

The Institute of Pacific Relations and Research on Issues of Northeast China

Lianjie Wang

Institute for Local History of the Party, Liaoning Academy of Social Sciences

No. 86, Taishan Road, Huanggu District, Shenyang 110031, Liaoning, China

E-mail: lianjie8722@163.com

Part of Achievements of the National Social Science Fund Project "Research on the Group of people saved in Northeast China" (06BDJ015).

Abstract

The Institute of Pacific Relations was an international non-governmental organization in the Asian-Pacific region after the First World War. Chinese Institute of Pacific Relations was an intellectual group with strong liberalism color converted from a desultory organization with Christianity color. In order to investigate the practical condition of Japanese power in Northeast China from all aspects, Northeast China PTPI played an important role. At the same time, major leaders of Northeast China PTPI were present at the international Pacific academic conference, and discussed the following issues: historical origin of northeast China, foundation of treaties signed by foreign countries about their rights in northeast China, and economic interest and railway issues of big powers in northeast China, etc. At the conference, Chinese delegates made known to the world the secret of Japanese imperialism invasion in China and the world, namely, "Tanaka Memorial".

Keywords: The Institute of Pacific Relations, Northeast China PTPI, Issue of Northeast China, Tanaka Memorial

1. The Institute of Pacific Relations and Northeast China PTPI

The Institute of Pacific Relations is also translated as International Pacific Exchange Conference, which was one of forerunners of international non-governmental organizations in the Asian-Pacific region after the First World War. (Note 1) At the beginning of its establishment, it was flaunted in the name of non-governmental organization and academic group. However, after being brought into China, the institute was endowed with certain national diplomatic color. From July 1 to 15, 1925, the first conference of the institute was formally held in Honolulu of Hawaii in USA. There were altogether 111 delegates who participated in this conference from Pacific Ocean Region and riparian states, including America, China, Japan, North Korea, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the Philippines. (Note 2) At the second conference in 1927, the institute worked out a constitution, stipulating the purpose of "research in situations of all nationalities of the Pacific Ocean to promote diplomatic relations between all countries from the Pacific Ocean". (Note 3) It was determined at this conference, a branch institute should be established in each country and the conference should be held biennially. The institute held the conference with the purpose of researching and introducing the actual situation of all areas in the Pacific Ocean and flaunting to improve relations between all countries. This institute altogether held 13 international conferences with the content of such issues of politics, economy, society, diplomacy, culture and nationality in the Asian-Pacific Region, organized and promoted research and discussion on the Asian-Pacific issues, published thousands of interrelated books and set up branch institutes in 14 countries. In 1950s, the institute was charged and investigated for a long time by "pro-communism" of American McCarthyism, and was disbanded ultimately in 1960. (Note 4)

From its establishment in 1925 to its disbanding in 1960, Chinese Institute of Pacific Relations survived for 35 years. It was a branch of the Institute of Pacific Relations, and, meanwhile, had its own independence. Hu Shi took up twice the post of Head of Executive Council of Chinese Institute of Pacific Relations, and he was the life of Chinese Institute of Pacific Relations. Under his influence, a batch of liberalism intellectuals joined in the institute and converted Chinese Institute of Pacific Relations from a desultory organization with Christianity

color into an intellectual group with strong liberalism color. Although the Institute of Pacific Relations originated from instigation of Young Men's Christian Association, it broke away from track of the association.

By the end of 1929, the Institute of Pacific Relations had gradually evolved into its maturation period. Functions of the institute had already been perfect, and a set of complete and detailed working procedures was being formulated. Some Northeast China democrats, such as Yan Baohang, Ning Encheng and Wang Zhuoran, etc, secretary-generals of Young Men's Christian Association in Fengtian at that time, were present at the third International Pacific academic conference held in Japan, and prepared for the fourth International Pacific academic conference to be held in Shanghai. At the same time, Liao Branch of the International Conference was established, (Note 5) with the purpose to investigate the practical condition of Japanese power in Northeast China from all aspects. However, as a matter of fact, Northeast China PTPI played an important role.

During WWI, European big powers were all engaged in fighting, having no extra time to look upon East Asia, which provided "a heaven-sent chance" for Japanese expansion in China and Asia. Before this, Japan had plotted "Manchurian independence" for several times and attempted in vain to separate Northeast China from the whole China and turn the former into his monopolized colony. Besides, since 1920s when Japan constructed the so-called "Nove Mesto" in Northeast China, they had launched the Mass Movement to take back Japanese rights. (Note 6) Especially in 1929 when the notorious "Tanaka Memorial" was exposed to the public at the Third Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, indignation of Northeast people was aroused. They were not only active, but were evolved from dispersive and spontaneous public struggle into organized, planned and conscious conduct under leadership. The following patriotic anti-Japanese organizations were established in succession: "Liaoning National Diplomacy Association", "Liaoning Drug Resistance Association", "Liaoning Initiative Association for Common Sense of Citizens", and "Grand Anti-Japanese Alliance", etc. In addition, Xu Shida & Gao Jianguo et al organized "National Diplomacy Association of the Three Provinces in Northeast China". (Note 7) These legal organizations had close connection with the Institute of Pacific Relations, with the goal of anti-Japan. Especially, Northeast China PTPI was established in direct face with the issue of Japan's so-called "resolving unsettled law cases in Manchuria and Mongolia". The Institute of Pacific Relations was brought into China as a practice of national diplomacy. First of all, "Pacific issues" discussed at the conference were closely connected with China. Then, some proposals at the conference accorded with national diplomatic concepts faddish in China after WWI, including frank discussion of the international relationship in Pacific regions between common citizens and citizens from other countries and elimination of barriers, etc.

In fact, it could date back to earlier period to reflect demands of citizens in terms of diplomacy through non-governmental organization. On March 18, 1923, "Harbin National Diplomacy Support Association" held a city assembly in Binjiang Park and set up the "Awakening League to Save the Nation". After the assembly, they held a demonstration, and shouted loudly the slogans of "Opposing to the Twenty-one Demands" and "Returning our Dalian", etc. In 1927 when Tanaka Giichi came into power and forcibly set up a branch of the consul in Linjiang, people from all circles temporarily organized "the support association by all commercial and industrial personage in Fengtian to refuse the Japanese consul in Linjiang" in August. In August and September, this association held city assemblies and demonstrations in succession, and there was a total of 100,000 population or so in the city assembly and demonstration on September 4, which was rare in the history. This action urged Japanese Government to have to give up its plan to set up the consul in Linjiang. In 1928, the Japanese Government forced Northeast authority to construct Ji-Hui (Jilin to Huining in North Korea) Railway. Then, some public anti-Japanese patriotic organizations (maintenance association for right-of-way in the three provinces" and backup association for right-of-way maintenance, etc) initiatively resisted and started the famous "November 9" Anti-Japan Railway Brigade Movement, which broke Japan's conspiracy to merger the right of railway in Northeast China. (Note 8) Of course, anti-Japanese organizations, such as diplomacy backup association, during this period were spontaneously organized by the public until 1928 which didn't obtain support from the local authority. It should be mentioned, with time going on, attitude of local authority towards these "diplomacy backup" associations changed slightly, from suppression at the beginning to tacit consent later and even to placing hope on them. For example, after the anti-Japanese movement by Harbin national diplomacy backup association in 1923, Wu Junsheng, Governor of Heilongjiang issued an order to "prohibit all institutions and organizations from any action of opposing to the "Twenty-One Demands". (Note 9) In September 1927 when the patriotic movement by the backup association in Fengtian to refuse Japanese consul in Linjiang progressed upwards, Zhang Zuolin released he mandate of "repressing any anti-Japanese movement", and claimed, "if any civil or military official does not exert his power and leads to unexpected outcomes, then I will hold the responsibility of the senior officials." Before the November 9 Movement in 1928, Zhang Xueliang who followed

his father's trade had negotiated with Zhang Zuoxiang & Chang Yinhuai In October to refuse Japanese irrational demand due to the diplomatic pressure caused by Japan's demand to loan from him to construct the road, and decided to disclose this matter to the public on purpose. Afterwards, happened the large-scale anti-Japanese movement of maintaining the railway.

On July 3, 1929, personage from all circles in Northeast China held a preliminary meeting consistently organized in the aspect of diplomacy in the three provinces of Northeast China. during the preparation period, Zhang Xueliang indicated to Yan Baohang, "Being encompassed by the Red and White Imperialism, I hope you, Brother Yuheng, can try to fight against foreign nations." He also definitely told Yan Baohang that he was commanding the Head of the Diplomacy Branch, Wang Jiazhen, to organize a delegation constituted by northeastern public figures which would be prepared to join in the Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations to be held in Japan. During the conversation, Zhang Xueliang placed his focus on the issue of Zhongdong Railway. (Note 10) He pointed out, "Zhongdong Railway is co-administered by Japan and Russia in name only, and its actual control power is in the hand of Russia. It is an unfinished great undertaking of the late Commander to take back the right of Zhongdong Railway, which is supposed to be finished by himself." This conversation revealed the characteristics of officials commanding and the common people following orders in the Northeast China PTPI. The preliminary meeting passed five resolutions. 1). Discussion with all legal associations to assist this conference; 2). Discussion of publicly elected delegates with the Negotiation Office about Beining Railway Incident; 3). To ask a large majority of people to join with attendants within the four days as the originator; 4). Discussion of the organization of this conference. Resolution passed: to name the organization as Liaoning PTPI; 5). Ask the drafting committee to draw up general regulations. At the same time, it was stipulated that enrollment had to go through introduction by at least two people as a means of being serious. To report satisfactory results to members of all parties. Temporarily, 12 delegates were elected to attend the provincial government conference. However, as for holding the national assembly, there existed obstacles, so it was finally determined to re-elect five delegates. Discussion with the provincial authorities should be conducted respectively. (Note 11)

On July 11, 1929, after negotiation by the following people: Du Chongyuan, Yan Baohang, Lu Guangji and Jin Zhechen, etc, considering that such incidents as Japanese imperialism coveting Northeast China would continue to happen, they immediately joined patriotic personage from commercial, industrial and social organizations in Liaoning to organize "Liaoning National Diplomacy Association", including associations of Peasants' Union, Commercial and Industrial General Assembly and Educational Association. "As a matter of fact, Liaoning National Diplomacy Association was a parent organization for its subordinate organizations to conduct any anti-Japanese movement, with functions to adjust and summarize these movements." (Note 12) The primary goal was to study Japanese policies of aggression in China, adjust Japanese aggression crimes and conspiratorial activities, study policies and strategies to resist Japanese aggression, supervise the foreign affairs of the government, assist the government in its foreign negotiation and conduct extensive patriotism propaganda and education to the public.

With development of national diplomacy, the executive members of Northeast PTPI increased from 9 to 21, with 7 members of the standing committee. In August 1929, the Propaganda Department of Northeast PTPI opened "National Diplomacy Weekly", which was changed afterwards into "National Diplomacy Fortnightly". Shengjing Times reported, Northeast PTPI published "Diplomacy Association Weekly" as a means to introduce diplomatic public opinions, which issued diplomacy weekly reports, including event reports and introduction of communications, etc. It was published once on each Monday. (Note 13) Yoichi Ogata said, this publication "is aimed at mastering the status quo of Japanese power in Northeast China from all aspects and introduce it systematically to people both at home and abroad. ... The ultimate purpose, as it goes without saying, is to take back Manchurian railway and Dalian." This weekly journal was an internal publication, which were periodically presented to all institutions and organizations. It was released to disclose the aggression crimes of Japanese imperialism in all areas in Northeast China, reflect the will of the common people and persuade people in Fengtian and all neighbouring counties to stop reading Japanese newspapers.

The Institute of Pacific Relations and Northeast PTPI appeared in the name of academic non-governmental organization, and played a role that the government could not in a particular period. Northeast PTPI was actually a brainpower and backup force for Zhang Xueliang to deal with foreign affairs. Liaoning Branch of the Institute of Pacific Relations played an important part in resisting Japanese aggression and maintaining the national sovereignty and national interests.

2. International Pacific conference and issues of Northeast China

From October 28 to November 9, 1929, the third International Pacific Academic Conference was held in Xijing, Japan. The eight countries attended the conference, including Britain, America, Japan, China, Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the Philippines, and this was, as a matter of fact, the first time that all representatives of the Pacific riparian countries attended the conference. There were 250 representatives present at this conference, and together with those attending as nonvoting delegates and those representatives who were accepted, there were altogether over 860, exhibiting a grand occasion. (Note 14)

Different from the previous two conferences, this conference was decided to discuss realistic political issues, with the topic of discussion on Chinese diplomatic relations including “the issue of Manchuria”, which even accounted for half of the conference agenda and caused great repercussion in the association. Therefore, both China and Japan made intensive preparations. Yu Rizhang, the head of Chinese delegations present at the conference and Secretary-general of Chinese Young Men’s Christian Association (YMCA), paid a visit to Northeast China before the conference, (Note 15) attempted to persuade all parties to allow Northeast China to participate in the conference, and reviewed Zhang Xueliang. Then, with the identity of Secretary-general of YMCA in Shenyang, Liaoning, and the chief member of Northeast China PTPI, Yan Baohang was appointed as the preparation director of the conference, and meanwhile, 15 delegates of Ning Encheng and Wang Zhuoran, etc, were sent for the conference.

Before the third International Pacific Conference was held, Liaoning local representatives committee made large preparations for this conference. On October 16, Chinese delegates to participate in the conference released the manifesto of “overthrowing Manchuria Association”, and generalized the policies of Japan in Northeast China into six points: 1). Policy of the railway. To pave five railways, extend the Line of Yan-Hui and realize the plan of two lines and two ports; 2). Policy of economy, including investment, iron and steel manufacturing, coal mine exploration, lumbering, farmland cultivation, trade, bank and finance; 3). Policy of politics, including stationing troops and police; 4). Policy of culture, including colonization education, cultivation and sowing; 5). Policy of immigration, including sympolyandria, expelling Chinese, and monopolizing the land; 6). Disturbing the peace, including trafficking in morphine, smuggling opium and weapons and instigating bandits and also proposing the following ten slogans.(Note 16) a. overthrowing enemies in the colony; b. taking back the institute of iron manufacturing, coal mines and all organs used for invasion by foreign countries; c. taking back Dalian and opposing to commercial rent and mixed residence; d. refusing any illegal immigration by foreigners; e. not to borrow money from enemies for all enterprises including self-run railway, etc; f. insistence on the economic nonsupport to promote arousal of the enemies; g. opposing to economic development of the enemies; h. opposing to regarding the three provinces of Northeast China as the invasion place by the enemies; i. abolishing any irrational treaties signed with the enemies; j. opposing to forcible pavement of Yan-Hui Railway by the enemies. (Note 17)

On October 18, proposals were proposed for discussion at the Japanese conference, including the following content: 1) abolishing any unequal treaty and military arbitrament right and taking back concessions, etc; 2) withdrawing station troops of China in foreign countries; 3) school education run by foreigners; 4) foreign postal issues. (Note 18) On October 20, Yan Yuheng, (Note 19) preparation director of the conference tabled the bill with Japanese local authorities and the body corporate before the conference, including the following issues: 1) unequal treaty; 2) independence of the railway; 3) forbidding foreign schools to carry out Chinese education. In his “Autobiography”, Yan Baohang mentioned this, and pointed out, Japanese imperialism accelerated its aggression against China, which stimulated my patriotic thought of anti-Japan and my enthusiasm in any anti-Japanese patriotic activities. At the end of the winter of 1929, I attended the International Pacific Academic Congress held in Xijing in Japan. At the conference, the aggression policy of Japanese imperialism in China was accused of. Before the conference, I presided over the preparation conference held in Shenyang by Chinese delegation. (Note 20)

As early as 1927, Zhang Boling organized and established the “Manchuria Research Association” in Nankai University with the purpose of academic research, which was, afterwards, altered into “Northeast China Research Association.” This association clearly pointed out in its establishment manifesto, “Considering the inland situation of Northeast China, how many researchers have conducted research on Northeastern mountains and roads, products and customs, politics and economy and social situation? How could we not feel ashamed when we saw the large number of public and private research institutes by other countries, their perfect equipment, abundant research funds and meticulous investigation?” This indicated the importance and urgency to study issues of Northeast China. Northeast Research Association was held by Xiao Ju, and his research content was extremely rich, including Northeast railway system organization and seaport self-establishment,

northeast financing issue, northeast immigration issue, northeast resources, agriculture, transportation and education of Chinese people within the border of Jinzhou, etc. According to data obtained in the survey, the Research Association wrote the research reports of "Northeast Economic Resources and Development" and the book of "Manchuria", which were submitted to organizations, such as Institute of Pacific Relations for academic exchange with them. Considering that the research of Northeast Research Association in Nankai University had achieved outstanding achievements, John.B.Condilff, Director of research group of Institute of Pacific Relations, donated two thousand dollars to the association as a book purchase fee to support survey and research of the association.

The third International Pacific Conference mainly discussed great issues in Pacific regions, and holding of this conference was sponsored by Japanese government. There were almost ten Chinese delegates attending this conference, including Hu Shi, Yu Rizhang, Zhang Boling, Xu Shuxi, Chen Hengzhe, Yan Baohang, Tao Menghe, Ning Encheng and Zhou Tianfang, etc. At the conference, "Chinese delegates made declaration of condemning Jinan Incident and the incident of exploding Zhang Zuolin to death." Different from the previous two conferences, this conference aroused wide attention from all relative countries. On one hand, the association had already been mature and Chinese delegates had made lots of preparation work of research and propaganda, etc. What's more, the topic of the conference was centered with the international relations of China. Under such a circumstance, "the international Pacific symposium" entered the field of vision of Chinese people for the first time. For example, a lot of newspapers at that time reported issues related with the association and the conference with great interest, such as, "Shengjing Times". This conference was generally paid great attention to by all fields who embraced definite expectation upon this conference and wished that it could show sympathy and understanding to China. Furthermore, they expected to attain consensus at the conference so as to affect the global public opinions. Chinese delegates were also placed high expectations. For instance, "The China Times" cautioned against Chinese delegates to "strive for survival for the four hundred million people which was a great responsibility" and wished that "they would answer our destiny" so as to "comfort wishes of Chinese people". (Note 21)

During the conference, delegates from all parties put forward different proposals. The seminar of Pacific diplomatic issues was held by dividing all into four round tables, each with a head of the seats. Before the conference, the head of the four tables put forward existing treaties about the Pacific Ocean. That is, 1) treaty not to set fortifications; 2) treaty of the four countries; 3) treaty of the nine countries; 4) treaty of no war; 5) treaty of international coalition; 6) treaty of arbitration. Delegates from all countries explained the relationship between their countries and China and America. The conference used two days to discuss the issue of Northeast China, which involved such issues as historical origin of northeast China, foundation of treaties signed by foreign countries about their rights in northeast China, and economic interest and railway issues of big powers in northeast China, etc.

American delegates put forward "Neo-Monroeism" at the conference. The so-called "Monroeism" meant that, the American President Monroe declared in his official communication with the Congress on December 2, 1823, America would not interfere in internal affairs of European big power or wars among them; America acknowledged not to interfere in the colonies and protectorates of European big power in Latin America; European big power would not recolonize in South or North America; any of European big power's control or oppression over South or North America would be regarded as act of hostility against America. He also proposed the slogan that "America was the America of Americans". As a matter of fact, he declared that Latin America was attached to USA. In a certain sense, Monroeism had an objective effect on preventing European big power from encroaching on those Latin American countries which were had already been independent. However, Neo-Manroeism was extension (Note 22) of Manroeism by American President Franklin Roosevelt (senior). Thus, American delegates mentioned at the conference, any European country had to negotiate with our country (US) about the possibility of any colony in the future, any war among European countries or any other matter among them. (Note 23) Du Chongyuan criticized the "false face of Japanese imperialists' goodwill with China in an article "Great Asianism". (Note 24)

According to Chinese delegates, the issue of Northeast China originated from the fact that Japan merged North Korea, and they listed all aggression measures taken by Japan in addition to their rights in the treaty in the three provinces in Northeast China, pointing out that the so-called threat to Russia was illusion of Japan, and that if Japan cancelled their political activities in Northeast China, then it would not be difficult for the two countries to improve their relationship. "After discussion for days on end by all delegates at the conference, it was decided that a mediation committee was specially organized for resolution of Chinese and Japanese issues. The conference decided that Chinese and Japanese delegates selected special members to organize the committee. As

for detailed survey on the scope of the organization and activities of the committee, the organizing and preparation committee investigated all parties to select the committee members after being ready, and after the conference was over, they immediately organized the mediation committee.” (Note 25) At the conference, Chinese delegates and Japanese delegates were engaged in a battle for several times on the issue of Northeast China, which indicated the serious standpoint of Chinese academics. Afterwards, academic groups from Dalian and Harbin, etc, also often exchanged relevant data and information about the issue of Northeast China with academics from Nankai University.

After exchange for several days between Chinese and Japanese delegates, the conference finally came to the following decisions:

1) Chinese diplomatic issues

a) as for extraterritoriality issues, China greatly advocated immediate abolishment, but foreign countries thought it was too early. Finally, the proposal by American delegate Shizwir was decided as the basic proposal;

b) as for the issue of settlement, China advocated to immediately take back those special settlements of foreign countries in China. Although they acknowledged to return common settlements one by one, it left to the central party to continue to investigate this issue.

2) the issue of Manchuria

Chinese and Japanese delegates did not attain conformity. For example, the Chinese delegate Xu Yanjing, a university Professor went into hot dispute with the Japanese delegate Yosuke Matsuoka (Note 26) on his position of the Vice President of Manchurian Railway, which China understood slightly. Japanese opinions were finally not resolved, and although they set up the meditation committee, it did not work at all.

3) the issue of Pacific diplomacy

There were two viewpoints on this issue, one being to entrust all sorts of diplomatic issues to the League of Nations and the other being to set up special investigation organizations, neither of which was determined.

At the final sitting, Yu Rizhang, as the Chinese delegate, made a speech that, “great success was attained at the third Pacific Issue Investigation Meeting. And the biggest success was that members from all countries had made new friendship, which would promote folk communication and goodwill of all nations, etc.” (Note 27)

It was at this conference that Yan Baohang, Chairman of the Northeast China PTPI Standing Committee, made “Tanaka Memorial” public to representatives present at the conference, which astonished the whole world. (Note 28)

In his autobiography, Yan Baohang narrated how he had obtained “Tanaka Memorial”. According to him, he got one copy of “Tanaka Memorial” (which was bought secretly by Zhang Xueliang from Japan at an expensive cost) from the Secretary of Zhang Xueliang --- Wang Jiazhen (at present holding the position of committee member for Institute of Foreign Affairs), and this copy was the well-known secret plan by Japanese imperialism to invade the peaceful world of China. With great astonishment, (I) felt as if I had found out treasure. Then, with agreement of the preparation committee, I translated it into English, printed out two hundred copies and sent them out to delegates from Britain, America and Canada, etc, (at the conference), which was the beginning of “Tanaka Memorial” to be made public. (Note 29)

In November 1929, an opportunity came to make “Tanaka Memorial” come out to the whole world at “the third International Pacific Conference”. The topic of this Pacific Seminar was the issue of Chinese Manchuria. Speeches of Chinese delegates intensively revealed the policy of aggression into China by Japan. The Japanese delegation headed by Yosuke Matsuoka argued in favor of Japanese policies. He spoke English fluently, talked with ease and confidence and made a hit. In his speech, he discussed vigorously that Japan had always been attaching great importance to the local peace and the friendly attitude of Ishihara towards the neighborhood on the post of an acting prime minister. He declared, Japan had a significant stake with the national defense and national welfare and the people’s livelihood of Manchuria and Inner Mongolia, so Japan had to take special consideration in some aspects. However, invasion of Japan into China was out of the responsibility of bordering on China, which had no ground for blame.

Entrusted by Zhang Xueliang, Wang Zhuoran attended this conference, and revealed Japanese savage act of aggression in China as a representative. “His patriotic enthusiasm and scholarly attainments received great admiration from the British Labor Party Head MacDonald, and after the conference, MacDonald followed Wang Zhuoran to pay a visit to Northeast University, where MacDonald made an enthusiastic speech to the students.”

As the Chinese representative, Yan Baohang attended this conference and made a speech at the conference,

“Northeast China had huge economic benefits like other countries, where they station huge armies, and an aggressive war may happen at any time. Of course, their target is not only Chinese Manchuria, but also Mongolia; not only Manchuria and Mongolia, but also Indochina and even the whole world. Some one says, they have a kind of responsibility for Northeast China, but if it is really called a responsibility, then will there be peace in Northeast China or even China? or all pacific countries? We can totally believe that, this sort of responsibility is synonymous with the word of ambition. We here have a document from Japanese Imperialism, so we totally have reason for thinking that this is a memorial presented by the Prime Minister Tanaka to the Mikado after the North Conference held in Japan in 1927. I have translated this document into English and have sent to all the delegates for your research reference.”

The whole assembly room went into hubbub. Yosuke Matsuoka, the Japanese chief representative, threatened by retreating from the conference to try to hold back continuous debate at the conference, which caused a great disturbance during the conference.

The notorious “Tanaka Memorial” was made public to the world as such.

“Although there still has dispute on the authenticity of “Tanaka Memorial”, Gu Weijun explained in his article written after the September 18 Incident, “There had had debate about the authenticity of the Tanaka Memorial, but incidents which happened after it was revealed matched completely with the plan recorded in this memorial. Thus, we can not but take this memorial as the specific action of Japan in China.” (Note 30) “Therefore, whether this memorial exists or not, it still has deep historical significance as for the process of development of Japanese policies in Mainland China.”

The authenticity of “Tanaka Memorial” became the most noted historical legal case in the history of Chinese and Japanese relationship in the 20th Century. Chinese and Japanese politicians and scholars debated heatedly its mysterious and legendary color, which still has not come to a final conclusion. A necessary logical relationship was formed between comments of “Tanaka Memorial” on the Manchurian and Mongolian political and economic status and development of Japanese invasion into China. Japanese invasion proved that they had totally behaved according to the track stipulated in “Tanaka Memorial”. The memorial elaborated development of Northeast China economy exactly in a precise scientific way, and description of the contract of Mongolian King was also a fact, (Note 31) which could not be obliterated and denied. Although Japanese Communist Party proved existence of this “memorial” after the war, Japanese authority has still denied authenticity of this document so far. Domestic scholars universally believed that the first time “Tanaka Memorial” was disclosed to the world was that it was publicized in “Current Monthly” whose author was believed to be Yan Baohang.

3. Focus issues disputed by Chinese and Japanese academics at the Fourth International Pacific Conference

On February 2, 1931, after its establishment in Hangzhou, China Institute of Pacific Relations immediately got support and help from the Institute of Pacific Relations. The reason for choosing Hangzhou as its site of establishment was that, “Hangzhou was far away from the political center, and was also convenient”. Furthermore, “Hangzhou had its historical glamour and modern spirit.” (Note 32) In July of the same year, Yu Rizhang resigned from the post of Council of China Institute of Pacific Relations and Chairman of the Fourth International Pacific Annual Meeting. Afterwards, Hu Shi was immediately elected as Chairman of the Fourth International Pacific Annual Meeting. At the preliminary meeting before the conference, China Institute of Pacific Relations formally issued regulations of the institute. Regulations stipulated this meeting as “China Institute of Pacific Relations). The purpose of this meeting was to “study Pacific issues, make an effort in national diplomacy and strengthen friendship and understanding between all nations”. The issue of Northeast China was the focus topic of this meeting.

From October 21 to November 2, 1931, the Fourth Institute of Pacific Relations was held in the International Recreation Club at the Bubbling Well Road. The site of the meeting was decided at No. 123 of Boulevard de Montigny Road in Shanghai.

There were 105 members in the China Branch and 15 executive members, with Hu Shi as the executive committee Chairman. Altogether 140 formal representatives were present, including 26 Americans, 20 British, 19 Japanese, 11 Canadians, 9 Australians, 6 New Zealanders, 5 Filipinos, 1 Dutchman, 2 from the League of Nations, 3 from the International Labor Office, and 38 Chinese. Together with 39 employments and family members of the representatives, there were 179 attending this meeting. The Chinese at present this meeting were listed as follows: Yan Huiqing, Chen Liting, Zhang Boling, Hu Shi, Wang Shijie, Ding Wenjiang, Xu Xinliu, Ma Yinchu, Liu Dajun, Zhang Gongquan, Chen Guangpu, Zhou Zuomin, Wang Yunwu, Dong Xianguang, Xia Jinlin, Tao Menghe, Wu Jingxiong, Zeng Baosun, Xu Shuxi, Liu Hongsheng, Chen Hengzhe, Bao Mingqian, Wu

Dajun, Lin Wenqing, Ning Encheng, Wu Yifang, Jiang Menglin, Liu Zhan'en, Yan Baohang, Zhong Rongguang, Wang Zhuoran, Su Shangda, Li Lunyi, He Lian, Wan Guangxiu, Chen Da, Zhou Jimei, Liu Zhujun, Yang Xingfu and Li Ximou. (Note 33) On October 21, the opening ceremony was held. First of all, the Chinese representative Xu Xinliu made the welcome remarks and concluded affairs that had been conducted during the past two years and scheduled the next meeting. The final topic discussed at the meeting included the following: 1) Pacific trade relations; 2) development of Chinese economy; 3) Pacific diplomatic relations; 4) cultural and social relations; 5) professions and population; 6) Pacific territory and indigenous people; 7) ethnic mixed immigration; 8) ethnic population and health; 9) service and the living standard. (Note 34)

As a local branch, the Branch of Northeast China also prepared its proposal. In terms of study on issue of Northeast China, there were the following: the issue of Korea in Northeast China (Wang Weixin), the status quo of Northeast China Railway (Su Shangda), the financial condition of Northeast China (Ning Encheng), the issue of Northeast Agriculture (Yao Mengnian), the condition of drug resistance in Northeast China (Yan Baohang), education in Northeast China (Wang Zhuoran) and the living of foreigners (Bian Zongmeng). (Note 35)

At the end of May 1931 when the fourth meeting was being prepared, a tide of opposing to the Institute of Pacific Relations suddenly appeared in Hangzhou. The tide was launched by Research Association for Beiping Eastern Issues, with its backbone including a batch of Kuomintang members and intellectuals influenced by Marxism. At that time, this association made a manifesto that they opposed to holding the Institute of Pacific Relations in Hangzhou. According to them, the Institute of Pacific Relations was a "royal organization for imperialists", and members of the China Branch were "servants catering to the imperialism". After this manifesto was made, some Ranters went canvassing all around and threatened that, if the International Pacific conference was to be held in Hangzhou, "there would be some loyal Kuomintang members and Korean revolutionary young people who would organize a blood-and-iron league and hold handguns and bombs to add to the fun at the conference". They mentioned that, the Institute of Pacific Relations was "completely an agent organization for the international imperialists, who deceived weak nations" and "it had no difference with the League of Nations". (Note 36) Thus, they sent a telegram to ask for the National Government and the KMT Central Committee to refuse holding this conference; furthermore, they wrote to the China Branch to ask them to dismiss by themselves. Their opinion got response from KMT party branches and some cultural organizations from Beiping, Nanjing, Zhejiang, Suiyuan, Jilin and Heilongjiang, etc. Preparation for this conference was also affected. However, since this conference had already been approved by the National Government and had notified representatives from all countries, there was no doubt that it would affect the national reputation and international standpoint if they arbitrarily cancelled this conference back and fill. The China Branch sent Chen Liting et al to go to Beiping and Hangzhou to explain and mediate to all parties. Chen Liting published a series of articles on lots of major journals to introduce origin of the institute, its nature, purpose and working content, etc, which was a finger in the dike. One focus disputed by the China Branch and its opponents was whether the institute was academic or political. During the two months of July and August, almost all publications all over the country published manifestos and warns about protesting holding the Institute of Pacific Relations in China. Considering the situation at that time, it seemed that the conference had no other choice but to go to abortion.

At the same time, Chiang Kai-shek made a speech at the anniversary of Kuomintang on September 22, 1931, and criticized the argument which opposed to the Institute of Pacific Relations. He pointed out, "Appointed by the National Government, the conference will be held in Hangzhou. If there is any of our comrades who are unaware of the truth and advocate opposition, he should come to realize that this conference has a great effect upon the national diplomacy... The Institute of Pacific Relations was constituted by delegates automatically elected by citizens of all nations, and it is actually not a governmental organization. Its purpose is to integrate all national qualifications to study all sorts of international contradictions, put forward appropriate resolutions in the hope of mutual understanding and emotion, but not a tool by one nation to aggress another nation. This sort of organization, I not only will not go against, but will fully approve and encourage so as to promote success of our national diplomacy and national movement. If any of people from other nations are not quite aware of the suppression and unequal treatment of China, I have to make full use of any opportunity at any time to make them fully aware of the circumstance of China and arouse their sympathy." This conference held by the Institute of Pacific Relations in China was invited by the government. "Actually, the government was determined to hold affection of people from all nations and make public the unequal status of China". "The headquarter should go in agreement with the government". "Its members should not be exploited by the opponents for their counter propaganda or blindly take rash actions. Otherwise, they may expose their weakness and be ridiculed by others in vain." (Note 37) In his speech, Chiang Kai-shek also mentioned the conference held in Xijing, Japan in 1929. He said, "Our representatives discussed Japanese aggression in China which aroused sympathy from people of

all nations, which was a case in point. Thus, if this conference is held in China, we should appreciate it, and how can we oppose to it." On September 24, Yu Qiaqing, the Chinese reception committee chairman for the conference made a speech that, because Japan took a noncooperation attitude, the conference in Hangzhou was cancelled, which had already been informed to members of all nations. (Note 38) After the speech by Chiang Kai-shek, "Ta Kung Pao" made comments of agreement, and said, "Establishment of a nation should not depend on others, but the international sympathy is required." "In recent years, China has, as a matter of fact, been isolated without any friends. And its political and social conditions have lost respect and sympathy from all nations. Thus, it is necessary for an attempt for reform. If we still follow the grandiloquence by the Communist Party, then won't it be duller?" (Note 39)

Since Chiang Kai-shek explained by himself, intense speeches about the conference suddenly hauled down in newspapers in Beijing, Tianjin, Shanghai & Hangzhou, etc, and voices of opposition also suddenly vanished. Previously, the China Branch of the Institute of Pacific Relations was little known by some people, it was widely concentrated by all circles around the whole nation after this war of words, which expanded the influence of the institute.

For all this, on one hand, since the institute focused on issues with dense political controversy, and on the other hand, limited to discussion of biennial meeting, its research activities were seldom known in China. Therefore, its opponents criticized that, "the institute made use of the name of an academic organization and made a fool of the oppressed Pacific nations". There were also some people in the press who mentioned, "the institute termed itself as an academic organization, but it fell over itself for discussion of political issues, with an extraordinarily unclear nature. Thus, one could not but doubt the institute which made false use of the academy and played a game of politics." (Note 40) There was also one kind of opinion among Chinese members who believed that the institute should break itself away from political dispute and focus on the academy so as not to be involved in the suspect of a political organization. (Note 41) Finally, the tide was calmed down owing to personal interference by Chiang Kai-shek.

When the fourth conference finally came to an end in Shanghai, it hadn't aroused as wide attention as it had as two years before and even the period of its preparation. This was because after outbreak of September 18 Incident, official and substantial diplomatic initiative was more noticeable. In addition, the opposition public opinion before the conference was also an influential factor that could not be ignored.

As the major leader of Northeast China PTPI, Yan Baohang mentioned in his autobiography how to participate in the Fourth Conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations, and he pointed out, "Again, I attended the conference held in Shanghai. At this conference, Chinese delegates criticized Japanese aggression in the Northeast China. Japanese delegates declared at the conference that, Japan had no ambition of aggression in China. Then, September 18 Incident was nothing but a local incident and Manchuria and Mongolia were no more than a white elephant to Japan (namely, of no use). Delegates from US and Britain took an ambiguous attitude and they just expressed slightly the intention to survey Japanese aggression." (Note 42) However, as a matter of fact, celebrity scholars from Britain, America and Japan, etc, who joined the conference were all tools of aggression of the imperialism, while the Institute of Pacific Relations was a tool for these aggression tools.

After the September 18, the League of Nations failed in holding down Japanese aggression. It was the unique measure for the National Government to appeal to the League of Nations in the case of Japanese aggression in the Northeast China. it was decided by Chiang Kai-shek, but it was not only he who had the idea of depending on the League of Nations. Especially among senior army generals and government officials, there were lots of people embracing illusion towards the League of Nations, including Zhang Xueliang who commanded the Northeast Army of hundreds of thousands. He believed, it was not enough to overcome Japanese aggression merely on the "single power of the Northeast China", so he advocated "following command of the Central Government." When the nonresistance order of the Central Kuomintang Government made him loss a great majority of the territory, he then laid his hope on interference of the League of Nations. At the conference, Chinese delegates advocated entrusting the issue of Northeast China to the League of Nations. By contrast, Japanese delegates believed, "For the time being, China has no government or order, so life of Japanese people in Manchuria fall into danger. China gave up the issue of treaty, that is, Japanese aggression. Thus, Japanese attitude towards Manchuria can not be changed." (Note 43) At the Council of the League of Nations, Fangzi Qianji, delegate of Japanese Government, made a speech which called white black, and claimed that it was China who should take the responsibility for September 18 Incident, while Japan was out of self-guard. He said, this incident should exclude interference of third party, and should be directly negotiated between China and Japan. On October 26, Japanese Government again made the declaration, "the cause of the Manchurian Incident was totally the provocative act of Chinese army. And just as the imperialism government has declared again and

again, the reason why at present a few troops still station at several places outside the attached land of Manchurian railway is to protect life and property of the imperialism citizens, which is unavoidable.” (Note 44) In sum, it can be seen, Japanese delegates were totally at the command of the Japanese Government in the issue of September 18 Incident.

At this conference, some western countries, such as Britain and America, took an indifferent attitude towards Japan launching the September 18 Incident just as they took an incredulous attitude towards “Tanaka Memorial” which had already been exposed at the third conference of the Institute of Pacific Relations. As a result of the partial attitude of western countries towards Japanese aggression, controversy at the conference ended in smoke. However, “Tanaka Memorial” was made public to the world which was out of expectation of Japanese authority and whose effects and influences were immeasurable.

On October 30, 1931, the conference conducted a discussion on the issue of Manchuria and extraterritoriality. At the conference, Chinese representatives held a debate with Japanese representatives on the issue of Manchuria and employment of police power. Japanese representatives, Tsurumi Suzuki and Takayanagi Sanshi switched from the legal round table to discuss the issue of Manchuria, "taking an extremely excited attitude". (Note 45) On the same day, Chinese representative Chen Liting made a summary statement on the topic of "international relations of China", enumerated Japan's aggression policies and aggression behavior in China and bitterly rebuked the fallacy that China was a non-sovereign state. None of the audience did not change their countenance after his speech with justice. Japanese representatives were ashamed into anger. Their team leader Xin Duhu interrogated Archibald Rose from England, President of the conference, whether speech of Chen Liting violated the conference rule, with the purpose of stopping speech by Chen Liting. However, Rose said that speech by Chen Liting would not violate the conference rule and let him continue his speech. Hardly had Chen Liting's voice faded away, the Japanese representative Takayanagi scrambled for his speech. Then, Xin Duhu suddenly stood up, yelling that Chen's speech had humiliated Japanese imperialism and Japanese representatives, which led to agitation by all the audience. Chen immediately stood up and declared the key point of his speech, saying that what he had said was merely a fact and was not intended to slander Japan. By that time, scholars of China and Japan had been engaged in a jaw-jaw and involved in a tangled warfare. (Note 46) On October 30, 1931, the conference conducted a discussion on the issue of Manchuria and extraterritoriality. At the conference, Chinese representatives held a debate with Japanese representatives on the issue of Manchuria and employment of police power. Japanese representatives, Tsurumi Suzuki and Takayanagi Sanshi

As for the issue of Northeast China at the conference, Chinese delegates proposed 14 proposals about taking back the attached regions and being centered by Dalian, which didn't become the topics of the conference. Japanese delegates present at the conference presented more than 12 volumes about reports of the issues of Northeast China, which astonished all representatives from Northeast China. (Note 47)

In one word, the Institute of Pacific Relations was an international non-governmental organization in the Asian-Pacific region after the First World War. This institute took advantage of the non-governmental diplomatic platform and played the due role as an international non-governmental organization. In order to investigate the practical condition of Japanese power in Northeast China from all aspects, Northeast China PTPI played an important role. At the same time, major leaders of Northeast China PTPI were present at the international Pacific academic conference, and discussed the following issues: historical origin of northeast China, foundation of treaties signed by foreign countries about their rights in northeast China, and economic interest and railway issues of big powers in northeast China, etc. However, without a great national power as the backup force, we deeply realize the principle of “a weak country without diplomacy”. Meanwhile, we also realize that public diplomacy can still play a role under a particular historical circumstance which the government may not play.

References

- Chen, Fengxiang. (1981). *Continental Policy of Modern Japan*. Jinhe Publishing House, December, p.314.
- Du, Chongyuan. (1990). *Great Asianism, in Collected Works of Du Chongyuan*. Wenhui Publishing House, September, pp.151-152. *The New Life, Quarterly*, Vol. 1, No. 45.
- Li, Hongwen & Zhang, Benzhen. (1987). *Great Events in Northeast China*, Vol. 2. Jilin Literature and History Publishing House, April, p.686.
- Liang, Jingxin. (1930). Notes on the Third Conference of Institute of Pacific Relations. *Current Monthly*, January, Vol. 2, No. 1.
- Ouyang Junxi. (2006). Hu Shi and Institute of Pacific Relations --- On Dilemma of Modern Chinese Liberalism. *Historical Research in Anhui*, No. 1.

Shanggenxingfu, Tengjingshengsan and Zhengfuyitianshenghong. (1984). *Threshold to Study on Relations between Modern Japan and China*, translated by Zhou, Qiqian. Jinhe Publishing House, June, p.173.

Wang, Taixue. (1992). *Brief Biography of Wang Zhuoran*. Collected Historical Data of Wang Zhuoran (all 36 volumes). Liaoning People's Publishing House, December, pp.13-14.

Yan, Baohang. (1990). *Anti-Japanese struggle of people exiling in Kannai*, in Portfolio of Cultural and Historical Data, Vol. 6. Zhonghua Book Company, p.88.

Zhang, Jing. (2005). National diplomacy under the national crisis --- Centered with disputes before the opening of the Fourth Conference of Institute of Pacific Relations. *Nanjing University Journal*, No. 3, pp.99-107.

Zhang, Jing. (2006). National diplomacy and academic research (1). *Social Sciences Review*, No. 4.

Zhang, Youkun & Qian, Jin. (1996). *Annual Chronicle of Zhang Xueliang*, Vol. 1. Social Sciences Academic Press, December, p.377.

Notes

Note 1. English name of "太平洋国际学会" is "Institute of Pacific Relations", and Japan called it "Institute of Pacific Issues Survey", with lots of Chinese names. In 1920, it was called "太平洋国交讨论会". There were several terms after 1930, such as, "太平洋国际学会", "太平洋学会", "太平洋关系学会", "太平洋国际协会", "泛太平洋学会" and "太平洋会议", etc. "太平洋国际学会" was the formal term by Chinese branch after 1931.

Note 2. Chen, Liting. First conference of Institute of Pacific Relations. *Oriental Magazine*, No. 19, Vol. 23, p.39.

Note 3. Chen, Liting & Ying, Yuandao. Latest Pacific Issues. Overall Outline of Institute of Pacific Relations, Institute of Pacific Relations in 1927, "Appendix 1", p.1.

Note 4. Study on Institute of Pacific Relations started in 1970s, and most researchers were from America and Japan. Relations between the institute and China and situation of Chinese branch did not be studied. This article mainly used current data to review discussion about Northeast Chinese issues in the Third Conference of Institute of Pacific Relations and explain how Tanaka Memorial was publicized.

Note 5. Recent situation about anti-Japanese activities centered with Fengtian. *East Asia*, April 1930.

Note 6. Weixingyangyi. Activity to take back the national authority of Shenyang --- Shenyang National Diplomacy Association Note. *Social Sciences Review*, Vol. 25, No. 2.

Note 7. Data about the history of Manchurian Railway. Vol. 2, 3th Fascicule, p.1032.

Note 8. There were three major railway systems in Northeast China. The first one was the Middle East Railway System controlled by China and Russia, swallowing Hong as Vladivostok; the second one was the Southern Manchurian System controlled by Japan, swallowing Manchuria as Lvda; the third one was Beining Railway System controlled by China, swallowing Manchuria as Huludao.

Note 9. Xie, Chufu. Great events of local Party in Communist Party of China in Heilongjiang. Data of the History of the CPC in Heilongjiang, Vol. 4, compiled by Heilongjiang provincial CPC history working committee in Harbin in 1985, p.97.

Note 10. China came into conflict with Russia as a result of the issue of Middle East Railway. On July 10, 1929, under the command of Chiang Kai-shek, the Army led by Zhang Xueliang occupied Middle East Road and sealed up such institutions as Far East Trade Bureau of Russia. On July 18, Russia declared to refuse diplomacy with China. On July 26, a battle broke out in the area of Manzhouli. In October, Zhang Xueliang was defeated. In December, the Kuomintang Government and Russian Government signed "Boli Treaty", with the following content: the two countries will immediately cease fire, the Middle East Railway will be co-administered again the two countries and Russia will withdraw from Manzhouli as soon as possible and re-open its consulate in Harbin.

Note 11. Work Diary of Liaoning National Diplomacy Association, currently archived in Liaoning Archives.

Note 12. Weixingyangyi. Activity to take back the national authority of Shenyang --- Shenyang National Diplomacy Association Note. *Social Sciences Review*, Vol. 25, No. 2.

Note 13. *Shengjing Times*, August 30, 1929.

Note 14. Opening Ceremony of Institute of Pacific Relations. *Shengjing Times*, October, 1929.

Note 15. Refer to Wang, Chenmian. Yu Rizhang & Youth Association. Institute of Modern History, Academia Sinica in Taipei, Collected papers of modern Chinese historical personage, published by Institute of Modern

History, Academia Sinica in 1993. The National Association of the Young Men's Christian Association was formally established in 1915, with the first Secretary-general of Fletcher S. Brockman from America and the Deputy Secretary-general of Wang Zhengting. Wang Zhengting succeeded Fletcher S. Brockman after he returned to America. In 1917, Yu Rizhang succeeded Wang Zhengting to take the position of Secretary-general.

Note 16. This slogan became the strategy of Northeast China National Diplomacy Association afterwards.

Note 17. Weixingyangyi. Activity to take back the national authority in Shenyang --- Shenyang National Diplomacy Association Note. *Social Sciences Review*, printed by No. 72, January in Year 55 of Zhaohe.

Note 18. Articles proposed by representatives from Liaoning, *Shenjing Times*, October 18, 1929.

Note 19. Namely, Yan Baohang.

Note 20. Autobiography of Yan Baohang, currently archived in Institute for Local History of the Party, Liaoning Academy of Social Sciences.

Note 21. Ye, Min. Pacific Issue Survey Association, (Vol. 1 & Vol. 2). Farewell to Pacific Chinese representatives, October 23-35, 1929. *The China Times*.

Note 22. Roosevelt said, "In the Western Hemisphere, when notorious improper behavior and timidity and incompetence as above occurred, out of its belief in Monroeism, America had to be extremely reluctant to exercise its authority as the international police. See US "Presidential Message and Documentation", Vol. 16, p.7053.

Monroeism in Asia: before the Second World War, Japanese militarism copied the formula of American Monroeism and put forward the slogan that "Asia is the Asia of Asians". It asked all countries to admit that Japan was in Asia, and especially its "particular interests" in China. It required that European and American countries as well as the League of Nations should not interfere in affairs of Asia, and declared that Japan was the "leader" in Asia, etc. People called this "Monroeism in Asia" or "East Asian Monroeism".

Note 23. "New Monroeism", *Shenjing Times*, November 9, 1929.

Note 24. Monroeism in Asia: before the Second World War, Japanese militarism copied the formula of American Monroeism and put forward the slogan that "Asia is the Asia of Asians". It asked all countries to admit that Japan was in Asia, and especially its "particular interests" in China. It required that European and American countries as well as the League of Nations should not interfere in affairs of Asia, and declared that Japan was the "leader" in Asia, etc. People called this "Monroeism in Asia" or "East Asian Monroeism". "Great Asianism" was originally proposed by Sun Yat-sen, with the original meaning that oppressed nations in Asia united to fight against the aggressive Europeans and fought for national equality. However, Japanese imperialism imagined to regard itself as the center. The reason why Japanese imperialism actively advocated China-made goods was not that they cherished Chinese goods, but that they embraced great ambition and purpose.

Note 25. Temporary Organization for Arbitration. *Shenjing Times*, November 9, 1929.

Note 26. Yōsuke Matsuoka (1880-1946), Japanese. When he was 14 years old, he went to US for study and returned to Japan in 1902. In 1920, he held the position of General Consul in Shanghai. In 1921, he resigned the position of general consul and held the position of Director in Southern Manchurian Railway Company, promoted as vice President in 1927. In 1932, he attended discussion of "Manchurian Events" in the League Assembly on behalf of Japanese Government. In 1935, he held the position of President of Southern Manchurian Railway Company. In August 1945 when Japan surrendered, he was arrested as a suspect of Class-A war criminal, and died from lung disease during his trial. He wrote the books of "Purpose and Fundamental Significance of Economic Cooperation by China and Japan in Manchuria and Mongolia" and "To Revitalize Manchuria", etc.

Note 27. Closing of Institute of Pacific Relations. *Shenjing Times*, November 11, 1929.

Note 28. Lv, Zhengcao. (1995). Selfless contribution in his life and long remembrance of his demeanor --- In memory of the Twentieth Anniversary of the death of Yan Baohang. Collected works of remembrance of Yan Baohang. Liaoning People's Publishing House, June, p.5. Wang, Meiping. Institute of Pacific Relations and Northeast China issues. *Modern History Study*, No. 2, 2008, p.55.

Note 29. Autobiography of Yan Baohang, currently archived in Institute of Local History of Party in Academy of Liao Social Science.

Note 30. Gu, Weijun. MEMORANDA, reprinted by Wenhua Publishing House. Compilation 483 of Modern Chinese Historical Data Collections, p.14.

- Note 31. Wang, Jiazhen. Source of Chinese Translation of the Two Japanese Confidential documents. Confession of a Mongolia King in Tanaka Memorial was different from what was said in the documents. See the Eleventh Volume of Collected Works of Cultural and Historical Data. Zhonghua Book Company, November, 1960, p.129.
- Note 32. Complete Diary of Hu Shi (6), pp.156-157,p.158.
- Note 33. Chinese representatives to attend Institute of Pacific Relations were already determined. The China Times, July 21, 1931.
- Note 34. Formal meeting of Institute of Pacific Relations in Shanghai. Shengjing Times, October 23, 1931.
- Note 35. Review and Prospectiveness of Institute of Pacific Relations. Shanghai Journal, July 15, 1931.
- Note 36. The first declaration of all circles in Peiping to resist Institute of Pacific Relations. See Po Lang, Northeast Event and Institute of Pacific Relations in "The latest Far East issues" in New Oriental, November 21, 1931.
- Note 37. Nature of speech by the President Chiang Kai-shek in Institute of Pacific Relations. Ta Kung Pao, September 15, 1931. Liu, Yuwan. Latest Pacific Issues, published in October 1932 by Chinese Institute of Pacific Relations, p.2.
- Note 38. Stoppage of Pacific Conference. Shengjing Times, September 25, 1931.
- Note 39. Feeling towards issues of Institute of Pacific Relations. Ta Kung Pao, September 16, 1931.
- Note 40. On anti-Institute of Pacific Relations activities. Peiping Morning Paper, June 30, 1931.
- Note 41. Ms. Chen Hengzhe declared not to join in Institute of Pacific Relations. Peiping Morning Paper, June 30, 1931.
- Note 42. Autobiography of Yan Baohang, currently archived in Institute for Local History of the Party, Liaoning Academy of Social Sciences, with the original document in Central Archives.
- Note 43. Discussion on Manchurian Case by the Pacific, October 30, 1931.
- Note 44. The second statement of the government about Manchurian Incident on October 26. Diplomatic chronology of Japan and major documentation (1840-1945) by Foreign Ministry, Vol. 2, p.185.
- Note 45. Dispute on Manchurian issues by Institute of Pacific Relations. Shengjing Times, November 1, 1931.
- Note 46. Disputes on Northeast China issues. Shanghai Journal, November 1, 1931.
- Note 47. Weixingyangyi. Activity to take back the national authority in Shenyang --- Liaoning National Diplomacy Association Note. Social Sciences Review, printed by No. 72, January in Year 55 of Zhaohe.