

economic activities of all nations. Further, on December 28th, the Japanese Prime Minister (since assassinated) stated that Japan would adhere to the open door policy and would welcome participation and co-operation in Manchurian enterprise. In view of these statements His Majesty's Government have not considered it necessary to send any formal Note to the Japanese Government on the lines of the American Government's Note, but the Japanese Ambassador in London has been requested to obtain confirmation of these assurances from his Government.

Unfortunately, since Japan had taken the aggressive and was in a position, because of the strength of her military and naval forces relative to those of China, to impose her own conditions on China, this do-nothing policy amounted to passive support of the Japanese attitude and action.

The United States, on the other hand, for obvious reasons that I need not go into here, but which can be summed up in the question: "Who is to control the Pacific? - the United States or Japan?", viewed the conflict in the Far East with alarm, and Mr. Stimson, acting on behalf of his government showed himself, not only ready to co-operate with the other powers in finding a solution of the difficulties there, but despite American readiness to ignore international responsibility in Europe, proved the leader in such negative action as has been taken to hamper Japan. His views are embodied in the following passages:

"The United States Government cannot admit the legality of any situation de facto, nor does it intend to recognize any treaty or agreement entered into between those governments or their agents which impairs the treaty rights of the United States or its citizens in China.

"The United States Government does not intend to recognize any situation or agreement which may be brought about by means contrary to the covenants of the Pact of Paris of August 27th, 1932, to which both Japan and China as well as the United States are parties
(Note, Jan. 7th, 1932, Mr. Stimson)

"The Nine Power Treaty forms the legal basis upon which now rests the Open-Door policy toward China.

"At the time that this treaty was signed it was known that China was engaged in an attempt to develop the free institutions of a self-governing republic after her recent revolution from an autocratic form of government; that she would require many years of both economic and political effort to that end; and that her progress would necessarily be slow. The treaty was thus a covenant of self-denial among the signatory powers in deliberate renunciation of any policy of aggression which might tend to interfere with that development.

"It must be remembered that this Treaty was one of several treaties and agreements entered into at the Washington Conference by the various Powers concerned, all of which were inter-related and interdependent. No one of these treaties can be disregarded without disturbing the general understanding and equilibrium which were intended to be accomplished and effected by the group of agreements arrived at in their entirety. The Washington Conference was essentially a disarmament conference aimed to promote the possibility of peace in the world, not only through the cessation of competition in