo-China and Thailand, with her pact with the Axis powers, her agreement with Soviet Russia, her steady campaign of intimidation against the Netherlands East Indies, and with her calculated mistreatment of British and American citizens. All this is of a piece with the Japanese design, now too clearly outlined to admit of doubt.

Here, then, is Japan's challenge, direct and defiant. It has shocked the American people into a realization of their danger. Faith in Japan's word has changed into open distrust. We know now that she will never be moved by any consideration of justice or right, that she will recognize no argument save that which she has used so effectively herself—the argument of force. Yosuke Matsuoka is a convincing Machiavelli.

Only a short time ago, the signing of the so-called Matsuoka pact with Russia was hailed as a new tie tightening the Tokyo-Moscow-Berlin-Rome Axis. But, in fact, neither of the governments intends to honor its signature once it becomes persuaded that a breach of the pact will serve its purpose better. All that each party hopes to accomplish by the agreement is to make the other keep the ring for the time being. This was apparent from the beginning, for despite the provisions of the instrument, the Soviets continued to give China war supplies as usual, and Japan, on her part, continued to maintain her army on the Siberian frontier. Therefore, the practical value of the pact is absolutely nil, beyond the scope of propaganda.

Japan's diplomatic attempts to remove the danger of Russian attack from the north have thus proved unsuccessful. Meanwhile, the attitude of the United States toward Japanese aggression in China and the South Pacific areas also served to keep Tokyo in a state of disquiet. The presence of the United States

fleets in Hawaii and the Philippines to protect United States nationals and their interests there added to the retarding influence on the extremists among the Japanese war lords. The views of the moderates have prevailed and they decided on a policy of watchful waiting, in the belief that something unforeseen would turn up somewhere soon. This accounts for the quiet withdrawal of Kenkichi Yoshizawa from the economic negotiations at Batavia when the Dutch East Indies authorities rebuffed Japan's demands for "the right to share with third powers," which means the United States and Great Britain, in the economic fruits of the Netherlands East Indies. No "drastic measures" or "punitive action" with which Tokyo papers had previously threatened the Netherlands has yet been attempted.

However, to the complete satisfaction of the Japanese, something did turn up. Like a bolt from the blue, Hitler's sudden declaration of war on Russia on June 22 came as a golden opportunity to the Japanese. The Nazi mechanized troops and panzers were rushed into western Russia, with the Finns and Rumanians, perforce, fighting for them. Which side will ultimately win in this campaign I do not wish to predict. But one thing is certain: Japan will do a lot of fishing in the troubled waters. Hardly twenty-four hours had elapsed after the commencement of the Nazi-Soviet hostilities when the Japanese negotiators in Batavia, who were about to leave for home after the termination of the economic conference, turned round and demanded renewal of the negotiations, and the Netherlands East Indies authorities quietly informed them that they would supply Japan with large amounts of goods "on an informal basis." And if anyone thinks for a moment that this will be the end of Japan's demands he soon will be disillusioned.

It is Japan's heaven-given opportunity to attempt another big jump in her territorial expansion. While Russia is preoccupied in her life and death struggle with the Nazi invaders, Japan will start her march of conquest in either of two directions. She may either withdraw her troops from along the Siberian frontier and combine all her forces in a South Pacific push, or march into Siberia and occupy the vast territory east of the Ural ranges. In

comparison, the southward move is more tempting because the British, French, and Dutch colonies produce more of the strategic war materials of which Japan is in such need. But it also involves more risk of war with the United States. The northern expedition would be comparatively easy, and all the territories of Asiatic Russia, including Outer Mongolia, Harbin, Vladivostok, Kamchatka, and the northern half of Sakhalin Island could be added to the Mikado's Empire almost with a single blow. The new possessions in the north would include all the western shore of the Bering Sea, upon which the Nipponese militarists have been casting their greedy eyes for strategic reasons. They want to build gigantic aerial bases there for the purpose of defending the Island Empire against aerial attacks from Alaska in case of war with the United States.

Which of these two courses Japan will choose to take first depends, first, on the development of the German-Russian war, and, secondly, on how far the United States will permit Japan to go in her expansion. Probabilities are that she may first move up to Siberia, because there she would find the least resistance at present. In either case, Japan will draw nearer to the United States and thus increase the danger of war.

It has been my task to present the case of Korea as an example to show that she is a victim—the first—of Japan's lust for power. Her destiny cannot be separated from that of the free peoples of the world, nor from the lot of those peoples who once knew freedom and have lost it for a while. At long last—perhaps sooner than we dare to hope—the democratic forces of the world will thrust the Japanese back on their islands, and peace will reign again in the Pacific. In that day Korea will rejoin the ranks of the free and again become known as the Land of the Morning Calm.

the 1990s, the number of people in the UK who are aged 65 and over has increased from 10.5 million to 13.5 million (1990-2000).

There are a number of reasons why the number of people aged 65 and over has increased. One of the main reasons is that people are living longer. The life expectancy at birth in the UK is now 77 years for men and 81 years for women.

Another reason is that people are having children later in life. This means that there are more people aged 65 and over who have children who are still alive.

There are also a number of reasons why the number of people aged 65 and over is expected to increase in the future. One of the main reasons is that people are living even longer.

Another reason is that people are having children even later in life. This means that there will be even more people aged 65 and over who have children who are still alive.

There are also a number of reasons why the number of people aged 65 and over is expected to increase in the future. One of the main reasons is that people are living even longer.

Another reason is that people are having children even later in life. This means that there will be even more people aged 65 and over who have children who are still alive.

There are also a number of reasons why the number of people aged 65 and over is expected to increase in the future. One of the main reasons is that people are living even longer.

Another reason is that people are having children even later in life. This means that there will be even more people aged 65 and over who have children who are still alive.

There are also a number of reasons why the number of people aged 65 and over is expected to increase in the future. One of the main reasons is that people are living even longer.

Another reason is that people are having children even later in life. This means that there will be even more people aged 65 and over who have children who are still alive.

There are also a number of reasons why the number of people aged 65 and over is expected to increase in the future. One of the main reasons is that people are living even longer.

Another reason is that people are having children even later in life. This means that there will be even more people aged 65 and over who have children who are still alive.

There are also a number of reasons why the number of people aged 65 and over is expected to increase in the future. One of the main reasons is that people are living even longer.

Another reason is that people are having children even later in life. This means that there will be even more people aged 65 and over who have children who are still alive.

There are also a number of reasons why the number of people aged 65 and over is expected to increase in the future. One of the main reasons is that people are living even longer.

Another reason is that people are having children even later in life. This means that there will be even more people aged 65 and over who have children who are still alive.

There are also a number of reasons why the number of people aged 65 and over is expected to increase in the future. One of the main reasons is that people are living even longer.

Another reason is that people are having children even later in life. This means that there will be even more people aged 65 and over who have children who are still alive.

