

hypocrisy. The second conference discussed exclusively questions of international politics: Immigration, unequal treaties, tariff autonomy of China, etc.

The League of Nations appreciated this situation and sent two observers to the second conference, Cummings and Aoki. Besides these Mr. Caldwell of the International Labour Office was present. At that conference the League of Nations presented quite a memorandum upon the work of the Mandates Commission in the Pacific Ocean. At the present time the only thing that keeps the Institute of Pacific Relations from entire success is the absence of the U. S. S. R. The entry of the U. S. S. R. would make the Institute an almost complete League of Nations of the Pacific. Therefore, it is easy to understand the excitement with which the leaders awaited our arrival at the conference in Kyoto.

The third conference of the Institute took place in Kyoto from October 28th to November 8th, 1929.

First of all it is necessary to note the entirely new attitude of Americans toward the League of Nations. If at first they merely laughed at the Geneva talk-fest, they were now more inclined to look on with indulgent approval. One American conference member even went so far in his indulgence as to propose that the League create a special commission to discuss and solve Chino-Japanese conflicts in South Manchuria. The Chinese attitude toward this proposal was very cold; the Japanese no better.

The attitude of Americans toward the U. S. S. R. is interesting. At the 1927 conference Ray Lyman Wilbur preached to the Soviet Union, suggesting they return to "democracy." At this later conference the American speaker said in his speech that he was sorry for the "isolation" of the U. S. S. R. which, he said, had real diplomatic relations only with Turkey.

As the U. S. S. R. was represented at the conference only by a silent observer, who was not taking part in discussions, the whole interest was centered around the Chino-Japanese duel. The speakers did not always keep to diplomatic etiquette. The heroes of the conference were Hsu Shu-hsi, professor at Yenching University in Peking and Yosuke Matsuoka, formerly director of the South Manchurian Railway. Their dialogue sometimes took such a lively form that the head of the British Group, Lord Hailsham, had to remind these duelists about the sacred pacifistic ideals of the Institute. The Japanese speaker referred to the great sacrifices Japan made of men and money to oppose the annexation of Manchuria by Czarist Russia, and he said that the danger still existed as Soviet Russia was pushing toward the East, and the collision with China is unavoidable. Hsu-Shu-hsi in reply to this lyrical effusion of his opponent, cynically asked: "Well, how much do we have to pay to Japan to insure that she become less active?"

However, no matter what the results of the Kyoto Conference may be, the growth of the Institute itself, as an organ of political influence for American ruling circles is evident. And in the Manchurian problem, and the question of extraterritoriality, the American point of view dominated. An American, Jerome Greene, the leader of the American group, was elected Chairman of the Institute.

The Japanese newspaper, the Osaka Mainichi, which paid close attention to the conference, even called the Institute a "League of Nations in