

This question of the U. S. S. R. was not the only one which divided the participants in the second conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations. In the same session where the invitation to the U. S. S. R. was discussed, there were disagreements upon a whole line of questions: About the character of the Institute; about their relation to the press; about the structure of the research work. On all these questions the members divided into three groups -- one led by Americans, another by British, and the Dominions not always occupying a definite position. Americans straightforwardly defended not only the political but the diplomatic character of the Institute. China fully supported the point of view of the Americans. The British, together with the Japanese, were on the contrary, very much against this tendency: they wanted to see the Institute entirely an educational-cultural organization.

However, no matter what disagreements existed upon the question of the invitation to the U. S. S. R., the common political sense was victorious. At the meeting of the Pacific Council, the governing body of the Institute, it was unanimously decided to invite the Soviet Union for the next conference in Kyoto. It was for this purpose that J. Merle Davis, General Secretary of the Institute, was sent to Moscow and entered into negotiations with the All-Union Society for Cultural Contact Abroad. In September of this year, just previous to the conference, there came to Moscow for the same purpose a delegation of Americans, British and Japanese, with such noted leaders as Jerome Greene, Chairman of the American Group of the Institute; Joseph Chamberlain, one of the authors of the Kellogg Pact and a famous professor of International Law; William Kilpatrick, noted professor; Shiroshi Nasu, famous Japanese economist, and others. The Soviet Union, through the Society for Cultural Relations Abroad, was represented at the third conference by one observer.

#### Evolution of the Institute

So, the Institute, created out of the plans of a "purely religious organization," underwent a great evolution.

Yet at the first conference the missionary influence was very strongly felt. The conference opened with grace said by the Japanese member, Tasuku Harada. In this prayer Professor Harada appealed to God to give his divine blessing to the meeting by his presence and to guide its work. He prayed especially for benediction for the leaders and responsible representatives so that they could complete their duty righteously. He finished with the expression of hope that in the near future the Kingdom of God would come over the earth and the name of God would be everywhere proclaimed.

The whole tone of the first conference corresponded to this beginning. Before each meeting fifteen minutes was assigned to "daily meditation." The speeches of the orators were full of religious terms. Questions like this were brought out and discussed: What is the role of religion in the solution of the problems of the Pacific Ocean? In what way can religious ideals assist in solving international problems? How can the teachings of Jesus, Buddha and Confucius be applied to the problems of contemporary interracial and international relations, etc..

The second conference (1927) was entirely contrary in that respect. It appeared to be of purely secular character. Not a trace was left of Quaker